

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on May 23, 1974, the following report was filed on May 24, 1974]

Mr. HEBERT: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 12565. (Rept. No. 93-1064). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARCHER (for himself, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HUBER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, and Mr. WAGGONER):

H.R. 15016. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a limited exclusion of capital gains realized by taxpayers other than corporations on securities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself and Mr. CONTE):

H.R. 15017. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that advertising of alcoholic beverages is not a deductible expense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLISON of Missouri:

H.R. 15018. A bill to extend for 1 year the time for entering into a contract under section 106 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS (for herself, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. STARK and Mr. TRAXLER):

H.R. 15019. A bill to create a national system of health security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 15020. A bill to improve the oversight capabilities of the House of Representatives and the Senate and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 15021. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to entitle veterans of the Mexican border period and of World War I and their widows and children to pension on the same basis as veterans of the Spanish-American War and their wi-

dows and children, respectively, and to increase pension rates; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YOUNG of Illinois):

H.R. 15022. A bill to encourage and assist States and localities to develop, demonstrate, and evaluate means of improving the utilization and effectiveness of human services through integrated planning, management, and delivery of those services in order to achieve the objectives of personal independence and individual and family economic self-sufficiency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 15023. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 5-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits in cases of terminal illness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSH (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 15024. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the rapid depreciation of expenditures to rehabilitate low-income rental housing incurred after December 31, 1974; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 15025. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1970 to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the forestry incentive program administered under title X of such act and to increase the size of a tract which may be affected by such program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, Jr., Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DORN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HUBER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LITTON, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. MANN, Mr. MILLS, and Mrs. MINK):

H.R. 15026. A bill to extend on an interim basis the jurisdiction of the United States over certain ocean areas and fish in order to protect the domestic fishing industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MUR-

THA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PREYER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SISK, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. STEELE, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VANDER VEEN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. YATES, and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 15027. A bill to extend on an interim basis the jurisdiction of the United States over certain ocean areas and fish in order to protect the domestic fishing industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 15028. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments and annuity and pension payments under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's or widow's pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WON PAT:

H.R. 15029. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise the definition of the term "State" to authorize the inclusion of Guam in the programs authorized by that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H. Res. 1149. Resolution to condemn terrorist killings of schoolchildren in Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials, were presented and referred as follows:

486. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the exoneration of Dr. Samuel A. Mudd of any complicity in the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

487. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to the Federal revenue sharing program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 15030. A bill for the relief of Fisheries Communications, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 15031. A bill for the relief of Eugene Leland Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE POOREST AMONG US

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the American Jewish Committee held its 68th annual meeting last week in New York. The committee passed unanimously a statement concerning world poverty which I insert in the RECORD for my colleagues' attention. It is an eloquent plea for the elimination of poverty worldwide. Americans must join other nations in this fight

and help create a world community committed to eradicating hunger and want. The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON THE POOREST AMONG US

The American Jewish Committee has long been concerned with the plight of 25 million poor Americans, those who subsist on incomes below federal minimum living standards. They include the 9 million people on public assistance (of whom only a small percentage are employable), the under-employed, and the fully employed who earn less than these federal standards. A majority of this group is white, but it includes a disproportionate number of Blacks and persons from other minority groups. Included also are poor Jews, particularly many elderly living in inadequate social security.

We believe that the existence of poverty in

an affluent society is morally indefensible, breeds hostility and community tension, and alienates one group from another. The best bulwark against poverty, we contend, is a prosperous nation that provides work opportunity for all, and adequate financial aid to those who cannot work. Therefore, we call for a program of social insurance that will incorporate financial safeguards, health insurance for all, and a social security program that will ultimately make the existence of a public welfare system unnecessary. Until such time, the present welfare system must be revised and improved.

But our efforts to eliminate the blight of poverty and malnutrition in America must not lead us to neglect our obligations abroad. The spectre of starvation is haunting large parts of the world today. Hundreds of millions of the world's peoples are under-

nourished. India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and scores of other nations in South Asia, Africa and Latin America face widespread famine. Thousands have already died in drought-ridden sub-Saharan Africa. U.N. Secretary-General Waldheim has warned that "peoples and countries could disappear from the face of the map" in West Africa if the world does not help with immediate relief and long-range efforts to make the region self-supporting.

The high cost of oil, created by the oil-producing countries, is wrecking the economies of the poorest countries. And because petroleum or natural gas is needed for fertilizer production, oil and gas shortages in poor countries are spelling starvation. It has been estimated that if just one quarter of the natural gas that is now wasted in the Persian Gulf fields was diverted into a fertilizer industry on the spot, the world's entire current demand for nitrogen fertilizer could be met.

We must also recognize that, in our finite world where resources are limited, the family of man must one day, and hopefully fairly soon, bring birth rates into reasonable balance with the lowered death rates that have been achieved. Many governments see the need to guide national policy toward this objective.

The American Jewish Committee is strongly committed to the search for economic and social justice everywhere. It sees the need to reduce the widening gaps between rich and poor states. This must be a concern of Jews, Christians, Moslems and Hindus; of blacks, browns and whites. As the world becomes smaller, and nations closer, we become increasingly aware of the interdependence of one with the other. The affluent and developed nations cannot remain untouched by the poverty and famine in the less advantaged nations. This means not only immediate famine aid, but development of productive economies in the poor states. The highest degree of charity, said Malmonides, is not only to give food but also to assist a poor person to find a job or business opportunity, in short, to put him "where he can dispense with other people's aid." That must be our goal.

Therefore, we urge our own members and Americans everywhere—in unions, business, civic and religious groups—to contribute to the famine relief efforts of the member agencies of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service.

And, despite the unfortunate vote of the House of Representatives in January, we hope that Congress will ultimately support the Administration's recommendation for a \$1.5 billion U.S. contribution spread over four years to the International Development Association. We urge all affluent nations—developed and developing alike—to join in the United Nations for similar efforts to aid the poor. This is the least we can do to help meet the needs of 800 million people in the developing countries who are living on only 30 cents a day.

LOWER SPEED LIMIT IS WORKING

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, even though Congress has been negligent in producing practical legislation to aid the long-term energy needs, I believe that we acted in a responsible manner by passing the 55-miles-per-hour speed.

Therefore, I was especially pleased to note that Paul Coffman, editor of *Proviso Star Sentinel* in Melrose Park, Ill.,

reported in his column of Wednesday, May 22, the benefits of the effects of the 55-miles-per-hour speed limit.

The article follows:

LOWER SPEED LIMIT IS WORKING

(By Paul D. Coffman)

Last Thursday and Friday, I joined about fifty editors and publishers from around the state in attendance at the 17th annual Illinois Editors' Traffic Safety Seminar in Champaign, Illinois.

In making the trip I traveled primarily on the Tri-State tollway and Interstate 57. Since I had traveled the same route to attend the Illinois Press Association meeting earlier this year and found few adhering to the 55-mile speed limit, I anticipated the same would again be true.

It was a pleasant surprise, however, when I settled down to the 55-mile-per-hour speed at which I usually travel, to find that only about three out of every ten cars and trucks were traveling at a higher rate of speed than I.

Upon arriving at the seminar, I noted that Dwight E. Pitman, superintendent of the Illinois State Police, was one of our panel speakers on Friday morning. His topic was "Illinois' New Energy-Saving 55 mph Speed Limits, a Status Report."

Mr. Pitman told us about the number of complaints he had received concerning trucks exceeding the posted speed limit and how the trucks used citizen band radios to inform each other as to the whereabouts of the police on the interstate highways. He also went into detail outlining how the state police coped with the situation and overcame the handicap by going to citizen band radios themselves.

Mr. Pitman said it is too early to ascertain the life saving effect (as well as the lower fuel consumption) the 55 mph speed limit will have over a long period of time, but so far he is very gratified with the results in both instances.

With the lifting of the Arab oil embargo and the presence of a more adequate supply of gasoline, he admits it is harder to enforce the lower speed limit, but feels confident that it is worth the effort.

We heartily agree with his way of thinking and are 100% in favor of keeping the lower speed limit in effect indefinitely. Whether the public wants to believe it or not, there is a definite fuel shortage and it will continue to increase as the years go by unless we are able to develop other sources of supply.

It doesn't take much longer to get where we want to go at a lower rate of speed and as surprising as it may seem to some of us, we may find our lives numbered among those 28% who are being saved by driving a little slower.

NERVE GAS: EDITORIAL COMMENT

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, one of the major daily newspapers in Utah, the *Deseret News*, ran an editorial on May 18 asking the question, "Do we need nerve gas?" The opinion expressed is most important, since the newspaper covers the district which is the major stockpiler and testing center for chemical nerve agents—the Tooele Army Depot and the Dugway Proving Ground. I recommend it to my colleagues as a further indication that chemical warfare is becoming increasingly understood as an outdated weapon system which the Congress al-

lows to continue through annual appropriations.

The article follows:

DO WE NEED NERVE GAS?

Utahans, perhaps more than residents of any other state, should be alert to the dangers of chemical and biological warfare, particularly nerve gas.

That is because of the deaths of 6,000 sheep during open-air nerve gas testing in 1969 in the Tooele desert.

Yet even in Utah, public concern over the dangers of nerve gas seems to be at a low ebb, even in the face of introduction of a bill by Rep. Wayne Owens in the House to prohibit expenditure of public funds for transportation of chemical nerve agents to or from military installations in the U.S.

That is a bill that needs consideration in view of the growing capacity of nerve gases to kill. It has been estimated, for example, that a one-quart bottle of the nerve gas agent, VX, contains several million lethal doses and costs about \$5 to produce. Today, 20,000 tons of nerve gas are stored in U.S. Army munitions depots.

But there's room for wondering if chemical weapons are needed at all.

For one thing, they contribute little if anything to military capabilities. If almost 8,000 U.S. warheads, thousands of tactical nuclear weapons, massive firepower, and a worldwide navy including 15 aircraft carriers aren't deterrent enough, it's doubtful if chemical weapons add anything.

Furthermore, if our nuclear capability and enormous conventional power eliminate the need for biological munitions, why do we need chemical weapons with similar characteristics?

The U.S. already has explicitly rejected the first use of nerve gas in combat, and the advantages of chemical warfare are said to accrue almost entirely to the aggressor.

Indeed, since the U.S. has renounced the weapons of germ warfare, shouldn't we also start cutting back on the weapons of chemical warfare?

HOSPITAL SPONSORS RURAL FACILITY

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing for the Record an article published in *Hospitals*, the journal of the American Hospital Association, written by Theodore R. Baranik, administrator of the Mercy Hospital in Johnstown, Pa., dealing with the establishment of a satellite medical clinic in Bolivar, Pa. I was instrumental in helping to develop this concept and, I believe, it may represent the solution to the problem of how to provide adequate medical services in both the rural and ghetto areas of the Nation. I commend it to my colleagues for their consideration:

HOSPITAL SPONSORS RURAL FACILITY

Provision of adequate medical services in rural and ghetto areas is a problem that continually confronts health care officials throughout the United States. Some educators say that there is a dearth of physicians in the country and that the problem is not one of inadequate supply but rather one of maldistribution. Unfortunately, efforts to obtain physicians in areas in which they are in short supply have not proved

successful, and rural and ghetto residents continue to be denied access to the vehicles through which they can obtain adequate health care. Huge sums of money have been spent by the government to alleviate this situation. All efforts have been costly and, in many cases, ineffective.

This paper will demonstrate how a not-for-profit community hospital in south central Pennsylvania uniquely approached the physician shortage in a rural community without asking for state or federal subsidization. Mercy Hospital of Johnstown, located in a city of approximately 43,000 persons, decided to become involved in this problem after having been approached by a citizens' group from Bolivar, a small rural community some 23 miles west of the city.

Bolivar and its contiguous rural areas, including a widely scattered population of 10,000 persons, initially had attempted to independently solve its medical needs with community involvement. Realizing the need for an adequate facility that should attract physicians, approximately 13 years ago a not-for-profit organization called the Community Medical Society was formed and charged with the responsibility of obtaining funds and volunteer labor to construct an adequate clinic building, which contained four examination rooms, a physician's office, a clerical area, and a large reception-waiting room. In the basement level, a two-car garage also was constructed for the physician's use. This brick building was most attractive and, at least initially, attracted a physician, who worked at the clinic for approximately six months. Another physician was obtained shortly thereafter, and he stayed for about two years, until he was drafted into the armed services. Other physicians followed and remained a short while. For the past five years, however, the community had had no physician and the clinic was vacant. A study revealed that those physicians who had located in Bolivar had been kept extremely busy. They all had been well liked and respected. Their collection rate on billings was very good. They would not, however, remain for any length of time in solo private practice in this rural area.

INACCESSIBLE MEDICAL CARE

After investigating the situation thoroughly, Mercy Hospital representatives determined that Bolivar and its surrounding area contained approximately 10,000 persons. On the periphery of this general area, there were only two physicians who were actively practicing medicine and both were grossly overworked. With the acceptable figure nationally of one physician for every 500 potential patients, we quickly decided that the need for at least one, if not two, physicians existed in this area. Now the problem was to "sell" the board of directors of Mercy Hospital on this concept.

In discussions with the Board, the hospital administrator and members of the medical affairs committee of the board, who had been doing the ground work on this project, explained the satellite clinic concept. They stated that contacts previously had been made with representatives of the county medical society and with representatives of at least one other local hospital by persons representing the Bolivar group. When contacted, each organization had indicated an interest but it appeared that none of the organizations could provide an immediate solution to the medical care problem of the Bolivar area although there was apparent need.

It then was indicated to the board that the administrator was interested in attempting to provide primary medical care for the Bolivar area, and he suggested that the hospital could extend its outpatient services by establishing a satellite clinic in that community. The administrator asked for approval to contract with one or more physicians who might be interested in work-

ing with the hospital in providing primary care, whether they be on salary, fee-for-service, a guaranteed income situation, or a combination of these three methods. It was emphasized that the immediate problem of course, would be one of obtaining the physicians to staff the satellite clinic.

The board of directors of Mercy Hospital accepted this challenge. They committed themselves to expanding the hospital's outpatient services in such a way as to provide rural medical care for the community of Bolivar and surrounding municipalities. The hospital administrator was authorized to obtain the services of one or more physicians, as the need developed, and to hire ancillary personnel to staff the clinic. A recruitment program then was initiated.

After considerable work, efforts to determine interest on the part of one or more physicians to provide care at the satellite clinic proved to be successful.

In a relatively short period of time, a young physician, just completing an internship, indicated an interest in this type of practice. After discussion with the medical affairs committee of the board of directors, a contract was completed with this physician. Hospital representatives then met with the officers of the Community Medical Society and arranged to lease the clinic building, which was available. Within a relatively short time, the basic problems had been resolved, and arrangements then were completed to supply the ancillary help for the clinic.

The Community Medical Society membership had indicated, throughout discussion, their support of the efforts of Mercy Hospital to supply medical care for their community. Prior to the opening of the clinic a public meeting was called by the board of directors of the Community Medical Society at which time members of the board of directors of Mercy Hospital, administrative representatives and key personnel, the new physician and his wife, and the clinic staff were introduced to the community. The response was excellent. Approximately 150 persons from the area attended this meeting in the local fire hall, at which time they were introduced to the persons who were responsible for opening the satellite clinic.

The clinic opened in November 1972, staffed by one physician, an RN, and an LPN. Office hours were held in the afternoon and early evening, Monday through Wednesday, and on Friday. The clinic was open Saturday from 11 a.m. until 2 p.m., and was closed on Thursday and Sunday. A steady influx of patients soon indicated that the services of a second physician were greatly needed. Fortunately, another physician had indicated an interest and within two months after the clinic had opened, a second physician and a parttime clerical person were added to the clinic staff.

One advantage that Mercy Hospital had in establishing the satellite clinic was that the hospital would act as a backup for provision of emergency services when the clinic was not in operation. All patients coming to the clinic would be instructed that in the event of an emergency they either could call or go to the emergency department at Mercy Hospital, Johnstown, which is staffed by full-time physicians on a 24-hour per day, seven days per week basis. This arrangement provides clinic physicians with a considerable amount of free time at night and on weekends.

After being in operation for approximately six months, the clinic now is self-supporting. The ancillary personnel at the clinic, residents of the Bolivar area, are included on the hospital payroll, and they receive comparable salaries and fringe benefits. The hospital does all billing for clinic services and provides all drugs and other supplies used in the clinic operation. The liability insurance of the hospital has been extended to cover the clinic and its personnel with the fire and extended coverage being provided by the Community Medical Center, which owns the clinic building.

PHYSICIANS SUPERVISE

At present, between 30 and 45 patients are seen at the clinic daily, with the average being approximately 35 patients. The physician's assistant concept was not utilized in the clinic operation initially. Discussions now are being held with Hahnemann Medical College, Philadelphia in this regard. However, if physician's assistants are utilized, they will be under physician supervision at all times. Nursing personnel perform basic nursing functions with all diagnosis and treatment being prescribed on the written orders of a physician. Patients who are seen at the clinic and then are determined to be in need of laboratory or x-ray services, which are not performed at the clinic, are so informed by the physician. The patient then has the option of choosing the hospital at which he would like to have these services done. Where indicated, blood samples are drawn and transported to Mercy Hospital with reports being available within 24 hours.

If the patient has to be admitted to a hospital, he decides where he wishes to be admitted. It should be noted that the physicians working at the clinic at this time, have obtained privileges only at Mercy Hospital of Johnstown. However, should the patients wish to be admitted to another hospital, they have this choice and their records are referred to the hospital and/or physician whom they designate.

In consultation with clinic personnel, it had been determined that the need exists in this area for a well-baby clinic and/or a child health conference. As a result, in conjunction with the Pennsylvania Department of Health, a child health conference has been established at the clinic. It meets every other Tuesday from 8 a.m. until noon, prior to the clinic office hours. This conference had been set up at no cost to the hospital.

Other immediate needs in the area are centered around inadequate dental care. Because there is no dentist in the community, it is not unusual to examine a youth in his middle teens who has never been to a dentist. Discussions now are taking place with a group of dentists who have indicated an interest in a part-time practice in Bolivar. If these talks prove fruitful, plans will be completed to renovate the basement of the clinic to provide a dental office.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Mercy Hospital of Johnstown determined that the need exists for improved medical care in rural communities surrounding this city. A commitment by the Mercy Hospital board of directors provided rural medical care through establishment of a satellite clinic. Started as an experimental project with no state or federal funding, the clinic has become self-supporting after six months of operation. Community involvement is necessary in projects such as this if they are to become successful. Community leaders must display their interest in obtaining needed medical services, and they then must exhibit their active support and determination that such a facility will become and continue to be self-supporting.

Consultation with the county medical society is advisable before such a clinic is established. In some instances, the county society may indicate its willingness to obtain one or more physicians to provide rural medical care. If this is the case, it is highly advisable to have the county society establish such a vehicle for provision of services, with local hospitals cooperating and acting as a backup in such a venture.

Start-up costs in establishing a satellite clinic should be kept at a minimum. A full-time clinic administrator is not justified in a relatively small satellite clinic. In most cases, it would not be advisable for a hospital to initially construct an expensive building, or to purchase, at great cost, a clinic facility. There is nothing wrong with inexpensively

renovating an old building for a clinic facility if an appropriate structure is not available. It is the quality of care that will be purveyed which is important, not the construction of an esthetic monument for this purpose.

In discussing financial arrangements with prospective physicians, the hospital representatives should be flexible and fair. Provision of needed medical services rather than a profit motive must be the underlying factor in establishing the satellite clinic. Any ethical arrangement agreed upon by the two parties should be given consideration. All facets should clearly be spelled out in the contract.

We at Mercy Hospital realize that the physicians whom we presently have working with us at the Bolivar Clinic undoubtedly will not stay indefinitely. Some eventually may wish to specialize, and/or go into a private practice in an urban setting. Hence, constant efforts must be made by the hospital to obtain additional qualified physicians for staffing the satellite clinic.

Establishment of satellite clinics by hospitals immediately makes available all resources housed in the institution, including physicians, specialists, and specialty equipment. The hospital emergency department is as far away as the telephone when the clinic is closed, and in this situation, only a 25-minute ride from Bolivar. This means that the physicians have adequate amounts of available free time with the emergency department as their permanent backup. All clinic records remain the property of the hospital, thus ensuring completeness and continuity.

Another advantage in establishing a satellite clinic is that the physician may or may not choose to settle permanently in the community in which the satellite clinic is located. (A fact of life today is that many physicians' wives will not settle in rural communities.) In our situation, both physicians involved in the clinic commute a total of approximately 60 miles daily to and from their homes.

With clinic hours scheduled only in the afternoon, early evening, and Saturday, one of the physicians stops daily at the hospital to make rounds of any patients who have been admitted on his service. Physicians also have free time available in the morning to assist surgeons in the operating room, or to become involved in other income-producing ventures, such as insurance or school physicals.

Extension of hospital services through the establishment of satellite clinics in rural communities is a unique way of providing rural medical care. Mercy Hospital of Johnstown has demonstrated that such clinics can be developed in a rural setting in a relatively short time without state or federal grants and funding. Thus the hospital has a sense of accomplishment not only by providing quality medical care at its base in an urban setting but also by meeting the health needs of rural communities through the satellite clinic concept.

BENEFITS FOR DISABLED VETERANS

HON. TENNYSON GUYER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleagues for passage of legislation which will certainly be welcomed by our Nation's fine veterans.

I was proud to have cosponsored the bill which will provide cost-of-living in-

creases in rates of disability compensation for disabled veterans and increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for their survivors. With the constantly spiralling inflation, these increases are essential.

Increases which will be retroactive to May 1, 1974, will include 15 percent for disabled veterans and 17 percent for widows and children of veterans who have died as a result of service-connected causes.

Other legislation passed Thursday should be especially good news to veterans of the Vietnam era, who are trying to complete their education under the GI bill. By passing a 30-day extension in which veterans may complete training, we gave thousands of veterans the opportunity to enroll in summer school.

If we had not passed this bill, some veterans eligibility would have expired May 31. What we must strive for now is a just cost-of-living rate increase under the veteran's education program for those veterans already enrolled in school.

NATIONAL POLICE CONFERENCE ENDORSES ANTICRIME BILL

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, another organization familiar with the problems of community crime prevention at the grassroots level has recognized the need for meaningful Federal assistance.

The National Police Conference on PAL and Youth Activities, a well-known national police community service organization, has gone on record in support of the Community Anticrime Assistance Act, H.R. 9175, which I introduced last session. The bill was subsequently introduced, with innovative additions, on the Senate side by the distinguished Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, and cosponsored by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, Mr. WILLIAMS.

A number of House Members have introduced companion bills. The Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, which I chair, has held four hearings on this legislation, and further testimony is anticipated.

I introduce into the RECORD at this point a copy of the conference's news release:

NATIONAL POLICE CONFERENCE ENDORSES ANTICRIME BILL

CLEVELAND, OHIO.—The National Police Conference on PAL and Youth Activities today endorsed the Community Anti-Crime Assistance Act of 1974, co-sponsored by Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) and Sen. Harrison Williams (D-N.J.).

The National Police Conference encompasses Police Athletic League and youth chapters from coast to coast, with a total of over 3 million youngsters reached in major U.S. cities.

National Chairman, Frederick J. Stauffer of Cleveland, stated, "The anti-crime bill of Senators Javits and Williams represents one of the most enlightened approaches to crime deterrence ever conceived in the United States. The National Police Conference, which is dedicated to the deterrence of juvenile delinquency and street crime, views

the proposed anti-crime bill as the best long-range solution to the problem of increasing crime in the cities."

Continued Stauffer, "Conventional crime-fighting methods have proven to be indecisive or have failed completely. This bill seems to present a viable alternative."

The anti-crime bill calls for an initial funding of \$50 million and would provide for grants to cities and public agencies for recruiting and training community relations officers, citizen patrols, police aides and for programs that would encourage the reporting of crimes, the marking of personal property, and the improving of police procedures in making arrests.

The National Police Conference and its local PAL chapters have been endorsed universally by both police departments and juvenile court authorities from coast to coast as the best juvenile delinquency prevention program ever created.

Concluded Stauffer, "Whereas it is not the policy of local Police Athletic League chapters to take sides on any political issue, the National Police Conference can do so and urgently requests citizens to write their elected representatives in the House and Senate asking that this bill be supported."

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the May 20, 1974, issue of the New Yorker magazine contains an interesting analysis from various national leaders concerning the edited transcripts made public by President Nixon. An excerpt follows:

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

Last week, people were reading the edited transcripts of the tape recordings made by President Nixon. We asked a number of them to tell us their reactions.

Alfred M. Landon, former governor of Kansas; Republican candidate for President, 1936:

The House Judiciary Committee started its hearings today, and I welcome their prompt attention to the question of the impeachment of the President. As far as my personal opinion of the transcripts is concerned, the most important point is that in all the tapes the conversations were apparently about the options that were open in dealing with the public-relations aspects and about how to avoid further disclosures. There is a complete absence of any positive and forceful policy by the President to clean out down to the bone, an absence of any concern to bring the malefactors to justice. The responsibility of the Republican Party in this situation is the same as the responsibility of the Democrat Party, or any other political party, for that matter. It's not a partisan question, and, so far, in the proceedings of the Judiciary Committee, while there has been some evidence of partisanship, on the whole partisanship has been most satisfactorily absent. The proceedings have to be carried out in a most thorough way.

William Scranton, former Republican governor of Pennsylvania:

I am just very, very sad. It bothers me that people in the country would get the impression that people in government all talk and behave this way. Even the language. But chiefly the amorality. I have not seen anything like it in my experience of politics. In any brass-tacks, gutsy conference in business or education or politics that I have been involved with, there may have been some im-

morality, but rarely amorality. In the whole two-thirds of the transcripts that I have read there is rarely a consideration of morality. The priorities of a person in public office should be first the people he or she represents, then the party, then the administration of the office he or she holds, and then the individual. Here the priorities are reversed. The individual is first, next the office, next the party, and last the people. It makes me very sad.

William G. Milliken, Republican governor of Michigan:

I fail to find in those transcripts the overwhelming proof of the President's innocence that we were promised. In the best light, all that can be said is that the transcripts of the tapes contain many ambiguities. Leaving aside the question of the President's guilt or innocence, the transcripts of the tapes can only have a depressing effect on those who read them. We search in vain for any discussion of what is good public policy. We search in vain for the kind of moral tone that is needed to restore public confidence in government and our political system. We search in vain for any discussion of how the true facts of Watergate and related abuses of power can be uncovered and brought to public light. But, in fairness to the President, it should be emphasized that these transcripts are but excerpts from the Presidency. Obviously, any final accounting of his Presidency needs to be considered in the context of the overall record of his Administration in domestic and foreign affairs. But the fact is that these transcripts could serve as a frightening model of political cynicism and pragmatism carried to the ultimate extreme. It is a distasteful brew of suspicion, distrust, and cynicism unworthy of any public official.

David W. Hirst, historian; associate editor of the papers of Woodrow Wilson:

I have no doubt that Wilson would have been horrified by the whole episode. It's a far, far cry from the kind of integrity that he stood for. Wilson could be petty and vindictive, and he had personality defects and so on, but nothing in his career was remotely comparable to the amorality and apparent criminality that are displayed in the Nixon transcripts. Wilson was acutely aware of the dangers of unstable government in a time of crisis. During the 1916 campaign, Wilson proposed in a letter that if the Republican candidate, Charles Evans Hughes, were to win the election, Wilson would immediately appoint him Secretary of State. Both Wilson and his Vice-President would then resign, assuring Hughes of a quick succession to the Presidency. But I am at a loss to find anything with which to compare Nixon's approach to the office.

Russell Kirk, historian:

Did President Nixon deliberately obstruct justice in the Watergate affair? That is the legitimate concern of Congress in the matter of the tapes. As far as I can judge from a reading of the transcripts, he did not. So the tapes do not supply grounds for impeachment. Did he participate in an attempt to cover up details of the Watergate folly? It seems to me that he did so, in the sense that he did not wish to have the public scandal grow even bigger. But in comparable circumstances any President of the United States would have attempted to hush up the matter so far as possible—with the possible exceptions of Presidents Washington and Hoover, and I have my doubts even about Hoover. President Kennedy, for instance, refrained from offering any public explanation of the American government's involvement in the overthrow of President Diem, in Vietnam. Much of the public was not aware of that involvement until the Pentagon Papers were published.

Doubtless, President Kennedy was vexed that the action against Diem had been accomplished by his subordinates, and just so,

doubtless, President Nixon regretted the zeal of his subordinates at Watergate. But the transcripts do not reveal any positive obstruction of justice by him in the attempted coverup. As for the expletives in the transcripts, I am not so shocked as some of my journalistic colleagues profess to be. It has been by experience that a good many people holding elective office sometimes say "hell" and "damn" in private conversations. I have found that even members of the Washington press corps sometimes use expletives. So on a few occasions did President Washington, while President Lincoln was a famous teller of dirty stories. If we begin impeaching Presidents because they curse occasionally, perhaps the likeliest candidate for 1976 is Mrs. Margaret Chase Smith.

William E. Leuchtenburg, historian, Columbia University; author of books about Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal:

In 1933, Roosevelt set up something called the National Emergency Council, and stenographic records of its meetings were kept. The council was basically a way of bypassing the Cabinet, although a few Cabinet members were among the dozen or fifteen men who came to the meetings. There is some pretty hard-nosed discussion—for example, about Huey Long and the distribution of patronage. At one point, Roosevelt says, "Don't put anybody in and don't keep anybody that is working for Huey Long or his crowd! That is a hundred per cent!" Roosevelt comes off as a tough guy, but it is all within a programmatic context. That's what's missing in the Nixon conversations, quite apart from the fact that they're talking about the commission of very serious crimes, such as subornation of perjury and obstruction of justice. For the first twenty-four hours after Nixon's speech, I was inclined to feel that people were huffing and puffing a little too much about this. After all, people don't sit around talking about their credos, and if you tape any sort of conversation in everyday life, it probably won't be very edifying. That amount of grace ought to be accorded to Nixon. But after reading the transcripts and thinking about them for a few days, I no longer feel so generous. It sounds kind of Pecksniffian to talk about morality, but this sounds more like transcripts of that gangsters' meeting in Apalachin a few years ago than the conversation of a man in the office that was held by Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt. There was always a crassness about Nixon, going back to his attack on Helen Gahagan Douglas as the "pink lady" and the way he used the Communist issue against Jerry Voorhis and Adlai Stevenson. Yet nothing prepared me for this. There is such a quality of moral emptiness. That remark of Dean's—Nixon has been talking about using police agencies against his so-called enemies, and Dean says, "What an exciting prospect!" I can't think of any kind of historical parallel for that, thank God.

Eugene Genovese, historian, University of Rochester:

It's a busy time in the academic year, and I have a weak stomach, but I have read the transcripts. One of the things that sadden me is that I haven't any doubt that this is the way things are done in governments—this ruthlessness, this consciencelessness. But that doesn't mean I take the matter lightly. I feel cynical about the expressions of outrage now being heard, but, on the other hand, I myself am outraged. The real problem is not just that they got caught, that they were slob, but that they failed to show that minimal respect for the decency and sensibility of the American people which sets limits to the ruthlessness, and even dirtiness, that may be intrinsic to ruling a world power. While the President may be taking the rap for what many of his predecessors have also done, it's possible that the carelessness and excesses of his Administration

may lead to greater vigilance and concern, which will minimize the dirty side of government, at least for a while. One thing I would hope to see coming out of this, though I'm not optimistic about it, would be a curbing of political police powers in the country. I'm afraid that the concentration on impeachment may very well push these considerations, which in my view are more important, aside. I would rather have Nixon stay in office and have the F.B.I., the C.I.A., and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration subjected to close public scrutiny than have Nixon impeached without a serious investigation of at least the illegal acts of the political police. Those that are legal are bad enough.

C. Vann Woodward, historian, Yale University:

Apart from the criminality that occurred, and the grounds for impeachment, which seem to be implicit in what was said, what the transcripts added, for me, was a moral dimension—a sort of sliminess, a low-grade quality of mind, the prevalence of which I had suspected and which has now been amply confirmed. These transcripts are something quite new in history. There is nothing I can compare them to. Normally, we must depend on diaries, memoirs, letters, official records. It's possible that U. S. Grant talked this way in private, but I doubt it. It's possible that Harding talked this way, but, again, I doubt it. I think it will mean a kind of history we haven't had before, a kind that may be unique for the future as well as for the past.

These transcripts have evidently been laundered, but what's there is appalling. It fills me with a kind of horror.

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., historian, City University of New York; special assistant to President Kennedy:

What struck me first was the squalor of the Nixon White House. Nixon was always proud of his historic firsts, and this beats all his predecessors in sleaziness. One hears a lot of realistic talk about people and circumstances around any politician, although I don't think it is usually done with such banality. When political problems came up in Kennedy's time, you would have a tough, realistic examination—a lot of swearing and so forth—but I can't imagine Kennedy's toughest advisers trying to cover up crimes. In the case of the Nixon crowd, the substance of the predicament seems irrelevant to the solution of the predicament. I don't think that you can separate the tone from what they were talking about. They were so infatuated with the ability of the President to get away with anything that it didn't occur to them to look where they were going, or to discuss substance. There was a mood of Presidential invincibility.

Lewis Mumford, historian and philosopher:

By trying to conceal the ugly facts about his conduct, he has completely exposed himself. He has committed moral suicide in public.

SENATOR BROOKE'S FIGHT AGAINST SEPARATISM

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, Senator EDWARD BROOKE eloquently and movingly presented the case for integration and against divisive, regressive, unconstitutional legislation. Senator BROOKE attacked the antibusing amendments to the education bill as

antidesegregation amendments. His leadership in the fight against these amendments is an example of deep commitment to a cause and a role. Senator Brooke believes in integration, and he believes in his duty as a public servant to uphold the Constitution and preserve national unity in the face of appeals to emotionalism and separatism.

Senator Brooke's stand against antibusing measures is a courageous one considering the degree of misunderstanding and strong sentiment in the country concerning this issue. His actions last week, and his May 15 statement, serve as a reminder to all Members of Congress that laws must not merely reflect public opinion, but educate it, and that public servants owe allegiance not merely to voters but also to the Constitution and to the traditional American ideal of justice for all.

I urge Members of Congress to read in their entirety Senator Brooke's remarks of May 15. His statement not only reflects his own profound convictions, it challenges us all to stand up for our own moral beliefs.

TENTH REUNION OF THE VICTORIA HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1964, VICTORIA, TEX.

HON. JOHN YOUNG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment of this distinguished body's time to commend a group of young people from the 1964 graduating class of Victoria High School, Victoria, Tex. On this date 10 years ago they received their high school diplomas. They are going to commemorate that occasion on July 4th weekend to recall those fond days. I want to commend them, because they are taking the time to spend an evening to remember something very important in their lives.

I am sure they will all be thankful for the education that they received in a free society that allows them to choose the path they wish to follow through life.

Scores of young men and women from that 1964 graduating class served this country during the height of the Vietnam conflict. Two young men, Leroy McCann and George Purdue, gave their lives for this country during that terrible war. Another young man, Mickey Costello, is still listed as missing in action. The 361 remaining graduates, I know, will remember those missing classmates and their supreme sacrifice.

I am proud to note that 88 of that class have remained in my 14th Congressional District and their jobs range from engineers, lawyers, bankers, laborers, preachers, housewives, and morticians. They are all outstanding citizens and of those that have moved to other States I commend them all to you.

They have spent over a year in preparation for the reunion and will gather together from as far away as Saudi Arabia, California, Nevada, Washington,

D.C., Washington, Arizona, Arkansas, Maryland, and Louisiana.

More than half of that class will gather in July for their reunion and I commend them for commemorating a small but most important portion of their heritage.

The names of the 1964 graduating class of Victoria High School follow:

LIST OF VICTORIA HIGH SCHOOL 1964 GRADUATING CLASS

Abernathy, Diane, Olkek, Jan, Anders, Linda, Anderson, Nevin, Arambula, Raul, Arambula, Viola, Arnold, Larry, Asbeck, Phyllis, Balfanz, Charles, Barefield, Ora Lee, Barnard, Gene, Barr, Sandra, Barrera, Alex, Batts, Bobby, Bauman, Patricia, Beatty, James, Beck, John Berger, Royce, Bernal, Joe, Blake, Roger, Blanchett, Les, Blazek, Virginia, Board, Kathy, Boehm, David, Boehm Leslie, Bohannon, Yvonne, Bonar, Diannia, Bournias, Nick, Boyd, James, and Brandt, Patricia.

Brown, Diana, Brown, Nancy, Buckelew, Bonnie, Buentello, Armando, Butler, Glenna, Butler, Sheila, Cabozos, Gladys, Caldwell, Suzy, Calhoun, Mike, Camacho, Alice, Carr, Bill, Carsner, Marie, Carrille, Brenda, Cavazos, John, Chadbourn, Lynn, Chamberlain, George, Cheverton, Nancy, Clark, Larry, Clark, Thomas, Cline, Mary, Coles, Patty Collins, Evelyn, Correll, Mike, Cortez, Viola, Cortinas, Rudy, Costella, Mickey, Craigen, Wayne, Crain, Bebe, Crass, Jack, and Creager, Edmund.

Crick, Gary, Curiel, Adriann, Davis, Barbara, Davis, Ann, Dawson, Ann, de la Garza, Doris, de la Garza, John, Delgado, Cornello, Delgado, Steve, Densman, Artis, DeYoung, Charles, Diedrich, Bob, Dobbins, Robert, Dossy, Linda, Dunseth, Michael, Edwards, Clydia, Elder, Julie, Elkins, Maxine, Erwin, Peggy, Everett, Vickie, Felger, Carol, Figuerova, Tony, Fimbel, Mike, Finley, Martha, Fleming, Fred, Flores, David, Flores, Raymond, Flores, Richard, Forman, Dessie, Fox, Nelson, Frankum, Jeanette, Fry, Melinda, Gamez, Ramona, Gandt, Barbara, Garcia, Carmen, and Garcia, Loy.

Garcia, Gloria, Garcia, Jasper, Garcia, Linda, Garcia, Bernal, Garcia, Nancy, Gardner, Pam, Garza, Stephanie, Garza, Ofelia, Garza, Raymond, Gaubatz, Jimmy, Garrett, Ruth, Gerhold, Bruce, Gilbert, Pat, Gillespie, Thomas, Giesler, Glenn, Goldsum, Marie, Gomez, Ben, Gomez, Joe, Gomez, Michael, Gomez, Ramona, Gonzales, Andrew, Gonzales, Anna Marie, Gonzales, Blas, Gonzales, Margo, Gonzales, Theresa, Gonzalez, Joel, Grant, Raymond, and Graves, Linda.

Greeson, Martha, Gregory, Larna, Gutierrez, Julia Anne, Haebler, Richard, Hajek, Louis, Hale, Brenda, Haley, Patsy, Hansen, Carol, Hansen, Sandra, Hartenberger, Jerilyn, Harvey, Frances, Haschke, Linda, Hanselka, Randy, Hartman, Bobby, Hartzell, John, Harvey, Gene, Harvey, Dennis, Hathaway, William, Haynes, Robert, Hedrick, Kenneth, Helbel, Beverly, Hempel, Lola, Hendy, Joyce, Hill, Linda, Hernandez, Eva, Hindman, Susan, Hobby, Cheryl, Hobbs, Patsy, Hogarth, Heather, Hohf, Jill, and Horelka, George.

Horton, James, Howard, Carol, Howard, Johnny, Hrnclir, J. G., Huckman, Johnny, Inscore, Johnny, Iraggi, Robert, Jamison, Sharon, Jenkins, Cathy, Johnson, Edith, Johnson, Howard, Johnston, Malcolm, Jones, Norman, Kandis, Jimmy, Kellogg, Susan, Kelley, Mary Ann, Kennedy, Barry, Kindrick, William, King, Ronnie, Kirchner, Gilbert, Klotz, Lynda, Knebllick, Linda, Kneip, James, Knight, Georgia, Koliba, Ronnie, Krause, Lenwood, Krebs, Hank, Kremling, Wayne, Kruse, Jeannette, Lange, Michael, and Langenberg, Chria.

Lara, Frank, Lassmann, Donna, Lawrence, Russell, Leger, Danny, LeJune, Bonnie, Leita, Dennis, Lemke, Kenneth, Lerma Nick, Leskar, Irene, Leskar, James, Lopez, Rose, Lord, Carolyn, Lord, Sandra, Lorenz, Carol, Lowe, Bobby, Lowe, Thomas, Lowther, Don, Luster, Carl, McCann, Leroy, McCleary, Don, Mc-

Clanahan, Joan, McCormick, Sammy, McCracken, Bobby, McGregor, Marlyne, McKey, Nola, McKinney, Robert, McWherter, Ronnie, Madden, Ted, Marshall, John, Martin, Danner, Martinez, Elida, and Matlock, Drew.

Matthews, Bill, Mayo, Danny, Maze, Cora, Meyer, Grace, Michna, Mary Ann, Miller, Chuck, Miller, Joan, Miller, Dell, Minatre, Gerald, Mitchell, Carol, Moeller, David, Montag, Joe, Moore, James, Nelson Linda J., Nelson, Tom, Norris, Joyce, Obermiller, Delores, Ortiz, Beatrice, Padilla, Fidel, Padron, Rose, Pair, Diann, Pantel, Curtis, Pavlica, Sherry, Pena, Donie, Penewitt, Nancy, Perdue, George, Perez, Lucinda, Perez, Jeronimo, and Petru, Roxie.

Petty, Julia, Pierson, Mike, Placker, Alton, Ponder, Clark, Poole, Mona, Post, Dian, Prewitt, Carroll, Price, Robert, Pullin, Linda, Purcell, Ann, Quimby, Martha, Quimby, Walter, Quintanilla, Rafael, Rackard, Carolyn, Ralls, Nancy, Ramierz, Norma, Romas, Frank, Ramos, Mary Alice, Ramseur, Ricky, Ray, Joel, Reid, Ruby, Reinhardt, James, Reyna, Virginia, Reynolds, Beth, Riggs, Ray, Roberts, Candy, Roberts, Gloria, Robinson, Ruth, Robinson, Gary, Robles, Lupe, Rodriguez, Jody, Rogers, Wanda, Rojas, Rogue, and Ross Lee.

Rossi, Sylvan, Rothwell, Richard, Rouse, Martha, Ruiz, Della, Ruiz, Patricia, Ruiz, Ted, Rux, Barry, Sanchez, Adela, Sanchez, Lucy, Sanchez, Manuela, Sanchez, Shirley, Sanders, Kyle, Stanford, Sherrie, Schmeltzer, Janet, Schmeltzer, Paul, Schumann, Edward, Scott, Cheryl, Shelton, Jean, Sherman, LaJuana, Short, Thomas, Shroyer, Clifford, Slade, Sondra, Smajstrla, Judy, Smith, Erlene, Smith, Fred, Smith, Sue, Spann, Leonard, and Spinks, Anita.

Staff, Charlotte, Stanford, Carry, Stephens, Joel, Stoker, Bobby, Stoltzman, Marlys, Stormont, John, Straight, Vicky, Strete, Merlin, Strelczyk, Dennis, Strother, Barbara, Summers, Anna, Summers, Buddy, Surratt, Laura, Swoboda, Judy, Taylor, Francine, Taylor, Thomas, Terry, Donna, Theus, Pat, Thompson, Brock, Thompson, Mary, Thompson, Mona, Timme, Richard, Tipton, Linda, Trapp, Joseph, Trenck, Bobby, Trevino, Mary, Trilline, Esther, Tristan, Ella, Tucker, Allyson, Tuncher, Tom, Turner, Hugh, Tyler, Larry, and Urban, Cheri.

Urban, Joyce, Urbano, Lee, Uresti, Leo, Vargas, Maria, Verret, Richard, Vickers, Andrew, Vickers, Barbara, Villafranca, Gloria, Villareal, Ruby, Villareal, Yalanda, Voigt, Richard, Volkmer, Patsy, Voss, Carroll, Wacker, Wanda, Wagner, Patricia, Walthall, Richard, Weaver, Mark, Weaver, Mary, Welch, Dottie, Wells, Rita, Wells, Tom, Wiggins, Relda, Wilke, Fritz, Williams, Charles, Williams, Larry, Williams, Ronnie, Willmon, Joye, Wilford, Donald, Wilson, Priscilla, Winters, Doug, and Woods, Sharold.

Worsham, Gail, Yarbrough, Sarah, Yariger, Anne, York, Diane, Young, Donna, Young, Sue, Zarate, Abe, Zepeda, Mary Ann, Zirjacks, Chi, and Zorn, Frances.

DON SIEBERT OF BROWNSBURG, IND., GUIDE, ASKS: "COULD IMPEACHMENT DESTROY OUR COUNTRY?"

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by Mr. Don Siebert of the Brownsburg, Ind., Guide, and appearing in that paper on May 22, 1974, is pertinent to a major issue concerning many Americans.

The article follows:

COULD IMPEACHMENT DESTROY OUR COUNTRY?

(By Don Siebert)

With every passing day, the leering specter of the impeachment of President Richard M. Nixon looms larger as the howling chorus of his enemies and even members of his own party grow louder. Even as I write this, the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives has begun its investigation of evidence and charges that could lead to the President's impeachment.

If he is brought to trial, Nixon will be only the second President in almost 200 years of American history to face this terrible physical, mental, and spiritual ordeal.

Only one President in our history has ever been forced to endure the awful, brutal punishment that is part and parcel of an impeachment. Only one Chief Executive was ever forced to summon up the moral courage needed to maintain his sanity and self-respect during an impeachment, to survive as an individual. That man was Andrew Johnson, who became President after Lincoln was assassinated in 1865.

Johnson was tried in 1868 in one of the most bitter and heart-breaking trials in history. Impeachment was finally averted by a single vote. But Johnson completed his term as President and even won re-election later as Senator from Tennessee.

But not even Johnson ever felt the brutalizing attacks or took the awesome punishment that has already been meted out to Richard Nixon for more than a year by those who hate and despise him and by others who honestly feel he should be removed from office.

Members of both political parties, much of the daily press, and both commentators and comedians on national television have never ceased to attack the President. Nothing has ever happened before like the constant barrage of hate, innuendo, ridicule, unproven charges, and vilification that has poured out almost hourly over the TV channels and daily in influential newspapers. Nothing like the nonstop, obsessive drive to make Nixon a non-person has ever been known in the history of man.

Not even President Lyndon Johnson was subjected to such a vicious, prolonged, deliberate, and well-planned attack that only a modern news media could mount. Men have found they have the power to destroy an individual—even the President—and they have a compulsive desire to use this power that they cannot control.

Whether the President is guilty of any "high crimes," as the U.S. Constitution specifies, or whether he is innocent hardly seems to matter anymore. After long months of listening to arguments by both sides, I find that I, too, am very weary and disgusted by the continuing struggle. Perhaps I have become numb. Perhaps it is no longer very important to me. I honestly don't know. And I am convinced that a great number of people have the same feeling.

But forgotten in the fire, fulmination, and fury of the long and terrible attack is the fact that no one has been able to prove that Nixon was involved in Watergate—or even knew about it. This is true despite the fact that millions of dollars of our money have been spent and many lives and careers have been tarnished or ruined during that unmemorable investigation. Even Senator Sam Ervin has finally admitted publicly that his Watergate committee found no evidence to justify the impeachment of Richard Nixon.

Yet, despite the long attack on the President, he still has millions of loyal supporters. Frankly I find that amazing. Some of these supporters claim that the attack on Nixon began a long time ago, back in the 1940's when he was instrumental in nailing Communist Alger Hiss to the wall despite

the many influential people high in government who tried to protect Hiss. Some supporters say his enemies never forgave Nixon for that.

But whatever sparked the current attack on Nixon, his detractors and enemies have not let the failure called Watergate discourage them. They have simply found other charges, however far-fetched, to hurl at him.

At any rate, the long fight to get rid of Nixon has begun to have one very different result which liberals, among others, claim they never wanted to see happen in America. It has polarized much of the country, one of the worst things that can happen to the United States, we have been told repeatedly by the news media.

Yet from all the weary arguments, endless charges, countercharges, innuendos, and ridicule, one fact stands out above all the confusing mess. The President has proven to be far tougher, far more durable than his enemies had counted on. They have failed, so far at least, to break the man. He is still there. He still administers the nation from the Oval Room of the White House despite all the pressures.

How President Nixon has managed to endure will probably be a topic for historians to argue about for decades to come. But whether there will be any decades to come for the United States of America—at least as we know it today—is arguable now.

Perhaps in their intense hatred for the President, his enemies have forgotten that America is the people, not the government. Perhaps they have forgotten that the government at best is only a very imperfect representation of the people. Or perhaps his enemies no longer care. Perhaps they are willing to burn down the house if that will destroy Nixon.

It is entirely possible that this great nation may not survive the awesome stresses and strains that the long battle against Nixon has already wrought. It could eventually destroy us. Certainly an impeachment would greatly magnify that danger. Lesser struggles brought down mighty Rome in the end.

PRIVACY ALERT: SEVENFOLD GROWTH FORECAST FOR REMOTE TERMINALS

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, integrity of individualized information can best be assured if appropriate confidentiality and security protections are introduced concurrent with advances in technology.

We who call for restoring rights of personal privacy are not against technical progress. Rather, we believe the strongest improvements in our society through science and technology can be made by coupling them with societal and humanistic objectives. The privacy legislation I have sponsored is designed to restore the balance between the citizen and his personal characteristics and information users and their legitimate requirements. Future developments must not come into being without appropriate investigation into their potential impact. This is technology preassessment in the social impact area.

Computer-telecommunications technology is rapidly developing new capabilities and potentials. One significant

article appeared recently in Computer-world describing a projected increase in the number of remote data terminals from 700,000 units in 1972 to 4.7 million in 1982, a sevenfold increase. The use of remote inquiry is, of course, greatly expanding as many branch offices of organizations become capable of entering a communications network to input or extract data. The fact that interrogation of the contents of many thousands of automated data processing systems by remote devices is expected to exceed 4 million units means a possible dissemination of personal information never before practical or even contemplated.

The commercial exploitation of remote terminals is a very positive step, but to let all the sensitive data contained in these systems flow to a vast number of access points requires strong control. Only on rare occasions in the past have these controls paralleled new technological applications.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Computer-world article of May 22, 1974, at this point for review by my colleagues and others interested in this important subject.

SEVENFOLD GROWTH FORECAST FOR REMOTE TERMINALS

(By Molly Upton)

NEW YORK.—The remote data terminal market will undergo a seven-fold growth by 1982, resulting in a \$6 billion annual business, according to a report from Frost & Sullivan, Inc.

During the next 10 years, over seven million units will be shipped with a value exceeding \$39 billion, the report predicted.

Because of demands for greater intelligence in terminals, prices are expected to rise, despite new technologies and greater production volumes.

Although the market will grow sharply, there will be fewer manufacturers in the field. "The requirements to stay in business will even be strenuous for the largest manufacturers," the report cautioned.

The installed base of remote terminals will grow from 700,000 units in 1972 to 1.3 million in 1975 and 4.7 million in 1982, for a sevenfold increase.

Estimated at \$3.6 billion in 1973, the installed base will be valued at \$6.2 billion in 1975 and \$24.4 billion by 1982, Frost & Sullivan said.

Factory shipments for the overall field of remote terminals is expected to jump from 223,000 units or \$1.9 billion in 1973 to 417,000 units or \$2.4 billion in 1975, and then 1.2 million units or \$6.56 billion in 1982, according to the report.

The category of magnetic storage devices, with a 10-year growth rate of 15 to 20 times, is expected to grow faster than any other segment.

The intelligent terminals will grow 12-fold; remote data stations and interactive displays, nine-fold; special function, eight-fold; low-cost data entry, six-fold; and audio response and interactive keyboard, five-fold, the report predicted.

HURRICANE MARKET

Ranked in terms of value of factory shipments in 1982, the forecast shows intelligent terminals (or interactive data stations) to be the leader, with a volume worth \$1.8 billion in 1982. The market will be "turbulent though dynamic throughout the Seventies," the report commented, noting the forecast is conservative.

The interactive display segment is second largest, with shipments worth \$1.6 billion in 1982. "New designs and the entry of new manufacturers will keep this market in a

turmoil for the next few years. The commitment to serve this market will be high, but the rewards could be great," the market research firm said.

Third is the area of interactive keyboards, with a total of \$1.07 billion in 1982. The report noted that with mainframe manufacturers controlling this market, new entry will be almost impossible.

Furthermore, the "trend toward capturing data at the source will curtail the growth of this type of terminal," Frost & Sullivan said.

"RISKS HIGH"

The "special function" market is expected to grow to around \$825 million in 1982. "These terminals require high investment designs for specific applications, where the risks are great and competition severe," the report noted.

Sixth in terms of value of shipments in 1972 is the magnetic storage sector, which should grow from \$27 million in 1973 to \$190 million in 1982.

NEW DESIGNS BY 1975

The report predicted that "technology advances, especially LSI/MSI circuitry, will impact terminal design for a new round of terminals by the end of 1975.

"The major failure of independent data terminal manufacturers will primarily be caused by lack of understanding of marketing techniques for selling to the end user and the limited skills and resources available for system engineering and product integration," the report said.

WATERGATE: AN UNHAPPY ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as one to whom the Washington Post has been cited as an authority by friends on both sides of the aisle, I would call their attention to this recent editorial:

WATERGATE: AN UNHAPPY ANNIVERSARY

The President has an odd way of celebrating Watergate anniversaries. Yesterday marked the passage of one full year since Mr. Nixon issued his compendious statement of May 22, 1973, promising to make available all relevant information on the complex of scandals that go by the name of Watergate. He chose to commemorate the occasion by informing the House Judiciary Committee, which is conducting impeachment hearings and which has—if anything—a larger and stronger claim on relevant evidence than the other bodies of inquiry do, that he would decline to produce any further Watergate tapes requested or subpoenaed by it. The full story of Watergate and of his own involvement in it, Mr. Nixon advised the committee, reposes in the White House materials already in the committee's hands.

In more ways than one, that is an interesting assertion. It not only confirms that the President is prepared to defy the committee's requests for material it deems necessary to conducting its inquiry. It also confirms that there is no better documentary case for Mr. Nixon to make concerning his own role in the coverup than that which can be made (if it can) from the highly incriminating documents and tapes now in the committee's possession. May 22, 1974, was a bleak day for those who still held out hope that somewhere, somehow, the President could come forward with persuasive exculpatory evidence. Apparently there is none.

Although we believe that Mr. Nixon's outright defiance of Congress in this matter is as unconstitutional as it is unwise, it does occur to us that he has a point in his assertion that more than enough is now known for the committee to act—never mind that it isn't the point he was seeking to make. For the plain fact is that both the magnitude of the shocks and revelations of the past year and the complicated legal disputes the President has promoted and prolonged with Congress and the courts have combined to distract people from what they already know. They have given the whole sorry affair the aspect of a continuing, if not interminable, Grade B thriller, as distinct from the aspect of a body of confirmed information which is, in itself, more than sufficient to require a public response. The question, in other words, is not so much "what is going to happen next?" or "what will we learn about tomorrow?" but, rather, "what do we already know?"

Think about it: we know plenty.

We know that the President's best defense throughout—and it is a terrible defense—is that he so mismanaged the conduct of his office that he was unaware that his aides were authorizing common burglaries, were forging State Department cables, were perjuring themselves before federal prosecutors and grand juries, were paying blackmail money to criminals to buy silence about the White House's own involvement in their crimes, were systematically seeking to politicize and pervert the allegedly apolitical agencies of government (the CIA, the IRS, the FBI, among others) for the sake of wreaking personal vengeance on institutions and individuals they considered enemies.

We know that the President on the eve of the sentencing of the originally convicted Watergate conspirators, learned that their trial had been skewed by perjured testimony and failed to so inform the judge.

We know that the President has repeatedly and systemically misled the American public in his statements "from the heart" on this matter, telling them things he knew to be untrue.

We know that six of his former aides have been sentenced to terms in federal penitentiaries.

We know that his appointees have conspired to destroy evidence in criminal cases.

We know that the man he twice selected to be his (and our) Vice President has been convicted of a felony, forced to resign office and disbarred from the practice of law.

We know that the President—a great scourge of "welfare cheating"—was found to be almost half a million dollars light on his federal income tax.

We know that indictments are now outstanding and trials awaited for his closest White House associates and one-time most powerful deputies for a series of alleged criminal acts. We know that he has, while claiming all the protections and safeguards accorded an ordinary citizen in trouble with the law, simultaneously and shamelessly utilized the great and unique powers of the presidency not only to argue his own case (falsely) but to protect himself from scrutiny by the Congress or the courts. He declines to honor subpoenas. He fires the Special Prosecutor he has promised to give full rein when that Prosecutor appears to be getting warm. And now he tells us, in the course of telling the House Judiciary Committee, that he is only doing these recalcitrant things to protect "future" presidents. We think the evidence is overwhelming that he is, on the contrary, trying only to protect this one.

Presumably the members of the House Judiciary Committee and those legislators outside the committee who have authorized its inquiry will seek some further action on the materials Mr. Nixon has now declined to furnish. And presumably, too, his defiance of the committee will be added to the list of

Constitution-bending offenses for which he, as President, is responsible. But we would hope that the committee would not permit itself to be drawn into a prolonged and diverting dispute over the production of this evidence to the exclusion of its responsibility to continue and conclude its inquiry as quickly and carefully as possible. The American people know plenty—and the members of the Judiciary Committee know even more. A variety of charges against Mr. Agnew were never fully adjudicated because he preferred that they not be, and the same may be true of certain of the charges against Mr. Nixon because he too has now indicated that he will not risk orderly and complete adjudication in a single body that is empowered to consider his case—namely, the United States Congress. Mr. Agnew copped a plea. Mr. Nixon is merely refusing, in the name of his office—or what remains of it—to let the full information come to light.

People have been, in our view, exceptionally patient so far, and that is especially true of the legislators themselves. And they have also been exceptionally judicious and restrained. But it seems to us that by this latest act of evasion and contempt, the President has released everyone from the injunction against drawing inferences from his refusal to produce subpoenaed evidence. And if he will not cooperate—so be it: the House will have to proceed without him on the basis of what it now knows.

ANOTHER NEWSWORTHY BLACK PAPER

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, a major route to influence in the affairs of this Nation is through the press. I am always pleased, therefore, when individuals interested in black issues establish a newspaper. The Grass Roots News, published in Washington, deserves recognition and praise for its coverage of black activities and achievements. No other paper performs this valuable service.

I insert in the RECORD a few examples of Grass Roots News articles which reflect the paper's purpose and value to the Washington community and concerned civil rights advocates everywhere.

ENERGY CRISIS CRUCIAL TO BLACKS

The energy crisis has created critical shortages of materials vital to American manufacturers in general, and Black manufacturers in particular. Even more distressing is that it has increased the failure rate of black businesses at a time when they were beginning to reach their full potential. Many of these firms have government contracts, and have been looking forward to the time when they could compete in the mainstream on an equal basis with other majority manufacturers. The energy crisis has slowed, and in too many cases, halted progress.

The National Association of Black Manufacturers, Inc. recently conducted a survey of its members in order to determine the scope of the problem, and to gain insights on what specifically should be done to assist our members during this difficult period.

The response to our questionnaire revealed that the energy crisis had engendered the following:

critical material shortages caused prices to increase 10-50% (fuel shortages curtail pickups and deliveries)
forced layoffs of personnel

caused a drop in gross receipts and ultimately reduced profits
halted plans for expansion
inhibited ability to compete for new business

seriously hampered ability to repay loans
Our member companies span the broad spectrum of industry. Those companies who are dependent on petroleum by-products (i.e., plastics and solvents) are suffering to a greater extent. One of our companies designs and manufactures machines to produce anything from lollipops to mattress pads. So you see the problems are many and varied.

Delivery delays has been one of the primary concerns of our companies, because the lack of critical materials means either delay in completing contract commitments or the inability to complete them at all. This is devastating to minority companies, who are usually operating on inadequate working capital and a very limited profit margin.

The minority businessman is caught between the rock and the hard place.

ONE GIANT STEP FOR MANKIND—BACKWARDS

Among the bills that became law in California on January 1 of this year was Senate Bill 1199. It allows teachers to be graduated and receive credentials again without the ability to teach reading. For many years educators and interested parents fought to get requirements in reading as a prerequisite for teaching regardless of subject. Now we have moved back into the "dark ages" again. It would be idealistic and nice of social studies teachers could teach that subject without reading. This is not the case.

To think that the time will be soon when all high school teachers will face classes where every pupil is able to read at grade level is not only wishful thinking, but sheer folly, in spite of the claims of Right to Read to have every child reading at leaving school by 1980. This is not a dream; it is a nightmare! At the present rate of improvement and implementation of reading programs the best I can see is another 30 years. This sounds quite pessimistic, but until the colleges prepare all teachers, regardless of subject of interest, in the know-how to disseminate the tools of learning, at least the skill of reading, to every child at least by the third grade.

Right to Read, Operation Reading, Project Literacy, Reading is Fundamental are just fantasies. Until the colleges prepare teachers to teach every child regardless of ethnic background, environmental circumstances, or financial and social status we will continue to have the reading problem. When teachers learn to teach human beings across the board without bias, much of the problem will be eliminated.

One further omission by the colleges has been to admit the error of telling parents not to teach their children anything. While educators somehow wish these children would come with some ability, I have yet to find an educator who would openly admit that the colleges made an error in the mandate "Don't teach your child anything; leave it to the school—let us do it our way". And "our way" has been a failure. Our way has been to put the blame on the student rather than the teacher or the method, which are synonymous. If the method fails, the teacher fails. If the teacher fails, the method fails.

If a student does not learn to read, the teacher has not taught reading, regardless of the antics and motions he may have gone through. Nothing is ever taught until something has been learned.

In this day, when 25% of the youngsters are coming out of school non reading, I don't know what educators are thinking about in giving out one more piece of paper: A license to kill—because as sure as the youngster goes through the school system and fails to learn to read, teachers kill him. They may not bury him, but they kill within the limits of his self confidence, the ability to learn

and the ability to earn an adequate living. They also kill within him the ability to pursue the right to liberty, justice, and happiness, through the written word. One giant step backwards—maybe! One colossal step backwards—a definite yes!

Sometime ago there was an article that said that teacher training and other in-put factors played second fiddle to the home environment for children. This article made it sound like a big deal. Parents have always been important and always will be, and this is as it should be. The very idea of schools telling parents to keep hands off; psychiatrists telling them not to discipline their children, etc., are bad enough, but when they end up non reading and the schools blame the parents, or when they wind up in Juvenile Court and the psychiatrist blames the parents, we reach the ridiculous. And now I am blaming the parents for listening to both the schools and the psychiatrists!

It is unfortunate that parents swallowed the hogwash of not teaching youngsters the letters and sounds, and misunderstood that when schools said not to teach them anything, they didn't mean it literally. They wanted children to know how to tie their shoelaces and blow their noses and go to the restroom, but they complained when the youngster came to school and the parents hadn't taught him anything.

In our permissive society the youngster is allowed the extravagance of thinking that the world belongs to him and him only, and anything he wants to do is all right. This possibly works for four or five years as the child is in his own private kingdom. But upon his first venture into the classroom he may find himself confronted with 20 to 30 other individuals with the same idea! The end result is total chaos for them and the brand new idealistic teacher, who is fresh out of college, with little understanding of human behavior, let alone how to cope with such totally spoiled brats. Then all the schools and psychiatrists can think of is that the parents should have done something.

Parents need to know that too much permissiveness creates an anatomy of crime and suicide. Why talk about suicide potential in a 5 year old when he is taught early that he can do anything he wants to and when he discovers that what he wants to do infringes upon other people's rights and he has not been taught that other people have rights, he winds up in the psychiatrist's office feeling a sense of rejection from the whole world.

A little more discipline and a lot more of the right teaching, particularly with regard to respecting other persons as individuals, might have prevented a lot of self rejection that just might possibly put a few psychiatrists out of business—or would it? Maybe they could spend their time really helping people who need it rather than listening to the prattle of spoiled individuals. It's about time educators began teaching parents that they should help children learn not only the three R's, but the fourth one, as well—Rights.

Every child should learn right from wrong, the right way to treat people, respect of others rights—just the good old fashioned sense of morality in order that they may know right from wrong. Yes, parents are important—or they should be—and it is high time we get back to the fact that parents could and should do most of the teaching during the first seven years of a child's life. The school, the teacher, and the outside world should play second fiddle to proper parental guidance.

PUBLISHER'S STATEMENT

True, Black is beautiful, and black people are beautiful. But how do we beautiful black people succeed in the system now running the country? For fuller involvement and a firmer position in the system, it takes a good

education, economic control, and political participation.

Blacks need education to prepare us so we're ready as the doors continue to open wider. Blacks need to control the dollars spent satisfying our needs and desires so we can deal with economic power. Blacks need to get involved in politics so we can become a part of shaping our future.

As blacks, we can no longer be content with getting a slice of the pie, no matter how delicious. We must demand full partnership in making, baking and cutting that pie. First that means placing more emphasis on our education and our schools—vocational education and professional education.

Second that means concentrating on controlling our buying power. (In 1973 the total spending power of American blacks was well over 50 billion dollars). How can we reap more rewards after exhibiting this amount of spending power.

Thirdly, it means the private sector must give blacks greater employment opportunities, including the channel to move up in the company. We need to continue to take a look at positions at the center level and be concerned about the proportion of blacks who have moved up the mobility ladder and into higher echelon positions. Corporate management must also continue to seek blacks out as suppliers of goods and services, as well as sub-contractors.

It all starts at the ballot box. Every black American over 18 years of age should already be registered to vote, and now making plans to go to the polls on May 7th. Vote Republican, Democratic, or Independent. Just vote. Organize a committee of one to see that you get out to vote.

NIXONOMICS: 11½ PERCENT INTEREST RATE—11½ PERCENT INFLATION EQUALS TIME TO MOVE IN NEW DIRECTION

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the light of recently released statistics, the administration's report card on the economy has to be amended to reflect the true impact of Nixonomics: A prime interest rate of at least 11½ percent and an inflationary price surge for the first quarter of 1974 of exactly the same figure: 11½ percent.

Every indication I have says that, insofar as big business is concerned, things are rosy: After-tax profits climbed 20 percent during the first quarter of this year over a year ago and pretax earnings rose by 10 percent during the same period. At the same time, insofar as the American consumer is concerned, he is clearly worse off than he was a year ago or than he was on January 1 of this year. How many more months must we suffer double-digit price surges, percentage point increases in lending rates, a decline in housing starts, and fewer and fewer consumers able to make ends meet?

The President has abandoned the country's economic future to chance. I, for one, do not believe that the throw of the dice is the best way to run the American economy. In April of this year, I introduced legislation proposing a fresh approach to dealing with our runaway economy. I believe we must move in

another direction quickly before it is too late.

To those of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD who may still doubt the need to reexamine our present economic policy, I commend the two articles which follow from the May 20 edition of the Wall Street Journal:

"REAL" GNP FELL 6.3 PERCENT IN FIRST PERIOD ON ANNUAL BASIS

WASHINGTON.—The first quarter economic downturn and inflationary surge were both worse than originally indicated, the latest government figures show.

And one apparent bright spot in the period—a 12% jump in corporate profits—was solely the result of price increases on inventories. Profits on current production declined.

Revised figures on the "real" gross national product, which is expressed in 1958 dollars to strip away the effects of inflation, show the total output of U.S. goods and services dropped at a staggering 6.3% seasonally adjusted annual rate instead of the 5.8% estimated a month ago, the Commerce Department said. Price increases ran at a huge 11.5% annual rate instead of the initially reported 10.8%.

OVERALL GNP RISE REVISED

The department revised the rise in the overall GNP to \$14.7 billion, or at a 4.5% annual pace, from \$14.3 billion, or 4.4%. This puts the first quarter economic output at a \$1.352 trillion annual rate.

But all of the small upward revision resulted from prices rising faster than reported earlier. The 11.5% price increase, as measured by the GNP price index, was the worst since the Korean war price spiral produced a 13% rate in the first period of 1951. The slump in "real" GNP was the largest since a 9.2% plunge in the first period of 1958, a recession year.

The department said after-tax corporate profits in the first period climbed to an adjusted annual rate of \$80.2 billion from \$71.6 billion in the fourth quarter, when earnings edged up only 0.1%. The figure was 20% above the \$66.9 billion rate of the March quarter in 1973. Pretax earnings in the first quarter rose 10% to a \$140.1 billion annual rate from \$127.5 billion in the fourth quarter.

BUSINESS INVENTORIES

In more normal periods, the sharp profit increase would suggest a robust economic performance. But, government analysts quickly note, the first quarter figures were inflated by hefty markups in the values of business inventories. The first-quarter markup in inventories was \$31.2 billion, double the \$15.5 billion adjustment of the previous quarter, and it reflects the soaring wholesale prices of the first three months of the year.

Profits arising from current production dropped \$3 billion, or 2.7%, to an adjusted annual rate of \$108.9 billion before taxes.

The profit picture was bleak for most industries last quarter, the department indicated. Sharply higher earnings of petroleum refiners, aided by soaring oil prices, and of financial institutions, helped by record interest rates, were more than offset by lower earnings in other industries, particularly auto makers, utilities and communications concerns.

Dividend payments rose to a \$29.5 billion annual rate from \$29 billion in the fourth quarter and \$26.9 billion in the 1973 period. Retained earnings, at a \$50.7 billion annual rate, were up from the previous quarter's \$42.6 billion and the year-earlier's \$40 billion.

RECORD PRIME RATE OF 11 PERCENT IS EXPECTED TO BE ESTABLISHED INDUSTRYWIDE TODAY

A record 11½% prime interest rate on bank loans to large corporations is expected to become industry-wide today.

First National Bank of Chicago, the nation's ninth largest bank in terms of deposits, could hurdle even the 11½% level and raise its prime to 11¾%, based on a formula it uses to help set its base lending fee. That fee is scheduled to be reviewed this morning. First of Chicago posted an 11.40% prime last Monday. The prime rate is the minimum interest fee banks charge on loans to their most credit-worthy large corporate customers.

The 11½% prime spread rapidly Friday after First National City Bank, New York's largest, announced an increase from the 11¼% level it initiated only one week earlier.

The jump reflected continued demand for bank credit, and higher weekly average money-market interest rates.

Some two dozen leading banks followed Citibank in raising their prime rates to 11½%. Among them were Chase Manhattan Bank, Chemical Bank, Bankers Trust Co. and Franklin National Bank, all in New York; Bank of America, the nation's largest, and Wells Fargo Bank in San Francisco; Security Pacific National Bank in Los Angeles; Mellon Bank in Pittsburgh; First National Bank in Boston and National Bank of Detroit.

The increase is the 11th general rise in the banking industry's base lending fee since mid-March.

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York said Friday commercial and industrial loans at the 12 major New York banks rose an estimated \$90 million for the week ended last Wednesday. That corrected a previous report that business loans were up \$399 million in the week. The Fed explained that one major bank had made a large error in reporting loans on its books.

The news that loan demand was more moderate than originally reported triggered some money-market activity. Treasury bills, which sold off when the original figures were released, recovered a portion of their losses, dealers said. But the recovery was short-lived.

The 13-week bill closed on some dealers' sheets unchanged at 7.94% bid. The companion 26-week bill ended at 8.22% bid, up from 8.18%.

JUDGE JACK A. LIPARI OF THE MAHONING COUNTY COURT, OHIO, IS HONORED AT TESTIMONIAL

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 19, 1974, Mahoning County Judge Jack A. Lipari was honored by his many friends in the Youngstown, Ohio area.

In addition to a testimonial dinner and dance at Our Lady of Mt. Carmel hall, the program included a special Mass, in which the priest chanted petitions and read passages from the Old and New Testaments containing spiritual guidance and advice for judges.

During the testimonial dinner, Dr. Raffaele Gesini, representative of Egidio Ortona, Italian Ambassador to the United States, presented Judge Lipari the Commander of the Order of Merit of the Republic of Italy Award for the judge's contribution to and promotion of the Italian culture and heritage.

Participants in the affair included: Ohio Supreme Court Justice Frank D. Celebrezze, Ohio Transportation Director J. Philip Richley, Youngstown

Mayor Jack C. Hunter, Rev. Joseph Iati, pastor of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Church, Rev. Frank Timar, Very Rev. Anselm J. Viano, and Italian Consul Dr. Mario Anziano.

Mr. Ralph R. Ranalli was chairman of the testimonial dinner committee. He was assisted by Anthony J. Tucci, Anthony C. Pannunzio, Rocco J. Manginella, John Trimboli, and Pasquale Leone.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my sincere congratulations to Judge Lipari and his lovely wife, Antoinette, on receiving this award. I am proud to be counted among Judge and Mrs. Lipari's many friends.

I insert portions of the Mass said for Judge Lipari in the RECORD at this time:

PRAYER

O Lord God Almighty, You give us all the good things of this world. You gave judges to your people of old to govern them. Today we honor one of our judges—Jack Lipari. As he is knighted with merit by our Motherland—you send your Holy Spirit upon him to guide him with wisdom. We make our prayer through the merits of Jesus Christ our Lord who live with you forever and ever. Amen.

FIRST READING

Reading From The Book Of Exodus—Advice to Judges.—"You shall not repeat a false report. Do not join wicked in putting your hand, as an unjust witness, upon anyone. Neither shall you allege the example of the many as an excuse for doing wrong, nor shall you, when testifying in a lawsuit, side with the many in perverting justice. You shall not favor a poor man in his lawsuit.

"When you come upon your enemy's ox and ass going astray, see to it that it is returned to him. When you notice the ass of one who hates you lying prostrate under his burden, by no means desert him; help him, rather, to raise it up. "You shall not deny one of your needy fellow men his rights in his lawsuit. You shall keep away from anything dishonest. The innocent and the just you shall not put to death, nor shall you acquit the guilty. Never take a bribe, for a bribe blinds even the most clear-sighted and twists the words even of the just. You shall not oppress an alien; you well know how it feels to be an alien, since you were once aliens yourselves in the land of Egypt.

SECOND READING

Reading from St. Paul's second letter to Timothy—Chapter 4—Verses 1-9.—And so I solemnly urge you before God and before Jesus Christ—who will some day judge the living and the dead when he appears to set up his kingdom—to preach the Word of God urgently at all times, whenever you get the chance, in season and out, when it is convenient and when it is not. Correct and rebuke your people when they need it, encourage them to do it right, and all the time be feeding them patiently with God's Word. For there is going to come a time when people won't listen to the truth, but will go around looking for teachers who will tell them just what they want to hear. They won't listen to what the Bible says but will blithely follow their own misguided ideas. Stand steady, and don't be afraid of suffering for the Lord. Bring others to Christ. Leave nothing undone that you ought to do. I say this because I won't be around to help you very much longer. My time has almost run out. Very soon now I will be on my way to heaven. I have fought long and hard for my Lord, and through it all I have kept true to him. And now the time has come for me to stop fighting and rest. In heaven a crown is waiting for me which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me on that great day of his return. And not just to me, but

to all those whose lives show that they are eagerly looking forward to his coming back again.

GOSPEL: JN. 14:23-29

A reading from the holy gospel according to John.

People: Glory to you, Lord.

Jesus said to his disciples: "Anyone who loves me will be true to my word, and my Father will love him; we will come to him and make our dwelling place with him always. He who does not love me does not keep my words. Yet the word you hear is not mine; it comes from the Father who sent me. This much have I told you while I was still with you; the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit whom the Father will send in my name, will instruct you in everything, and remind you of all that I told you. 'Peace' is my farewell to you, my peace is my gift to you; I do not give it to you as the world gives peace. Do not be distressed or fearful. You have heard me say, 'I go away for a while, and I come back to you.' If you truly loved me you would rejoice to have me go to the Father, for the Father is greater than I. I tell you this now before it takes place, so that when it takes place you may believe.— This is the Gospel of the Lord.

People: Praise to you, Lord Jesus Christ.

PETITIONS CHANTED BY PRIEST

Lord God—giver of Leaders to your People send your Holy Spirit upon us as we pray: That Judge Lipari may continue to serve you and your people with honesty, wisdom and sincerity—we pray to the Lord.

That the people he serves will truly appreciate his services—we pray to the Lord. That your Holy Spirit will guide all leaders in Government with honesty and wisdom—we pray to the Lord.

That you will bless all here gathered with peace, health and prosperity—we pray to the Lord. That you will permit our deceased Loved ones to take our prayers to your altar on high as they share your eternity—we pray to the Lord.

For all our intentions (Pause)—we pray to the Lord.

CEREMONY

My dear friends—we are gathered together to honor a man who has been outstanding in his service to his people.

By your presence here you attest to this man's honor and worthiness.

Now I ask you Judge Lipari and you Annette, his co-sharer in Love and Life, to come forth. (Pause) Judge Genufects—Wife stand by—

Do you Judge Lipari accept the honor about to be bestowed upon you.

Do you Lady Annette agree to the Knighthood of Your Spouse, and to his worthiness.

Then I charge you to continue in your dedicated and tolerant sharing spirit of Love.

Do you in all humility deem yourself worthy of this honor?

Will you pledge yourself to a full hearted—dedicated service to your people.

Then may the Holy Spirit of God descend upon you as I knight You—into the order of Commandatore de Merito—May the Almighty Steer you with wisdom so that you may be a true Knight of freely bestowed kindnesses.

Arise—Sir Knight and accept the medal of honor to be bestowed upon you by the Republic of Italy.

AMBASSADOR

Do you reverend Father agree that this honor should be bestowed upon Judge Lipari? Then as the Representative of the Republic of Italy and the Italian Ambassador Egidio Ortona, I, Raffaele Gesini, vested with this authority pin you with this medal of honor.

I congratulate you Annette as Lady Lipari and ask you to continue supporting your husband in his dedicated Service to humanity.

I charge you people who are present in testimony to this knight to continue your support and cooperation. To give of yourselves freely in service to the betterment of your kindred and I charge you to excel as citizens of this God blessed Land of America.

POST COMMUNION

Lord Triune God—creator of the universe and all its Life. We thank you for the Blessings of this day; the honor of Judge Lipari; and the love of my people. Bless us all as we each travel the journey of life you have set our feet upon. You who live forever and ever.

HEALTH EXPERT TESTIFIES ABOUT HEALTH EFFECTS OF AIR POLLUTION

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, my own views on air pollution legislation have been presented to this body frequently. I have attempted to stress the importance of the adverse health effects of air pollution, and the need for the Congress to protect the public health. A noted health expert recently gave an excellent statement to the Subcommittee on Environmental Pollution of the U.S. Senate Committee on Public Works. Because this body continues to debate the need to amend the Clean Air Act, frequently without benefit or reference to the health aspects of the problem, I believe this testimony should be made available to the entire Congress. For this reason I insert the statement of Bertram W. Carnow, M.D., into the RECORD at this time.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF BERTRAM W. CARNOW, M.D.

My name is Bertram W. Carnow, M.D., of Chicago. While I am speaking today on behalf of the National Clean Air Coalition and the American Public Health Association, I hold a number of other affiliations and positions which may interest the Subcommittee. I am Professor and Director of Occupational and Environmental Medicine at the University of Illinois School of Public Health and also hold a Professorship at the University of Illinois Lincoln School of Medicine, Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health. I serve as Director of the Environmental Health Research Center of the State of Illinois Institute of Environmental Quality and am environmental consultant to the Governor of Illinois. Additionally, I am Chairman of the American Public Health Association Energy Task Force which will shortly publish a major study entitled, "Health and Safety Effects of Energy Systems" and Chairman of the National Academy of Sciences Panel on Sulfur Dioxide which will shortly report formally to this Subcommittee. At the local level, I have been Medical Director of the Chicago Lung Association since 1967, a chest consultant at the Union Health Services since 1957 and attending physician and chest consultant at the Michael Reese and University of Illinois Hospitals.

I am a Fellow in the American Public Health Association, a Fellow in the Royal Society of Health, a Fellow in American College of Chest Physicians, and a member of numerous medical and scientific organizations.

The National Clean Air Coalition and the American Public Health Association have asked me to represent them here today to provide some comments on the Clean Air Act from a physician's viewpoint. I will share with you some of my concerns based on 15 years of observing and treating humans suffering from the effects of air pollutants and 10 years of epidemiologic study of air pollution's impact on health.

My concerns about the impact of air pollutants on health must be seen as part of a total concern for public health in view of what is occurring in regard to the diseases afflicting Americans, particularly cardiovascular diseases, bronchitis and emphysema and lung cancer. The major killer, cardiovascular disease, particularly coronary artery disease, now kills 60 percent of all Americans. Bronchitis and emphysema disable millions and are responsible as a primary and secondary cause for some 100,000 deaths each year. Lung cancer has increased to the point where it kills more American males than all other cancers combined. These are all noninfectious diseases, have multiple causes, insidious onset and very long incubation period. What is most frustrating to clinicians is that when they appear they are irreversible, in a majority of cases, and very little can be done for those who suffer from them. I note this in relation to air pollution because studies carried out by our group at the University of Illinois, by the Federal EPA, and by others strongly suggest that air pollution is an important factor in all of these diseases.

In view of the nature of the onset and irreversibility of these diseases, it becomes critical to define the major causative agents in order to practice primary prevention. And this represents one of my major concerns in regard to air pollutants.

A few comments about health effects assessment and its use as a basis for standards-setting are now in order. Air pollution standards, like other health standards, reflect social, economic and political decisions. Too often, however, standards are viewed as levels which protect the health of all people. This, of course, is just not true. The environment is essentially hostile, and humans, as biological organisms with varying degrees of resistance and adaptive capacity, are in a continuous struggle with it. Any factor in the environment which increases its hostility or anything lowering the resistance of humans decreases adaptability. When one views the health effects of air pollutants on humans in the context of this struggle, it becomes obvious that in a heterogeneous population of 200 million people with varying ability to adapt, for example those with genetic defects, asthma, allergies, heart disease, and lung disease, there can be no well defined threshold or safe level. Our studies and those of others strongly indicate that at every level of air pollution, someone's health is affected adversely, and someone may die.

Human adaptive capacity is limited by many factors in addition to those noted, including developmental defects, personal habits, physical and mental stress and living conditions. The latter includes poor housing, medical care and nutrition. All of these are environmental stressors which tend to diminish adaptive capacity of humans. A detailed listing of these factors is attached as Appendix 1.

Those populations at high risk because of limited ability to adapt have not been well defined, and the pollution levels at which various groups may be endangered have not, in most cases been adequately quantitated. While some, like cardiacs and asthmatics, are well known, others like those with sickle cell anemia or alpha-1-trypsin deficiency

are just now being recognized. It is therefore critical to consider both the numbers and kinds of people at high risk at different pollution levels and the pollution levels themselves, if we are to make decisions in regard to the impact of environmental stresses on human health.

Two other important and related questions which have not been adequately dealt with and must be answered relate to the concept of total body burden and synergism. While most of the standards have been based upon epidemiologic data, in some cases, serious consideration has been given to setting standards based on data obtained in studies of normal populations exposed to single pollutants. Drawing conclusions from these data can be hazardous, since, in life, humans are exposed to many sources of the same pollutants. For example carbon monoxide may enter the blood stream via cigarette smoke, automobile exhaust, industrial and energy sources. Lead is another case in point. As an automobile pollutant, it may be inhaled from the air and ingested with street dirt. In addition, many other potential sources exist such as ingestion from toothpaste tubes, leaded paint, cheap pottery, and so on. It is critical to understand that it doesn't matter what the source; the total burden faced by the body represents the environmental stress. Additionally, multiple pollutants such as sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, and cigarette smoke, to name a few, all impact on a single target organ, the lung. Thus, consideration of standards based on a single source of a single pollutant may not adequately safeguard human health. This is particularly true when one considers that 70 million Americans smoke significant numbers of cigarettes, and are therefore at high risk when exposed to these pollutants.

Another important point to keep in mind when considering the safety of standards relates to the concept of synergism, that is, two materials which have a greater than additive effect when acting together. In regard to lungs, for example, sulfur dioxide and ozone have been found to act synergistically, affecting the lungs much more adversely when both are present than when they are presented singly in equivalent amounts. In relation to the severe problem imposed by the growing rates of lung cancer deaths, synergistic effects should also be of considerable concern. Studies which we have carried out suggest that for every microgram of benzo(a) pyrene, a carcinogen present in the air, and used in this case as a marker since other carcinogens are also present, per thousand cubic meter of air, there appears to be a 5% increase in lung cancer deaths. It is our estimate that a 60% reduction in urban air pollution might result in a 20% reduction in lung cancer. The carcinogenic effect of asbestos and cigarettes and radioactive materials and cigarettes are well known. It would also appear that air pollutants and cigarettes may act synergistically, causing this dread disease. For these reasons, pure physiological studies should not become institutionalized as a clean air standard; such standards will not likely protect the health of our heterogeneous population of 2 hundred million people exposed to multiple environmental insults. The Clean Air Act, of course, recognizes the principles of synergism, of multiple sources, and the need for considering total body burden. Federal standards most often do not. Congress should strive to assure that these principles are continually recognized. Moreover, Congress should foster the viewpoint that clean air standards are the minimum protective measures for public health.

Rather than a standard-by-standard appraisal of the existing EPA regulations, it might be more useful to direct the Subcommittee's attention to four significant

health hazards which have not been considered in the current standards. These include respirable particulates (those less than 5 microns in size), air borne carcinogens, toxic metals and derivatives of sulfur dioxide, namely acid sulfates and sulfuric acid aerosols. Ambient air quality standards do not exist for any of these materials despite the fact that there is strong scientific evidence that they jeopardize human health. The air pollution-lung cancer study noted above and studies examining SO₂, sulfates, and acid aerosols, moreover, find correlation between variations of levels of these pollutants and of mortality and morbidity rates. I recognize that some of the analytical and monitoring equipment is not fully developed. However, in some areas, particulate sizing and monitoring of many air borne carcinogens such as benzo(a)pyrene and trace metals can and should be measured so that better quantitative assessment of their health impact can be made, even though it appears that development of standards are some years away. Since they are recognized at least qualitatively as hazardous materials, strict control of fuel sources and combustion methods must be maintained in the interim. Mass conversion to high sulfur coal for urban energy production without stringent control procedures will unquestionably result in increased illness, disability, and death among urban dwellers, particularly those with heart and lung disease. I urge the Senate to maintain the language of the Senate Emergency Energy legislation passed on Tuesday. It is much preferable to the House version.

I should like now to turn to another area of concern, namely the nature of pollution control procedures. There appears to be a trend toward adopting high stacks and directed plumes (intermediate control strategies) as a major pollution control strategy. It has been suggested that the use of this method of dispersion during non-inversion periods represents a reasonable method for disposing of SO₂ and particulate air pollutants, particularly the former. There is mounting evidence to suggest that this would be a very poor strategy.

Acid sulfates and sulfuric acid are more toxic than sulfur dioxide itself. They are formed in large quantities in the air from emitted SO₂. Recent evidence suggests that high stacks lead to the formation of stable clouds of these toxic substances. Thus, rather than diffusing and dissipating these materials, this strategy may actually increase the stable concentrations of these more harmful pollutants and, indeed, may affect much larger populations than those in the urban areas where the pollutants are developed. There appears to be good evidence that large cloud masses of these agents are present over the Northeastern United States, so that even those in rural areas are now being exposed to significant levels of toxic SO₂ derivatives. This effect may prevail even though SO₂ levels near the ground are decreasing. This phenomenon may be true with toxic materials, also.

A substance like lead, for example, which is immutuable and does not disappear, is also emitted from the stacks, and while it may be diffused, it ultimately reaches the ground and remains there. In addition, where a significant number of these stacks are present in a relatively small area, the result is one of blowing dirty air from one place to another.

Considerations of technical feasibility and reliability aside, the high stack, directed plume strategy is best labeled as an epidemiological gamble. At stake, of course, is human disease and death. I therefore suggest that federal dollars might be better allocated toward elimination of these pollutants by other devices, the use of cleaner fuels, more complete combustion methods, and the ex-

ploration of new methods for producing clean energy.

Another area of concern from the medical viewpoint is the adequacy of the health care delivery system to deal with increased patient demand during periods of high pollution. Studies by our group in Chicago, over the past 8 years, have suggested significant increases in cardiac and respiratory disease and death on days when sulfur dioxide is elevated. During a 1969 high pollution episode, hospitalization of bronchitics was markedly increased, when compared to either before or after the episode. The need for planning for such occurrences is clear. Communities must promulgate plans for emergency care during pollution crises. This planning should include, perhaps, medical surveillance of certain groups at high risk such as cardiacs, bronchitics and asthmatics, newborns and very young infants. I feel that Congress and the Environmental Protection Agency may be well directed to investigate this area in detail from the national perspective.

I have dealt at great lengths with the importance of defining those populations at high risk. Qualitative definition of those at risk will permit physicians to caution those patients regarding levels of activity during high pollution periods and counsel them on the advisability of living in highly polluted areas. For other reasons also, it is critical to make an assessment of those at high risk, since the only way that decisions can be made regarding safe levels will be to develop dose-response relationships and establish the numbers at risk at each level of pollution. Models which have been developed by our group will shortly appear as a Ford Foundation/American Public Health Association Energy Report, soon to be released. I am concerned that studies attempting to find those at high risk and quantitating the level of risk have not been assigned high priority by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency. If this is true, it would be most unfortunate, and I would urge that it receive the emphasis that most of us in the field believe it should have.

Finally, I urge the Subcommittee to advocate full funding for the Clean Air Act and especially for the implementation of the State Plans sometime hence. I must also emphasize that this funding should provide for ample multidisciplinary training in both air pollution epidemiology and control technology.

My written statement is now concluded. Thank you for permitting me to appear before you. I shall be happy to answer any questions you may have.

APPENDIX 1 FROM "HEALTH AND SAFETY EFFECTS OF ENERGY SYSTEMS" A DRAFT REPORT OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION Factors which Decrease the Host's Resistance to Environment Stressors:

GENETIC DEFECTS

- *Hypercholesterolemia.
- *Diabetes with atherosclerosis.
- Asthma.
- Cystic fibrosis.
- *Alpha anti-trypsin deficiency.
- Cystic disease of the lungs.
- Hypogammaglobulinemia.
- *Tetralogy of Fallot.
- *Atrial or ventricular wall defects.
- *Valvular defects.
- Sickle Cell Anemia.
- Glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase disorder.

Allergic predispositions.

DEVELOPMENTAL DEFECTS

Cor pulmonale (secondary to chronic obstructive pulmonary disease).

*No data but might be expected to be at high risk.

Hypertension with left ventricular disease.
Coronary insufficiency (*with or without angina).
Rheumatic heart disease.
*Congestive heart failure (secondary to atherosclerotic heart disease).
Chronic bronchitis.
Emphysema.
*Kyphoscoliosis.
Advanced (active or inactive) tuberculosis, histoplasmosis.
Bronchiectasis.

PERSONAL HABITS

Cigarette smoking.
*Heavy exertion.

PHYSICAL CONDITION

Aging or debilitation.
*Premature or newborn state.
Preschool ages.
*Obesity.

LIVING CONDITIONS

Overcrowding.
Malnutrition.
Excessive cold.

WHAT TO A SLAVE IS THE FOURTH OF JULY?

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as we move toward the Bicentennial year and the great national birthday celebration we in the minority communities continue to feel a certain sense of irony that great sums have been appropriated and are being spent to celebrate 200 years of American history at a time when the minority citizens, who in the most part have been left out of the mainstream of that history, are still suffering the type of economic and social deprivation that makes obscene great expenditures for self-congratulation at the expense of moneys that could be going to social programs.

It is because of this bitter irony that I have consistently opposed the authorizations for appropriations for Bicentennial activities.

The Afro-American Bicentennial Corporation located here in Washington, D.C. has been attempting to influence Bicentennial planning in a more positive direction. Under leadership of Vincent and Bob DeForrest the Afro-American Bicentennial Corporation has been lobbying for more meaningful Bicentennial projects, projects which will leave a legacy of which we can be proud in the next hundred years of our existence.

I was pleased to see that the Amsterdam News in its issue of Saturday, May 11, 1974, paid editorial tribute to the Afro-American Bicentennial Corporation in an editorial entitled, "Food For Thought." I place it in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

The Afro-American Bicentennial Corporation in Washington, D.C., is taking a hard

line approach to America's Bicentennial Corporation.

For example, the organization has posed a question: "How were certain groups (Indians, Mexican-Americans, Blacks, women, Asians, etc.) rendered invisible in the historic, narrative and cultural symbols of the American majority? How does our view of history have to change when the stories of these people are told?"

Continuing on this hard line of approach to the Centennial, the organization quotes the famous words of Frederick Douglass on his views concerning America's celebration of the fourth of July when he said:

"What to the American Slave is your Fourth of July? I answer, a day that reveals to him more than all other days of the year, the gross injustice and cruelty to which he is the constant victim. To him your celebration is a sham; your boasted liberty an unholy license; your national greatness, your sounds of rejoicing are empty and heartless; your denunciation of tyrants, brass-fronted impudence; your shouts of liberty and equality, hollow mockery; your prayers and hymns, your sermons and thanksgivings, with all your religious parade and solemnity, are to him mere bombast, fraud, deception, impiety, and hypocrisy—a thin veil to cover up crimes which would disgrace a nation of savages."

The Afro-American Bicentennial Corporation sees the Bicentennial as a way of focusing this nation's attention on the still unmet economical, political and social needs of the nation's poor Black and Brown citizens and on the contributions which Afro-Americans have made to the nation's heritage.

Unless and until someone comes along with a better idea, we wholeheartedly recommend this one to the National Bicentennial Corporation.

The celebration of this event will consume a lot of time and cost a lot of money.

Such an idea will see to it that this time and money are not wasted.

A PUBLISHER'S VIEWS ON VOTER APATHY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the publisher of one of Pennsylvania's finest daily newspapers, Mr. Thomas D. Mansfield of The Daily News in McKeesport, discussed in a recent editorial the growing apathy on the part of many Americans to exercise their right to vote in public elections.

Describing this as "incredible, in a republic where a person's vote should be regarded as a precious gem," Mr. Mansfield observed this indifference has resulted in Federal, State and local governments that no longer respond to people. Too many Americans, he wrote, are ignoring what has become fact: that their attitude toward voting has led to government for public officials instead of government for people.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting Mr. Mansfield's editorial into the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues in the Con-

gress of the United States. I know they will find his views on voter apathy informative as well as interesting.

VOTER APATHY ELECTION DAY LAMENT

(By Thomas D. Mansfield)

Those of you who keep an eye on the political advertisements, read the posters on utility poles and glance at the card that was handed you on a downtown street or at a mill gate are aware tomorrow is primary election day.

And some who have been stirred by interest in one candidate or another will be going to the polls.

Indeed, many Mon-Yough area residents never miss out on an opportunity to cast a ballot. Unfortunately, these good folks are too few in number.

I was prompted to write this column by a recent news story wherein the "experts" again are predicting a slim turnout of voters tomorrow—not only in this area, but across the country wherever elections are being held.

These so-called experts do their thing twice a year—once in the Spring, once in the Fall. But it seems each year they advance a different reason as to why many, many Americans aren't going to vote.

More recently, for example, those supposedly in the know, and apparently more knowledgeable than I, suggest that "voter distrust"—stemming, of course, from Watergate—is the chief reason why many people are going to stay away from the polls tomorrow.

To some degree, they may be right. But why haven't they fallen back on their predictions of previous years? Then, they forecast poor voter response for such reasons as: (1) the candidates haven't turned them on; (2) the weather is going to keep people at home; (3) there is apathy because no solid issues have been raised in the campaign. I'm sure you can recall others.

This year, the experts have fallen back on Watergate.

But, really, is it Watergate that has failed to prime the voters this year? Was it the absence of "issues" in a previous year?

Isn't it just possible the experts aren't placing the blame where it really lies? On people. You and me.

Certainly, a Pete Flaherty-Herbert Denenberg race for a U.S. Senate nomination should turn people on. It's a pairing that should bring Democrats out in large numbers tomorrow. But will it?

There are other races, notably for state House nominations, that should have folks champing at the bit to go to the polls. And there's a controversial home rule question in Allegheny County that should stir people up. But will it?

Frankly, it seems to me that too many people have an "I don't give a darn" attitude about elections. It's not an issue, nor the lack of one, that fails to get them moving to the polls on election day. They just don't want to be bothered.

As I see it, on this day before election, perhaps all of us should keep in mind that the fruits of our indifference are in full bloom in Washington, in Harrisburg and in state capitals all over the country. Yes, and in the Mon-Yough area, too, on every level of government.

Our indifference has given birth to federal, state and local governments that no longer are responsive to the people. And we have only ourselves to blame.

That indifference has led to our being lulled to sleep, and while we are dozing, government has chipped away at our rights and at our pocketbooks. It's taking more and more, and giving us less in return.

But, can we really blame the politicians

for our dilemma? To be honest, if I were a public official today I might be tempted to sit with a smug look on my face.

After all, many officeholders make it to the general election by being nominated in the Spring by a minority of his or her party's voters. Once over the primary "hump", that officeholder can be elected with ease in the Fall if his party enjoys a hefty registration margin, as is often the case.

Sad to say, this is happening all over America today. Not because of Watergate, nor because of rain, nor because there aren't any issues. But because of apathy.

Too many Americans apparently are not shamed by the fact their neighbors are voting, and they aren't. Too many Americans

aren't heeding the pleas of their children to get out and vote. And too many Americans are ignoring what has become fact: that their attitude about voting has led to government for public officials instead of government for the people.

Incredibly, in a republic where a person's vote should be regarded as a precious gem, people just aren't getting turned on.

Personally, I feel sorry for the candidate who walks the streets and pounds on doors soliciting votes. The way I see it, he doesn't have much of a chance these days, mainly because too many people just don't seem to care enough to go out and vote.

Is it any wonder the politicians are smiling?

LETTER TO THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION REQUESTING INVESTIGATION

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the following copies of form 4 reports to the SEC of two board members are referred to in my special order in the body of today's Record:

FORM 4—STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP OF SECURITIES

STATEMENT FOR CALENDAR MONTH, DECEMBER, 1973; DATE OF LAST PREVIOUS STATEMENT, JANUARY 1973; RECEIVED AT SEC, FEB. 25, 1974

1. Name and business address of reporting person: Bovaird, William J., president, the Bovaird Supply Co., P.O. Box 2590, Tulsa, Okla. 74102.
2. State of incorporation: Delaware.
3. If an amendment give date of statement amended: None.

4. Name of Company: Pennzoil Co.
5. IRS or SS identifying number of reporting person: xxx-xx-xxxx
6. Relationships of reporting person to company: Director.

Title of securities	Date of transaction	Amount of securities acquired	Amount of securities disposed of	Character of transaction reported	Purchase or sale price per share or other unit	Amount owned at end of month	Nature of ownership of securities owned at end of month
Common stock	Dec. 21, 1973	12,800		Open market	26		Indirect holdings of Choctaw Corp., an investment company of which the Bovaird Supply Co. owns 7.53 percent.
Do	do	2,500	do	do	24 3/4		Do.
Do	do	7,500	do	do	25		Do.
Do	do	500	do	do	26	383,300	Do.

STATEMENT FOR CALENDAR MONTH, JANUARY 1974; DATE OF LAST PREVIOUS STATEMENT, DECEMBER 1973; RECEIVED AT SEC, FEB. 25, 1974

Title of securities	Date of transaction	Amount of securities acquired	Amount of securities disposed of	Character of transaction reported	Purchase or sale price per share or other unit	Amount owned at end of month	Nature of ownership of securities owned at end of month
Common stock	Jan. 3, 1974	400		Open market	27 3/4		Indirect. Holdings of Choctaw Corp an investment company of which the Bovaird Supply Co. owns 7.53 percent.
Do	do	3,100	do	do	28		Do.
Do	Jan. 4, 1974	4,700	do	do	27 3/4		Do.
Do	do	100	do	do	27 3/4		Do.
Do	do	1,200	do	do	27 3/4		Do.
Do	do	3,100	do	do	28		Do.
Do	do	1,100	do	do	28 1/2		Do.
Do	do	12,000	do	do	28 1/4		Do.
Do	do	2,000	do	do	28 3/8		Do.
Do	Jan. 7, 1974	2,300	do	do	28		Do.
Do	do	3,500	do	do	28 1/2		Do.
Do	do	1,300	do	do	28 1/4		Do.
Do	Jan. 8, 1974	100	do	do	28 1/4		Do.
Do	do	400	do	do	28 3/4		Do.
Do	do	13,200	do	do	28 3/8		Do.
Do	do	4,700	do	do	29		Do.
Do	do	2,000	do	do	29 1/8		Do.
Do	do	5,500	do	do	29 1/4		Do.
Do	Jan. 9, 1974	1,000	do	do	26 3/4		Do.
Do	do	1,000	do	do	27		Do.
Do	do	5,000	do	do	27 1/2		Do.
Do	do	900	do	do	27 3/8		Do.
Do	do	2,000	do	do	28		Do.
Do	do	9,700	do	do	28 3/8		Do.
Do	do	1,800	do	do	28 3/4		Do.
Do	do	500	do	do	28 3/4		Do.
Do	do	5,000	do	do	28 3/8		Do.
Do	Jan. 10, 1974	500	do	do	25 1/4		Do.
Do	do	500	do	do	25 1/2		Do.
Do	do	400	do	do	25 3/8		Do.
Do	do	600	do	do	25 3/4		Do.
Do	do	500	do	do	25 3/8		Do.
Do	do	2,000	do	do	26	475,400	Do.

FORM 4—STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP OF SECURITIES (SECURITIES BOUGHT, SOLD, OR OTHERWISE ACQUIRED OR DISPOSED OF)

1. Name and business address of reporting person: Coleman, George L., P.O. Box 709, Palm Beach, Fla. 33480.
2. State of incorporation: Delaware.
3. If an amendment give date of statement amended: None.

4. Name of company: Pennzoil Co.
5. IRS or SS identifying number of reporting person: xxx-xx-xxxx
6. Relationships of reporting person to company: Director.
7. Date of last previous statement: Feb. 11, 1974.

STATEMENT FOR CALENDAR MONTH—DECEMBER 1973 AND JANUARY AND FEBRUARY 1974; DATE OF LAST PREVIOUS STATEMENT, FEB. 11, 1974; RECEIVED AT SEC. MAR. 5, 1974

Title of securities	Date of transaction	Amount of securities acquired or disposed of	Nature of ownership of securities acquired or disposed of	Character of transaction reported	Purchase or sale price per share or other unit	Amount owned at end of month	Nature of ownership of securities owned at end of month
Common stock						44,387	Direct.
Do.						4,480	Indirect. ¹
Do.						35,000	Do. ²
Do.						485,000	Do. ³
Do.						699	Do. ⁴
Do.						5,440	Do. ⁵
5½ percent convertible subordinated debentures (per annum).						\$11,000	Do. ³
Do.						\$5,000	Do. ⁴
Common stock	Dec. 21, 1973	12,800	Indirect	Open market	26.00		
Do.	do	2,500	do	do	24.75		
Do.	do	7,500	do	do	25.00		
Do.	Dec. 24, 1973	500	do	do	26.00	383,300	Do.
Do.	Jan. 3, 1974	400	do	do	27.75		
Do.	do	3,100	do	do	28.00		
Do.	Jan. 4, 1974	4,700	do	do	27.625		
Do.	do	100	do	do	27.75		
Do.	do	1,200	do	do	27.875		
Do.	do	3,100	do	do	28.00		
Do.	do	1,100	do	do	28.125		
Do.	do	12,000	do	do	28.25		
Do.	do	2,000	do	do	28.375		
Do.	Jan. 7, 1974	2,300	do	do	28.00		
Do.	do	3,500	do	do	28.125		
Do.	do	1,300	do	do	28.25		
Do.	Jan. 8, 1974	100	do	do	28.25		
Do.	do	400	do	do	28.75		
Do.	do	13,200	do	do	28.875		
Do.	do	4,700	do	do	29.00		
Do.	do	2,000	do	do	29.125		
Do.	do	5,500	do	do	29.25		
Do.	Jan. 9, 1974	1,000	do	do	26.75		
Do.	do	1,000	do	do	27.00		
Do.	do	5,000	do	do	27.50		
Do.	do	900	do	do	27.875		
Do.	do	2,000	do	do	28.00		
Do.	do	9,700	do	do	28.50		
Do.	do	1,800	do	do	28.125		
Do.	do	500	do	do	28.25		
Do.	do	5,000	do	do	28.625		
Do.	Jan. 10, 1974	500	do	do	25.25		
Do.	do	500	do	do	25.50		
Do.	do	400	do	do	25.625		
Do.	do	600	do	do	25.75		
Do.	do	500	do	do	25.875		
Do.	do	2,000	do	do	26.00	475,400	Do.
Do.	Feb. 4, 1974	500	do	do	24.50		
Do.	do	1,500	do	do	24.75		
Do.	do	1,600	do	do	25.00		
Do.	do	400	do	do	24.75		
Do.	Feb. 11, 1974	500	do	do	24.25		
Do.	do	500	do	do	24.50		
Do.	Feb. 12, 1974	500	do	do	24.00		
Do.	Feb. 19, 1974	500	do	do	25.625		
Do.	do	1,200	do	do	25.75		
Do.	do	700	do	do	25.875		
Do.	do	700	do	do	26.00		
Do.	Feb. 20, 1974	1,000	do	do	26.00	485,000	Do.

¹ Shares owned by my wife, Dawn L. Coleman.² Shares owned by a trust of which I am trustee and my mother and 3 adult children are beneficiaries.³ Shares owned by Choctaw Corp., an investment company in which I own a 7.4 percent interest.⁴ Shares held in my wife's name as custodian for my 3 grandchildren under the Universal Gifts to Minors Act.⁵ Shares owned by my mother, Mrs. Jessie E. Coleman, who is now residing in my household.

SILVER SACERDOTAL JUBILEE HONORING VERY REVEREND THEODORE J. SEGINKAK, O.S.B., OF YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 19, 1974, I had the pleasure of attending the Silver Sacerdotal Jubilee honoring the Very Reverend Theodore J. Seginak, O.S.B., on the 25th anniversary of his ordination to the holy priesthood. Father Seginak is pastor of St. John's Roman Catholic Church of the Byzantine Rite in Youngstown, Ohio.

As a Benedictine, Father Seginak enjoys the privilege of serving in both the Latin Rite and the Byzantine Rite, and is not under the jurisdiction of any bishop except the Holy Father in Rome. During his many years as a priest and missionary, he has helped many people find spiritual fulfillment. The name "Theo-

dore" means "gift from God," and the name "Seginak" means "poor guy." So, Father Seginak is a poor guy who is a gift from God. He has brought the love and peace of God to everyone with whom he has come in contact.

It is indeed a privilege for me to extend my sincere congratulations and best wishes to this good and decent man. We are most fortunate to have him as a member of our community.

Mr. Speaker, I insert excerpts from Father Seginak's silver jubilee program in the RECORD at this time:

SILVER SACERDOTAL JUBILEE HONORING VERY REVEREND THEODORE J. SEGINKAK, O.S.B., ON HIS 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ORDINATION TO THE HOLY PRIESTHOOD, 1949-74, SUNDAY, MAY 19, 1974, MAHONING COUNTRY CLUB, GIRARD, OHIO

LITURGICAL PROGRAM—DIVINE LITURGY OF THANKSGIVING

Celebrant

Very Reverend Theodore Seginak, O.S.B.

Coc celebrants

Rev. Monsignor Michael Hrebin, V.F.

Rev. Monsignor Sylvester Hladky, V.F.

Very Reverend Method A. Royko, O.S.B.

VERY REVEREND THEODORE SEGINKAK, O.S.B.

"You have not chosen me but I have chosen you." These are the words of our Divine Savior, and so it was, God who possesses divine wisdom beyond human comprehension, chose the Very Rev. Theodore Joseph Seginak, O.S.B. to follow him, first as a Benedictine Monk at St. Procopius Monastery, Lisle, Illinois. This Monastery was chosen of all the Benedictine Monasteries by Pope Pius XI to work for Church Unity—to promote in a most positive way an understanding between the Byzantine Rite and the Latin Rite. Father Seginak had the privilege of studying at the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C.

By the grace and goodness of God, the Very Rev. Theodore J. Seginak, O.S.B. was ordained to the holy priesthood on May 8, 1949 at St. Mary's Church in Whiting, Indiana, by the Most Rev. Bishop Daniel Evancho, D.D. together with Rev. Msgr. Michael Hrebin and the late Very Reverend Paul Vasko.

The first assignments given to the newly ordained was to conduct Holy Missions throughout the United States and helping in different Catholic parishes of the Byzantine and Latin Rite—he helped in any last minute emergencies.

Theodore Joseph Seginak was born in Gary, Indiana on March 5, 1921, son of the late John Seginak and Martha Seginak, (nee

Martha Gersak). Father Seginak's mother, sister Suzanne and brother Emil of Silver Spring, Maryland, sisters Marie and Martha at Camp Hill, Pennsylvania and Bethesda, Maryland respectively. Brothers John of Washington, D.C. and Stephen of West Point, New York.

As an infant, Father Seginak and his family moved to Nesquehoning, Pa., the Switzerland of Pa., nestled between two mountains. His hometown was next to Lansford, Pa., the home of the famous Dorsey brothers. It was in this conducive atmosphere and environment that Father Seginak began to think in terms of a higher state of life to be a priest and a missionary, being close to God and nature as he climbed the mountains and passed through the beautiful forests. He attended the Sacred Heart Parochial School and belonged to St. Mary's Church.

During his early years in the Holy Priesthood, Father Seginak was Assistant at St. Michael's Cathedral in Passaic, N.J. His last assignment before being appointed Superior of the Benedictine Fathers at Holy Trinity Monastery, was at St. Nicholas Church, McKeesport, Pa., in 1953. In 1955 the Monastery received its right of autonomy, granting the community members to hold an election for their first Major Superior with Jurisdiction comparable to that of a Bishop. On September 7, 1955, the Very Rev. Theodore J. Seginak, O.S.B. was elected the first Major Superior. Prior to this the Benedictine Community had two appointed Priors—the first was Father Claude Viktora, O.S.B. of the Latin Rite and then Father Method A. Royko, O.S.B. of the Byzantine Rite.

In Catholic Church history, the Benedictine Monks played an important part in the conversion of most of Europe. History refers to their work as the "Benedictine Centuries." Many of the Popes were Benedictines and many Benedictines were Canonized Saints. The Pope issued an Encyclical Letter pertaining to St. Benedict—Father of Europe. The Benedictine Fathers have the special privilege of giving a special blessing to the sick with either the Relic of the True Cross or with the famous Benedictine Medal.

As a Benedictine, Father Seginak enjoys the privilege of Bi-Ritualism—to serve in the Latin Rite as well as the Byzantine Rite. He is under the Jurisdiction of the Holy Father as an exempt religious—not under the Jurisdiction of a Bishop. He could be "loaned out" to work for any Catholic Bishop in the United States with permission of his rightful Superior.

Father Seginak studied at St. Procopius Monastery, Lisle, Illinois (now Illinois Benedictine). During the summer months, he studied at the Catholic University of America in Washington, D. C. and was invited to many universities and abbeys to celebrate mass in the Byzantine Rite. Among them were the following: St. Vincent's Arch Abbey, Latrobe, Pa. (1st Benedictine Monastery in the United States). The Holy Name Cathedral in Chicago, Illinois and Notre Dame University in Indiana and many other places throughout the United States and Europe.

Father Seginak had the great privilege and honor during his tenure of office as a Major Superior to meet with the following Holy Fathers: Pius XII, Pope John and Pope Paul. He attended the congresses which were attended by all Benedictine Superiors throughout the whole world. They all meet at San Anselmo in Rome every two years for the last 20 years.

Father Seginak initiated the summer camp for boys at the Holy Trinity Monastery in Butler, Pa., and continues to operate a boys camp here at St. John's Parish for boys (7-15) in Ohio and Pa. Recently Father Seginak has been elected Senior Consultant and has

been appointed to act in the capacity of Public Relations for Holy Trinity Monastery. During his 19 years as a superior of Holy Trinity he was very active and instrumental in the role of Public Relations, that is in making friends and contacts for the monastery.

Father Seginak enjoys being with people of all ages—the market place or hospitals—they love and enjoy his gift from God, his play on words. He makes a sentence out of his own name. Seginak means the poor guy, Theodore means gift from God—so the poor guy is a gift from God. With his God-given gift, he puts joy into the hearts of the downtrodden. He is a real humanitarian and has been asked many times by many people, especially doctors and nurses to write a book on humor.

Our sincerest congratulations are expressed on behalf of the spiritual family of St. John's Parish, family and friends on this joyous and spiritually beautiful occasion of 25 years of faithful service in the Holy Priesthood. May God grant Father Seginak many more spiritually fruitful and happy years!

BANQUET PROGRAM

Invocation, Rev. John Pohorlak.

DINNER

Master of Ceremonies, Mr. Peter Prokop.

Liberty High School Girl's Ensemble.

Remarks, Mrs. Roberta Bundy.

Remarks, Mr. Eric Anderson.

Remarks, Mr. Stephen Shirlilla.

Remarks, Mr. Bob Hope.

Remarks, Mr. Dan Casanta.

Remarks, Dr. Michael Kulick.

Remarks, Congressman Charles J. Carney.

Remarks, Rev. Monsignor Michael Hrebin, V.F.

Remarks, Rev. Monsignor Sylvester Hladky, V.F.

Address, Very Rev. Method A. Royko, O.S.B., Superior of Holy Trinity Monastery.

Response, Very Rev. Theodore J. Seginak, O.S.B., Jubliarian.

Benediction, Rev. George Petro.

Music by—Olympians.

"God Grant You Many Happy Years!"

OBJECTS TO "LYNCH MOB HYSTERIA"

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, most Members, I believe, would agree that we work in a somewhat artificial atmosphere here in Washington and that it is healthy to heed the observations and commentary from leading citizens at the grass roots level.

One of Illinois' most distinguished public servants is Carl L. Klein, former assistant secretary of interior in Illinois and a former Illinois State legislator who is now practicing law in Oak Lawn, Ill. His letter to the editor, carried in the Sunday, May 19 issue of the Star-Tribune publications discusses the impeachment issue.

The article follows:

OBJECTS TO "LYNCH MOB HYSTERIA"

(By Carl L. Klein)

The impeachment of the President or other officer is based on the Constitutional provision in Article II Section 4 as follows:

"The President . . . shall be removed from office on Impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors."

This statement thus imports an action of at least quasi-criminal nature. The document known as a Bill of Impeachment is therefore akin to a bill of indictment by a grand jury. The action cannot be governed only by these few words. A trial, any trial, even an impeachment trial, must be protected by all the safeguards that the American system of Jurisprudence provides.

The Fifth amendment provides for protection against self-incrimination and the Supreme court has set forth standards as to confessions and admissions in a number of significant cases so that you and I are protected in the event of a potential arrest. It also provides for protection against deprivation of life, liberty or property without due process of law.

The subpoenas issued by the House Judicial committee (like unto a grand jury subpoena) asks the potential accused to furnish the evidence against himself—and to give all the details of his defense before there is even an indictment. Such an action directed against any lesser citizen would result in a dismissal of the charge.

The Sixth amendment to the Constitution provides that all citizens have the right to a trial by an impartial jury. You and I have seen the quotations of many congressmen and senators who have already indicated their stand on one side or the other. It is obvious that there will be no impartial jury in this matter.

John Doar, the committee counsel, has said that there are only allegations to date; Nicholas Von Hoffman has written "One senses the decision has been made and that some time in the next year or so, if not sooner, Nixon will be impeached (and) convicted . . . We're going to do it although nobody will quite know why."

It is a time for soul-searching. Have we proceeded and are we proceeding within not only the total framework of the Constitution but also within the terms of American jurisprudence and fair play? Are we threatening the very foundations of our constitutional forms of government by using popular opinion polls for our guidelines?

And to those who call for resignation, ours is a Constitutional government with set terms. I object to the attempts to turn our Constitutional form of government into a form of plebiscitary or parliamentary government instead. Are we to allow our elected officials to serve at the whim of public opinion polls? Will any President after 1976 be able to survive a bad press or a bad guess?

The stakes in our future are tremendous; the actions taken cannot be hasty or ill-advised; there must be impartial factfinding and decision, full consideration of all consequences on our economy and our foreign relations.

There must not be any lynch mob hysteria, which seemed to me to pervade Washington during my last visit; there must not be actions of vengeance based on personal, political or philosophical differences. There must not be actions for advancement by politically-ambitious men.

Finally, it is my opinion that the tapes are not proper evidence, having been secured directly or indirectly from the accused; that only the testimony of third parties should be considered in the impeachment proceedings; and, that the excessive preoccupation with the stupid acts of a few men with whom I had disagreed in the past, is not of sufficient important nature to justify impeachment proceedings which may rock our entire Constitutional structure, processes and freedom.

THE CENSUS BUREAU'S NEGLECT OF THE SPANISH SPEAKING

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, in order to insure that minorities are afforded the opportunity to equally and fully participate in all aspects of American life and to share whatever benefits may be available on an equal basis with other citizens, it is imperative that we have complete and accurate data on the status of minority communities. Precise and current information is essential if we are to take meaningful action to cope with problems of poverty, poor education and housing, disease, unemployment, and deprivation. It is particularly incumbent upon the Federal Government to take an active and affirmative role in identifying the urgent and special needs of the Nation's minorities, such as those facing the approximately 15 million Spanish-speaking citizens.

During much of the time I have been in the House I have devoted considerable effort in attempting to secure accurate and up-to-date data on those factors which have a direct bearing on the status and progress of the Spanish-speaking community. Unfortunately I have not been able to rely on most of the material furnished by the Bureau of the Census because its data is neither realistic nor accurate and I have long maintained that the Bureau seriously undercounted Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, Cubans, and other Spanish-speaking people in this country.

This situation is particularly tragic as a great importance is given to census data—especially in apportioning governmental assistance at all levels—and Census Bureau statistics serve as the benchmark for some 10 years in certain instances. Because of the serious shortcomings in the manner in which the Census Bureau information on the Spanish speaking was collected, cataloged, and reported, the Spanish-speaking community has been penalized because it has failed to receive the proportional share of assistance and programs to which it has been entitled.

Following the release of the 1970 enumeration and related data the Census Bureau blindly maintained that the Spanish speaking had not been undercounted, even in spite of proof to the contrary submitted by groups such as the National Puerto Rican Forum and the Mexican-American Population Commission of California. At long last, however, the claims that the Spanish speaking have not been properly reported have been supported by a comprehensive report issued by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. In this 112-page report—entitled "Counting the Forgotten"—the Commission declared that "... the Bureau's procedures have been insensitive to the Spanish-speaking background population"; that "... the Bureau's

efforts to enumerate persons of Spanish-speaking background ... were not well thought out and, as a result, were inadequate"; that "... the Bureau's severe underemployment of persons of Spanish-speaking background contributed to its inability to enumerate effectively persons of Spanish-speaking background and, finally "... that there is strong evidence that the Spanish-speaking background population was substantially undercounted."

Space prohibits the inclusion of the entire well-written and timely report in the RECORD. However, I believe it is important that we carefully review and consider the Commission's findings and recommendations and I insert them herewith for the RECORD. In view of this report I trust the Census Bureau will now move promptly and effectively to correct its past mistakes and take action to provide more definitive and precise information on Spanish-speaking Americans.

The findings and recommendations follow:

FINDINGS

1. Current and accurate demographic, social, and economic statistics on persons of Spanish speaking background are needed by Federal agencies, State and local governments, private organizations, and individuals for a variety of purposes including the protection of voting rights, the administration of Federal and other public social programs, and the assurance of equal employment opportunity.

2. The Bureau's attention to data collection relating to persons of Spanish speaking background has come late in its history.

a. Blacks have been enumerated since the first census in 1790.

b. Until the 1970 census, the Bureau used no uniform measure which would enable a nationwide estimate of the total population of persons of Spanish speaking background.

3. In 1970, the Bureau made five measures of the Spanish speaking background population.

a. Four of these, surname, language, birth or parentage, and heritage, while providing important data about that population, are correlated only indirectly with membership in that group.

b. The fifth measure, Spanish origin self-identification, is the preferred method but was asked only of 5 percent of the United States population.

4. In determining data collection techniques for the 1970 census, the Bureau did not pay sufficient attention to the methodology necessary to obtain an accurate count of persons of Spanish speaking background.

a. No effort was made to include persons of Spanish speaking background on advisory committees used in conjunction with the preparation of the 1970 census, and no advisory committee was convened to provide assistance on the count of Spanish speaking background persons.

b. Mailing lists for the 1970 census were drawn up from commercial mailing lists of such persons as property tax payers and, therefore, would be unlikely to have included all households of Spanish speaking background.

c. The Bureau made only a meager effort to hire bilingual enumerators; and, thus, there was an insufficient number used during the 1970 census.

d. The Bureau hired an insufficient number of bilingual community education specialists.

e. A sample bilingual or Spanish ques-

tionnaire was not mailed to individuals in all areas of high Spanish speaking concentration.

5. The census data on persons of Spanish origin were not released until almost 2 years after data on the total and the black population were released by the Bureau.

6. Press releases announcing the 1970 Spanish speaking background population totals were confusing, failing to make clear the Bureau's esoteric usage of such terms as "birth and parentage," "Spanish language," "Spanish heritage," and "Spanish origin."

7. Evidence that the data finally published undercounts the Spanish speaking background population comes from a variety of sources including independent studies, the Bureau's undercount of the black population, and informed opinions held by some demographers.

a. The Bureau of the Census, itself, has not made an estimate of the undercount of persons of Spanish speaking background, even in selected jurisdictions with high concentrations of members of that group.

b. The Bureau states that the necessary data for estimating the undercount, including vital statistics and immigration/emigration data, are unavailable; but it has not used its influence as the major Federal data collection agency to ensure that such data will be gathered in the future.

c. The Bureau has not made use of the myriad data available on a local basis for estimating the approximate size of the undercount.

8. Although the Bureau is beginning to take steps to make its procedures more sensitive to persons of Spanish-speaking background, its employment practices evidence an underutilization of persons of Spanish speaking background; and this impedes its efforts to ensure that its programs are attentive to the needs of this group.

a. The affirmative action plan of SESA—83 percent of SESA's employees work for the Bureau of the Census—totally disregards the President's Sixteen Point Program as it flagrantly disregards the Civil Service Commission's directive to include action items specifically applicable to that program.

b. SESA's affirmative action plan contains no goals and timetables for the remedy of this underutilization.

c. Despite encouragement from the Civil Service Commission, SESA has not made sufficient use of selective certification procedures in order to hire the bilingual staff necessary for communication with the minority community.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Bureau should familiarize itself with Federal, State, and local government and private needs for demographic, social, and economic statistics on persons of Spanish speaking background.

a. The Bureau should ensure that persons of Spanish speaking background are represented on all advisory committees.

b. The Bureau should establish an advisory committee composed of representatives of a wide variety of Spanish speaking organizations with an interest in using census data.

c. The Bureau should request the assistance of OMB in obtaining information about the need for Spanish speaking background statistics.

2. The Bureau should take steps to ensure that all aspects of its program, including questionnaire design and data collection, tabulation, and publication, are responsive to the needs of the Spanish speaking background population.

3. The Bureau should include the "Spanish origin" question on all questionnaires in the 1980 census.

a. The question should be asked for each member of the household.

b. Separate identification should be made of Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Central and South Americans, and other persons of Spanish speaking background.

c. The Bureau should continue to collect data on birth or parentage, surname, and language as characteristics of this population group.

4. The Bureau of the Census should conduct a study to determine the best procedures to ensure total coverage of the Spanish speaking background population in the 1980 census.

a. It should review its procedures for obtaining lists of addresses and use conventional enumeration, if necessary, to ensure coverage of housing units which may not have been listed on address registers.

b. The Bureau should make a special effort to hire bilingual enumerators for the 1980 census and use them for followup and for door-to-door enumeration in areas in which address lists are not complete.

c. The Bureau should increase its community education program for the 1980 census, ensuring that the program reaches every city of 10,000 or more persons, 5 percent or more of whom are of Spanish speaking background.

d. In addition to the English questionnaire, a bilingual or Spanish questionnaire should automatically be forwarded to every household in census tracts in which 5 percent or more of the population is of Spanish speaking background.

e. The Bureau should conduct a field study in cities such as Bridgeport, Connecticut, and San Antonio, Texas, to perfect its techniques for reaching the Spanish speaking background population.

5. Data on persons of Spanish speaking background collected in the 1980 census should be released simultaneously with the population totals by race.

6. All releases of Spanish origin data should specifically identify what the data are and how they may appropriately be used, clarifying such terms as "birth or parentage," "Spanish language," "heritage," and "origin."

7. The Bureau immediately should begin to develop techniques for measuring a census undercount of persons of Spanish speaking background.

a. It should make known its needs for independent data on Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, Cubans, and other persons of Spanish speaking background to the Office of Management and Budget; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and other Federal agencies with statistical responsibilities.

b. It should attempt to estimate the undercount in the 1970 census in selected cities.

8. The Bureau should increase significantly its employment of persons of Spanish speaking background in each of its units of operation.

a. It should conduct an analysis of the underrepresentation of persons of Spanish background in each of its units of operation.

b. It should revise the SESA affirmative action plan to include meaningful action items to increase the employment of persons of Spanish speaking background.

c. It should set goals and timetables for increasing its employment of persons of Spanish speaking background with special attention given to policymaking positions.

d. The Bureau should hire bilingual staff for positions which require communication with the Spanish speaking community.

THE HARD ROAD TO WORLD ORDER—SECOND SECTION

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith the second section of Professor Gardner's article in the April issue of *Foreign Affairs*, entitled "The Hard Road to World Order." In this section, Professor Gardner describes 10 areas where international "institution-building" is now going on.

The information follows:

THE HARD ROAD TO WORLD ORDER—SECOND SECTION

The hopeful aspect of the present situation is that even as nations resist appeals for "world government" and "the surrender of sovereignty," technological, economic and political interests are forcing them to establish more and more far-reaching arrangements to manage their mutual interdependence. It is instructive to ponder the institutional implications of the negotiations to which nations were already committed before the "energy crisis" preempted international attention in the fall of 1973. Although some of these tasks of institution-building may be complicated or postponed by the energy problem, all are now continuing fixtures on the diplomatic agenda:

1. The non-Communist nations are embarked on a long-term negotiation for the reform of the *international monetary system*, aimed at developing a new system of reserves and settlements to replace the dollar standard and at improving the balance-of-payments adjustment process. The accomplishment of these objectives would almost surely require a revitalization of the International Monetary Fund, which would have unprecedented powers to create new international reserves and to influence national decisions on exchange rates and on domestic monetary and fiscal policies. Such a strengthened IMF might be given power to back its decision by meaningful multilateral sanctions, such as uniform surcharges on the exports of uncooperative surplus countries and the withholding of multilateral and bilateral credits and reserve facilities from recalcitrant deficit countries.

2. Roughly the same wide group of nations is launched on a parallel effort to rewrite the ground rules for the conduct of *international trade*. Among other things, we will be seeking new rules in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to cover a whole range of hitherto unregulated nontariff barriers. These will subject countries to an unprecedented degree of international surveillance over up to now sacrosanct "domestic" policies, such as farm price supports, subsidies, and government procurement practices that have transnational effects. New standards are also envisaged to regulate protectionist measures to cope with "market disruption" from imports. To make these new rules of the game meaningful, GATT arrangements for consultation, conciliation and enforcement of its decisions will have to be greatly improved. Moreover, as will be discussed, the energy and food crises have stimulated a new concern about access to raw materials and a clear need for new ground rules on export controls.

3. The trend in recent years has been toward a steady increase in the resources of the *multilateral development and technical assistance* agencies, in contrast to static or declining bilateral efforts. This should enhance the authority of the World Bank, the regional development banks and the U.N.

Development Program over the economic policies of rich and poor nations. By the end of this decade, a portion of aid funds may be channeled to international agencies from sources independent of national decision-making—many have proposed some form of "link" between monetary reserve creation and development aid and some arrangement for the payment to international agencies of fees from the exploitation of seabed mineral resources.

4. The next few years should see a continued strengthening of the new globe and regional agencies charged with protecting the world's *environment*. In addition to comprehensive monitoring of the earth's air, water and soil and of the effects of pollutants on human health, we can look forward to new procedures to implement the principle of State responsibility for national actions that have transnational environmental consequences, probably including some kind of "international environmental impact statement" procedure by which at least some nations agree to have certain kinds of environmental decisions reviewed by independent scientific authorities. At the same time, international agencies will be given broader powers to promulgate and revise standards limiting air and ocean pollution.

5. We are entering a wholly new phase of international concern and international action on the *population problem*, dramatized by the holding this year of the first World Popular Conference to take place at the political level. By the end of this decade, a majority of nations are likely to have explicit population policies, many of them designed to achieve zero population growth by a specific target date. These national policies and targets will be established and implemented in most cases with the help of international agencies. Under their auspices, several billions of dollars in national and international resources will be mobilized in fulfillment of a basic human rights objective already proclaimed by the United Nations in General Assembly Resolution 2542 (XXIV)—that every family in the world should be given "the knowledge and means necessary to determine freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children."

6. Belatedly, a World Food Conference has been scheduled to deal with the long-neglected problem of assuring sufficient *food supplies* for the world's rapidly growing population. As reserves of food and arable land dwindle under the impact of crop failures and disappointing fish harvests, there is mounting concern about "world food security." The Conference is likely to result in efforts to expand agricultural productivity, assure the maintenance of adequate food reserves, and food aid.

7. In the 1974 Law of the Sea Conference and beyond—in what may be several years of very difficult negotiations—there should eventually emerge a new international regime governing the *world's oceans*. New law is, all agree, urgently needed on such crucial matters as the territorial sea, passage through international straits, fisheries, the exploitation of the mineral resources of the seabed, the regulation of marine pollution, and the conduct of scientific research. To make these new rules of law meaningful, there will have to be tough provisions to assure compliance as well as to provide for the compulsory settlement of disputes. The regulatory responsibilities of the new oceans agency are likely to exceed those of any existing international organization.

8. As the INTELSAT conference has foreshadowed, and in accordance with responsibilities already lodged in principle in the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) and the United Nations, new rules and institutions will almost certainly be created to regulate emerging *communication technologies*, notably direct broadcasting from satellites. While providing some safe-

guards against the unwanted intrusion of foreign broadcasts, these arrangements will aim to maximize the potential for using satellite communications to promote trade and economic development as well as world culture and understanding. Ways will very likely be found to give the United Nations and other international agencies access to this new technology for both operational and informational purposes. The ITU and other agencies will probably be given new powers to allocate radio frequencies and satellite parking orbits among users.

All these are cases where negotiations are already underway or scheduled for the near future. In addition, one could add two other items that have already been, one might have said, negotiated to death over the years; nonetheless they are so absolutely critical that progress simply must be made—and nations must come to know this.

9. At some point in the years ahead the world will move beyond U.S.-Soviet agreement on strategic weapons, and NATO-Warsaw Pact agreement on some measure of force reduction, to a truly multilateral set of negotiations (comparable to the nonproliferation treaty) designed to limit conventional weapons. It seems inevitable that the United Nations and perhaps regional bodies will be given new responsibilities for the administration of these arms control and disarmament measures, including means of verification and enforcement.

10. And finally, despite the constitutional impasse over U.N. peacekeeping, there will in practice be increasing resort to U.N. forces to contain local conflicts. The arguments over authorization, financing and operational control will be resolved on a case-by-case basis where the interests of key countries converge, as they have already in the launching of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East. With the United States, the Soviet Union and China each behaving "more like a country and less like a cause," some principles for mutual noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries are likely to be worked out, either bilaterally or under U.N. auspices. A corollary of such agreements will be international peacekeeping arrangements to patrol borders, supervise elections and verify compliance with nonintervention norms.

Does this list read like a decalogue, more convincing as a statement of what nations ought to do in the pursuit of their enlightened self-interest than as a prediction of what they actually will do? Let the reader who has this impression go back over the ten items. Admittedly, there is not a one of these specialized negotiations that could not be wrecked and brought to nothing by the same forces of shortsighted nationalism that has crippled the central institutions of the United Nations. But is it not a totally hardheaded prediction that we shall see very substantial changes in the great majority of these areas by the end of the decade?

The reason is simple: for most, perhaps eventually all, of the subjects, failure is simply not an acceptable alternative to decisive coalitions of nations. Felt necessity is often not strong enough to commend assent to general principles with unpredictable applications; but it can lead to agreement on specific measures and regulations.

In short, the case-by-case approach can produce some remarkable concessions of "sovereignty" that could not be achieved on an across-the-board basis. The Soviet Union, China and the United States may be unable to agree on the general rules that should cover U.N. peacekeeping in all unspecified future contingencies, but they may well agree on a U.N. peacekeeping force to secure a permanent Middle East settlement that is otherwise satisfactory to them. The same three countries are unlikely to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice over all disputes to which

they might be parties, but they may very well agree upon effective third-party machinery for compulsory settlement of disputes on the specific subjects dealt with in a new Law of the Sea agreement—where they recognize compelling national interests in getting other nations as well as themselves to comply with the rules. Thus, while we will not see "world government" in the old-fashioned sense of a single all-embracing global authority, key elements of planetary planning and planetary management will come about on those very specific problems where the facts of interdependence force nations, in their enlightened self-interest, to abandon unilateral decision-making in favor of multilateral processes.

THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM AND THE NEED FOR REFORM

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, in August 1968, the Republican candidate for President told the American people:

Time is running out for the merchants of crime and corruption in American society. The wave of crime is not going to be the wave of the future in the United States of America. We shall reestablish freedom from fear in America.

In that same speech, Richard Nixon also assured us that the crime rate could be reduced dramatically by appointing a new Attorney General.

Today—6 years and five Attorneys General later—crime continues to threaten every section of this country, and no one can truly say that there is "freedom from fear in America."

But to blame the present administration for our inability to cope with America's crime problem makes no more sense than Mr. Nixon's attempt to single out a Democratic Attorney General and a Democratic administration.

The fact is that public officials at all levels of government—Democrats and Republicans alike—must share the failure of government to insure relative peace and security for its citizens.

And no amount of rhetoric, or counter-rhetoric, will reduce our disgraceful crime rate—a crime rate which is far higher than in many other industrialized countries of the world.

THE COST OF CRIME

The cost of crime to the people of our country is staggering. Crime costs our Nation between \$20 to \$25 billion every year, and some have estimated that those costs are even higher.

In my own State, the statistics tell an equally alarming story. Since 1968, the rate of violent crime has increased by over 50 percent in Utah. And more than 2 out of 100 Utah citizens were victims of some type of crime in 1972.

In Salt Lake and Tooele Counties, serious felonies such as homicide, rape, aggravated assault, burglar, and robbery increased 74 percent between 1967 and 1971—just 4 short years.

And according to a recent study sponsored by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, we know that these

frightening statistics do not even tell the entire story. For that study showed that most crimes are not even reported by the victim and thus never enter into the statistical picture. Actual crimes are generally two to three times as high as reported crimes in Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, and New York; while in Philadelphia it is five times higher.

Beyond the cold statistics, we know what crime means in human terms. Sundown often brings fear to our cities' streets; and once peaceful, rural areas are now beginning to experience this fear. Crime means the failure of small businesses due to thefts and armed robberies. It means the breakdown of long-established neighborhoods. It means that many Americans avoid parks and recreation areas because they fear assaults and muggings. And most distressing of all, if you look behind the crime statistics, you will find that millions of Americans now fear and distrust their fellow citizens.

I have introduced legislation to aid and compensate the victims of crime, and I have sponsored and voted for legislation to compensate the dependents of policemen and firemen killed or disabled in the line of duty. But as important as this legislation is, it only deals with the symptoms of the problem and not the problem itself.

DRUGS AND ORGANIZED CRIME

There is much to be done if we are to succeed in reducing our spiraling crime rate. To begin with, we must continue to strengthen our efforts to stop the traffic in heroin and other dangerous drugs on our streets.

The number of crimes committed by heroin addicts in search of money to support their deadly habit is incredible. According to recent studies, the best estimates indicate that in urban areas about 35 percent of persons arrested for property crimes are narcotics users.

The drug traffic in this country could not exist without the active support and financing of organized crime. But the impact of organized crime on our society extends far beyond the traffic in narcotics.

If we are to eliminate organized crime—and the violence and corruption it breeds—Federal law enforcement authorities must play a central role.

In 1971, the Federal Government was spending approximately \$68 million on investigations and prosecutions of organized crime cases. That figure has now risen. In its 1971 report, the National Urban Coalition recommended an increase in outlays for Federal activities against organized crime to \$125 million in 1976. But that figure should be even higher today if the Federal Government is to cope with this major aspect of the crime problem.

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT

While the Federal Government is uniquely suited to lead the attack against narcotics pushers and organized crime, it would be a serious mistake to assume that reducing our crime rate is primarily the responsibility of the Federal Government.

We must recognize that most of the crime plaguing this country falls within the jurisdiction of State and local gov-

ernments. Consequently, the primary responsibility for law enforcement and the maintenance of an effective criminal justice system rests with those State and local governments. That is the way it should be. Americans do not want a national police force, nor do they want a Federal responsibility for all law enforcement.

But it has been evident for some time now that our State and local governments need help in their effort to reduce crime. Many local police are inadequately trained and underpaid; State and local courts are increasingly unable to effectively and efficiently deal with their staggering backlog of criminal cases; and the corrections programs in most States have failed to rehabilitate offenders.

We know that more professional and better paid law enforcement personnel, an efficient and well-run judicial system, and corrections programs which rehabilitate offenders rather than teach crime are the keys to substantially reducing crime.

We also know that simply pouring money into one part of a criminal justice system while neglecting other parts of that system will, in the long run, prove ineffective in reducing crime.

The world's best police force will be hamstrung in reducing crime if there are interminable delays in bringing a defendant to trial; and a judicial system operating at maximum efficiency will be meaningless if those convicted in the courts are placed in prisons which produce only hardened criminals.

In 1973, the Utah State Law Enforcement Planning Agency (ULEPA) concluded that we can no longer afford "to plan and fund token projects that affect only part of the criminal justice system."

But Utah—and almost every other State—cannot accomplish comprehensive reform of an entire criminal justice system alone. Our States and local governments, faced with a variety of difficult problems, need substantial financial assistance to achieve this reform, and the Federal Government can provide such assistance.

Passage of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 recognized this principle of Federal help. But under that legislation, funds have been distributed on a piecemeal basis; and there has been a notable failure to encourage the type of comprehensive reform of a State's criminal justice system which proponents of this legislation anticipate.

That is why I believe the Federal Government can make its most significant contribution to the fight against crime by encouraging and financing this type of vital reform.

THE MODEL CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM ACT

And that is why on April 10, 1974, I introduced legislation known as the "Model Criminal Justice System Act" to accomplish this goal.

This legislation reflects the consensus of many experts that we need a bold new program of Federal financial assistance to combat crime—a program which offers substantial assistance as an incen-

tive for comprehensive reform of a State's entire criminal justice system.

My legislation is designed to establish model and experimental programs in several States. It establishes flexible standards for reform of each part of a State's criminal justice system. States interested in participating under this program will, with Federal financial assistance, develop and submit plans designed to meet the standards contained in the bill. And those States whose plans are selected can immediately begin to implement their plans.

This measure contains a comprehensive program for reform with emphasis on law enforcement, the criminal courts, and corrections. For those States, selected under this program, the Federal Government will pay 75 percent of the costs of implementing some reforms and 90 percent of the cost of implementing others.

The most crucial parts of this measure are the standards it establishes for measuring the acceptability of a State's plan for reform. These standards are derived from the recommendations of various commissions and other groups which have carefully examined the problem of crime in America, such as the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and various State crime commissions and planning agencies. For example, many of the recommendations of the Utah State Law Enforcement Planning Agency's most recent State plan are embodied in these standards.

LAW ENFORCEMENT REFORMS

The standards on law enforcement are generally designed to improve the recruitment and training of law enforcement officers, and to ensure that these officers—most of whom are now badly underpaid—are fairly compensated for their difficult and demanding work.

While salaries of the Nation's police have increased since 1967, they are still inadequate. That is why an important standard in this bill would require increases in compensation which are appropriate for a professional, in accordance with the size of the community for law enforcement personnel and the cost of living in that community.

Because of their present inadequate level of pay, many policemen in Utah and throughout the country are forced to "moonlight" with other jobs in order to support their families. If we want full-time professional, and well-trained policemen who can concentrate on their law enforcement duties, we must pay a decent wage for such demanding work.

COURT SYSTEM REFORMS

The second broad category of standards under this bill is aimed at improving the fairness and efficiency of the criminal court system. To accomplish the expeditious disposition of criminal cases in those States participating under this program, the bill requires that a State and its localities take whatever steps necessary—such as increasing the number of judges and court personnel and appointing professional court administrators—to ensure that the trial of all criminal cases will be commenced no later than 60

days from the date of a defendant's arrest or the initiation of a prosecution.

Chief Justice Burger, recognizing the link between increasing crime and court delays, has also recommended a 60-day limit for the commencement of all criminal trials. When asked whether delay has been a major factor underlying the rise of crime over the last decade, the Chief Justice responded:

I cannot think of any judicial factor more important than delay and uncertainty. It's always difficult to assign priorities in this sort of thing, but I know of none I can think of more important than the absence of the sure knowledge that a criminal act will be followed by a speedy trial and punishment.

And that's why I have said that if we could have every criminal trial ready to be presented within 60 days after the arrest or the charge, I think you'd see a very, very sharp drop in the crime rate. It would surely put an end to the large number of crimes committed by men out on bail waiting six months to 18 months to be brought to trial.

CORRECTIONS SYSTEM REFORMS

Finally, the legislation I have introduced calls for basic reforms in the area of corrections. Almost all authorities agree that the weakest link in the criminal justice system is what passes for a program of corrections in most States. There are a variety of reforms which are needed. To begin with, most corrections programs do not have the capacity for dealing flexibly with a broad rank of offenders. We can no longer tolerate a corrections system that allows petty offenders and juveniles to live and learn with hardened criminals.

For the incorrigible offender who poses a clear danger to society, maximum security prisons are necessary. But it makes no sense to build an entire prison system designed to serve only the most hardened criminals and thereby forcing other classes of inmates to adapt to such an institution.

The importance of properly classifying offenders was underlined by the disturbing finding of the President's Crime Commission "that approximately one-fourth of the 400,000 children detained in 1965—for a variety of causes but including truancy, smoking, and running away from home—were held in adult jails and lockups, often with hardened criminals."

Utah, like other States, lacks proper facilities for dealing with juvenile offenders. According to the ULEPA report:

Adequate juvenile detention facilities are inaccessible on a statewide geographical basis. There are only six approved detention facilities in the State. The majority of counties in the State do not have adequate facilities, and children are often placed in jails. . . . The result is that children are placed in detention inappropriately.

As the President's Commission and others have emphasized, a variety of penal institutions and programs are required to meet the special needs of various types of offenders. In particular, the development of community-based correctional facilities—designed to avoid the use of far-removed and isolated institutions—is considered an extremely valuable rehabilitation tool.

In the final analysis, excellent law

enforcement and an efficient court system will do little to reduce the crime rate as long as the prevailing problems in the area of corrections remain unsolved. That is why a vital part of the bill I have introduced requires reforms designed to solve each of these problems faced by so many States.

CONCLUSION

These standards—and the other standards in the bill concerned with law enforcement and the criminal court system—are not novel ideas. They represent the consensus of the best thinking of those who have worked in and studied the system of criminal justice as it exists in this country today.

Indeed, it is depressing that 7 years after the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, so many of that Commission's recommendations have either been ignored or only partially implemented.

That Commission—and the commissions and studies that came before it—told us a very simple truth: Crime can be reduced, but only if we are willing to invest in excellent law enforcement, an efficient court system, and a flexible corrections program with the skilled people necessary to offer meaningful treatment and rehabilitation.

Unfortunately, it is very difficult to dramatize the importance of such reforms and to mobilize public opinion on this issue. When an Attica or some other prison riots, there is a temporary call for prison reform. But once the riot is over and forgotten, the demands for reform disappear.

We can no longer afford to ignore the relationship between a rising crime rate and an outmoded, inefficient criminal justice system.

We can no longer continue to act as if a rising crime rate is a fact of life for the years ahead.

Justice Felix Frankfurter reminded us some years ago:

There is no inevitability in history except as men make it.

With the type of comprehensive reform outlined in the bill I have introduced, I am convinced we can turn that crime rate around—and make our society a more decent and safe place for us and our children.

SYLVIA RAMIREZ HONORED BY LOS ANGELES TV STATION

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, Sylvia Ramirez, a resident of my congressional district, has long been active in community affairs. She has been successful in all of her civic endeavors, but her most outstanding achievement is the SEEK (Students for Educational Enrichment and Knowledge) program.

Ms. Ramirez founded the SEEK pro-

gram in 1970 in order to provide talented and gifted children with the opportunity to develop their intellectual abilities and academic potentials through courses not available to them in their regular school curriculums. The SEEK program began with 98 children, all of whom were from Montebello. In 4 years, the program has expanded to include approximately 800 children from the East Los Angeles College District and has become a component of community services at East Los Angeles College. Titled the "Talent Development Program," it consists of 10-week enrichment courses taught by college professors 1 day a week for one and a half hours.

Ms. Ramirez describes the "Talent Development Program" as "an evolutionary concept in progressive education for the illustrious child." She believes it will continue to be successful and will grow. It is her hope that the program will some day be used as a guiding model for every community college throughout the Nation.

Recently, Sylvia Ramirez' outstanding accomplishments in the SEEK program were recognized by the ABC-Channel 7 television show "Girl in My Life." Ms. Ramirez was selected to participate in the show, which recognizes exceptional women who have made significant contributions toward improving the lives of those around them, for her outstanding work, and consistent dedication to SEEK.

The "Girl in My Life" program honoring Ms. Ramirez was aired on Channel 7 on Tuesday, May 21. I would like to congratulate her on receiving this honor, and to thank her for all she has done for her community and for the field of education.

KAREN MORRISON OF ST. CHARLES NAMED MISS U.S.A.

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I congratulate today Miss U.S.A.—Karen Jean Morrison of the 13th Congressional District of Illinois. Miss Morrison was awarded the title of Miss U.S.A. May 18 during the 23d annual Miss U.S.A. Pageant at the new Niagara Falls International Convention Center, Niagara Falls, N.Y. Karen is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Rex Morrison of 71 North 12th Street, St. Charles, Ill.

Miss Morrison was selected Miss Illinois on April 14 in Decatur, Ill.—in competition with 58 other contestants—which allowed her the opportunity to compete for the title of Miss U.S.A. Karen has recently returned to St. Charles where she will spend a few weeks of relaxation with family and friends before departing to New York City where she will prepare for representing the United States in the Miss Universe Pageant on July 20 in Manila.

Mr. Speaker, the costume Miss Morrison wore during the nationally televised finals last Saturday night represented the American flag in honor of Dr.

Bernard Cigrand of Aurora, Ill., who organized the first Flag Day of observance in Chicago in 1895. This annual June 14 observance was later declared a national holiday by President Woodrow Wilson.

Miss U.S.A. is a lifelong resident of St. Charles, Ill. She attended Lincoln Elementary School, graduated from St. Charles High School in 1972, attended Wisconsin State University at Whitewater, Wis., and is presently attending Elgin Community College as a business administration major.

Mr. Speaker, I know how proud her parents—Mr. and Mrs. Rex Morrison—and her younger sister, Linda, a junior at St. Charles High School, must be. The people of the 13th Congressional District and the State of Illinois share that pride with the Morrison family.

THE RAINMAKERS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial that appeared in the Monday, May 27 issue of the Washington Post on the military use of weather modification. I concur with the Post's view that this country should take the lead in developing international institutions to control weather modification. Our colleague from Maryland (Mr. GUDE) and I have introduced legislation (H. Res. 329) to put the House on record as favoring an international agreement prohibiting research experimentation, or the use of weather modification activities as a weapon of war. The House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements is planning to hold hearings on this resolution within the next few weeks. The Post editorial follows: [From the Washington Post, May 27, 1974]

THE RAINMAKERS

The Defense Department has now admitted that from 1967 to 1972 the 7th Air Force conducted a top secret rainmaking program over North and South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. All told, 2,602 "cloud-seeding" sorties were flown from Thailand, using the publicly known technique of inducing or accelerating rainfall from dropping burning containers of silver or lead iodine on clouds. The objective was to slow the movement of enemy troops and supplies by drenching the roads, particularly the Ho Chi Minh Trail. The operation was stopped two days after The New York Times, on July 5, 1972, published an article about it.

The best guess—by Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Dennis J. Dooley—is that this \$21.6 million huffing and puffing in the air added perhaps two inches of rain to the normal monsoon rainfall. There is no way of telling what military effect this might have had. Nor can one predict the effect of this revelation on the reputation of Melvin R. Laird, who as Secretary of Defense denied in an open hearing that there was such an operation, and who now, as a private citizen, corrected his statement in a letter to Sen. J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.). But such speculations should not distract us from contemplating the horror or, at any rate,

the potential horror such operations might unleash.

The science and technology of "cloud-seeding" and other means of changing the weather are in their infancy. Their promise for good is obviously immense. Timely rains might make deserts bloom. But the potential of evil as an instrument of war is frightening. As a good many scientists have testified before Sen. Claiborne Pell's Subcommittee on Oceans and International Environment, we cannot permit man's erratic quarrels to endanger future generations and, indeed, the future of the earth. "We have only one atmosphere on this planet and it may be more deadly than Russian roulette to play with it before we know what we may produce," said one of the scientists, Gerner A. Baum, who represents this country on a United Nations panel on meteorological studies.

The trouble is that when we disturb the balance of nature, the line between good and evil soon disappears. As a hypothetical example, Mr. Baum cited hurricanes. It may eventually become possible for man to eliminate this nuisance and danger. But hurricanes also serve to transport large amounts of converted solar energy from tropical latitudes to polar latitudes. This transfer is essential if the earth is to have a reasonably stable climate, because the amount of energy the sun imparts in the tropics will always be greater than that it imparts in high latitudes. If the hurricanes are eliminated, there is no telling what nature might do to adjust or what would happen in the complex atmosphere-ocean system that now sustains life. It could be, said Mr. Baum, "a deadly gamble."

There are other gambles. They cannot be taken, as Gordon J. F. MacDonald of the Council on Environmental Quality has testified, without "proper and public research and management." As the Federation of Ameri-Scientists wrote President Nixon more than a year ago, when our rainmaking in Southeast Asia was only rumored, "the use of weather modification as a weapon of war is an opening wedge to the use of climate modification, the inducement of earthquakes, and other still more terrible methods. We see geophysical warfare as a 'Pandora's box' to which the seemingly inoffensive weather modification may be the disastrous key."

We therefore commend both Sen. Pell for insisting on public disclosure of this secret operation and Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger for coming clean. And we hope that as a logical next step this country will now take the lead in developing international controls over weather manipulation, much as we have taken the lead in banning biological warfare and nuclear testing in the atmosphere. There must be limitations on man's destructive capabilities.

DISASTER RELIEF ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues for their decision to pass the conference report on Disaster Relief Act Amendments, S. 3062. This legislation is greatly needed by those portions of Ohio which now need Federal assistance to help them rebuild in the wake of the severe tornado damage inflicted upon them in early April.

Of particular concern to me has been

the rebuilding of two excellent institutions of higher education: Wilberforce University and Central State University. These two predominantly black institutions are located in Wilberforce, Ohio, near the urban center of Dayton. Central State is a 4-year, public, coeducational university with more than 2,000 full-time students, while Wilberforce is a private, 4-year, coeducational university with more than 1,000 full-time students. Central State is located on a 60-acre campus with more than 40 buildings. Wilberforce is located on more than 100 acres with more than 15 buildings.

After contacting the presidents of both universities, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as well as a number of my distinguished colleagues in Congress, and others, I was able to make an early determination of both the extent of the damage and of the desirability of making certain changes in the existing Federal law relating to disaster assistance. I am very pleased that the Congress has passed what has now become Public Law 93-288.

As I have said to many of my colleagues, extending assistance to Central State, and now also to Wilberforce, is a wise and farsighted decision as well as educationally and humanitarianly justified in the short run. These institutions have played and will not continue to play an important role in the educational development of black students as well as of all the citizens of Ohio.

LOAN FOR SOVIET FERTILIZER PROJECT SMELLS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on May 21 William Casey, Chairman of the U.S. Export-Import Bank, announced that the Bank's Directors had authorized a \$180 million low-interest loan to help finance a fertilizer manufacturing complex in the Soviet Union. This decision can only be described as outrageous.

Farmers in my 17th Congressional District and throughout the Nation have suffered a serious fertilizer shortage this spring. Many fertilizer manufacturers placed their long-term customers on partial allocation. Some farmers even had their supplies cut off completely.

The fertilizer that has been available has sold at incredibly high prices. The price of ammonia, for example, a common nitrogen fertilizer, jumped from \$60 a ton last October to as high as \$120 a ton. It has been estimated that U.S. farmers may pay 40 percent more for fertilizer this year than they did in 1973.

High prices and shortages are by no means a short-term problem. Demand for fertilizer is continuing to run far ahead of production capacity.

Faced with this serious situation, what is the response of our Government? The U.S. taxpayer-subsidized Export-Import Bank makes a \$180 million loan to the Soviets for a fertilizer manufacturing

complex in the Soviet Union. This is ridiculous. If an agency of the U.S. Government is to subsidize any fertilizer plant, it should be right here in America, not the Soviet Union.

And can anyone believe the terms of this deal? The interest on the loan will be only 6 percent—about half the prime commercial lending rate in the United States. The American taxpayer who is subsidizing this loan has been taken to the cleaners again.

THE 200-MILE LIMIT

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue, the Patriot-Ledger of Quincy, Mass., ran a persuasive editorial regarding the proposed extension of our territorial waters to a 200-mile limit. This editorial states the options well, and points to the necessity for extended territorial waters if we are to protect our coastal resources from decimation at the hands of modern foreign fleets. Our precious offshore resources must be preserved from overfishing if we are to continue to utilize these most important and valuable waters. The editorial follows:

PROTECTING THE FISH

In the past, The Patriot Ledger has opposed efforts to unilaterally extend United States fisheries jurisdiction beyond the present 12-mile zone.

However, we believe in order to protect declining Northeast Atlantic fish stocks and promote orderly and regulated fishing consistent with conservation of this valuable marine resource, national action is now required.

We therefore support, with one reservation, the bills filed in the Congress by Sen. Warren G. Magnuson, D-Wash., (S. 1988) and Rep. Gerry E. Studds, D-Cohasset (H. 8665), the "Interim Fisheries Zone Extension and Management Act," which would extend U.S. fisheries jurisdiction to 200 miles offshore. But instead of having the 200-mile fishery zone apply to the whole U.S. coast, it should be limited to those areas where the problems are, in the Northeast and Northwest.

At hearings on the Senate bill held last week in Boston before the Senate Commerce Committee, Massachusetts members of Congress, state officials and fishing interests stressed the points that protection of dwindling coastal fish stocks is urgent and imperative; that large, modern foreign fishing vessels are systematically depleting the most valuable food fish; that international agreements have been inadequate in conserving fish stocks and are inadequately and unevenly enforced; and that the best way of protecting valuable species from virtual extinction is by extending American jurisdiction to cover the prime fighting areas.

The State Department and other federal agencies have opposed such action, as has The Patriot Ledger, not because of lack of sympathy for New England fishermen, but because of broader international considerations.

Next month, in Caracas, Venezuela, the third international Law of the Sea Conference is scheduled to begin. This United Nations conference will deal with matters of extreme importance to nations of the world; the goal is to avoid impending anarchy over

uses of the ocean and its living and mineral resources.

Without such agreement, it is feared, the oceans could become a battleground for competing claims over their uses and their resources. As powerful nations in previous centuries laid claim to land territories in creating colonial empires, so the oceans could become prey to national claims, to the detriment of other nations.

The rational way out of this maritime encroachment is a global, accepted uniform limit to offshore national sovereignty with most of the oceans and their resources reserved as the common heritage of mankind under international management. This means coastal states would have to waive national claims to sovereignty over adjacent waters beyond a specified limit, as well as to underwater resources.

The U.S., like most maritime nations, has conflicting interests.

On the one hand, there are the marine resources, including fish, offshore oil and gas, and deep-sea minerals, as well as national security considerations, which tempt nations to extend their offshore jurisdictions.

On the other hand, there is a matter of freedom of navigation and of marine scientific research. Shipping and naval considerations call for the narrowest possible territorial seas, and for insistence upon freedom of navigation through international straits and waterways.

The basic United States position, therefore, at the Law of the Sea Conference includes a maximum breadth of 12 miles for the territorial sea (which would be an extension of the present three-mile U.S. territorial sea under the old "Cannon Shot Rule" of 1737); free transit through and over straits used for international navigation; international standards and controls to protect the marine environment from pollution; an agreement on freedom of marine scientific research; and reservation of deep seabed resources to an international authority which would manage and regulate exploration and exploitation.

By and large, the U.S. position is admirably idealistic and self-denying, for the U.S. has the technological prowess to exploit deep-sea resources, and the military power to extend its coastal jurisdiction even beyond the continental shelf. But if every nation did so, there would be little of the oceans for international use, and the U.S. would be in trouble elsewhere in the world where it had maritime interests. So the United States has opposed unilateral claims by other nations to 200-mile territorial waters and/or exclusive economic rights, including fishing.

The U.S. government also has opposed efforts, such as the Studds-Magnuson bills, to extend our fishing jurisdiction to 200 miles. If this were done, the administration has argued it would jeopardize international efforts to restrain other coastal states' claims, would amount to recognition of existing 200-mile claims, and would tend to promote a universal 200-mile limit—which would give coastal states control over about 70 per cent of the world's total ocean territory and almost all maritime wealth.

Yet what in fact is happening is the development of an international consensus on a coastal state economic zone out to 200 miles, which may become about the same thing as a 200-mile zone. The U.S. draft treaty provides for exclusive coastal state jurisdiction over marine resources (excluding fisheries), tempered by international standards, within a "coastal seabed economic area." The extent of this area is to be thrashed out at the conference, but most coastal nations favor 200 miles.

Instead of a 200-mile fisheries zone, the U.S. has proposed a "species approach," and has begged New England to be patient while an international agreement to this effect is being worked out.

The species approach is based on the

premise that "coastal state rights should depend upon the biological characteristics, including migratory habits, of the different species of fish involved and should not be exercised in a zone of fixed mileage off the coast."

Under this approach, coastal stocks (such as cod, haddock, flounder) would be under the jurisdiction of the coastal state—this could be beyond a 200-mile limit!—and coastal states also would regulate and have preferential rights to anadromous fish (those which ascend rivers for breeding, such as salmon), throughout their migratory range. Tuna and other highly migratory oceanic species would be regulated by international organizations.

If a species approach were negotiated, New England could wind up with greater American control over its most valuable fish than under a 200-mile-limit. A species approach is no less "protectionist" than a preferential fishing zone.

But the hangups are, "if" and "when," as well as the more problematic matter of enforcement under a species approach. A territorial definition has the virtue of having a distinct cut-off line; a species approach does not. And under territorial regulation, it is possible to impose quotas and regulations on fishing operations for various species. Highly migratory fish, such as tuna, would be under international control in both the government position and the Magnuson-Studds bill.

Out of this, several points may be drawn:

1. There is an urgency to the Northeast fishing problem that must be promptly met. International agreements may take years to negotiate. The Magnuson-Studds legislation would meet that immediate need, but is not intended as a permanent claim. It would go out of existence when Law of the Sea provisions go into effect.

2. The 200-mile fishing jurisdiction would be no more protectionist in concept than the U.S. government's proposed species approach and would be simpler to enforce. Foreign fishermen in both cases would share in the catch.

3. While we favor a narrow territorial sea and a narrow zone of national economic jurisdiction beyond that, most coastal nations favor a 200-mile economic zone. If this is to be the norm for oil, gas and mineral exploitation, a 200-mile fisheries conservation zone is not incompatible and should not jeopardize international negotiations.

4. The international impact can be limited by emphasizing the U.S. action as necessary to conserve valuable species and by limiting the 200-mile jurisdiction to those areas in which overfishing is depleting important species.

Limiting the 200-mile zone to the most threatened fishing grounds off the Northeast and Northeast Coasts, perhaps above a certain latitude, would demonstrate American concern for conservation, rather than territorial expansion, and it would avoid potential jurisdictional problems with Cuba and Mexico. Canada should be invited to help work out problems of mutual interest.

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today May 28, American of Armenian descent celebrate a very important event—the 56th anniversary of their independence.

The courageous people of Armenia have spent more than 600 years in search of liberty, suffering under their oppres-

sors but never giving up hope that one day freedom would be theirs. And for 2 brief years, freedom for Armenia was a reality. It was, however, quickly ended when Russia and Turkey partitioned the fledgling Republic of Armenia.

The gallant Armenians are still committed to efforts to restore liberty to their country. Despite incalculable hardships, they have kept alive the hope that one day soon their brothers and sisters will be free once again.

On April 24, we marked a great tragedy in the history of this country—the death of 1 million Armenians who died in a massacre attempting to gain liberty, and the banishment of 500,000 Armenians who were driven from their homeland in an effort to rid the land of all those who strove for liberty.

May 28, however, should be a day on which we lift our heads once again and renew the bond that all men share who savor freedom. It should also be a day on which we reaffirm our commitment to all those people who struggle under the domination of others.

May the time not be too far in the future when we can celebrate a lasting independence for Armenia and the achievement of freedom for all those who have never given up hope for a brighter future.

COMMUNITY ACTION: A RECORD OF SERVICE TO THE ATLANTA AREA

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as the House considers the Community Services Act, I would like to acquaint Members with the outstanding record of service to the Atlanta area by Economic Opportunity Atlanta, EOA, a community action agency in my district.

EOA directly employs 430 people, but more importantly, it reaches many thousands of people.

The agency is very much oriented to participation by poor people in decisions which affect their communities. Last year, 33,000 residents of such communities voted in the EOA neighborhood elections. It is generally acknowledged that the turnout of poor voters led to passage of the referendum to build the Atlanta area's new mass transportation system—MARTA, a \$1.4 billion project which benefits all of the people, rich and poor, in the area.

At the heart of the EOA program is its system of neighborhood service centers. Some 20,000 people utilized the centers last year—people with serious problems thus receiving immediate attention in their own communities.

EOA also coordinates numerous programs, in cooperation with many other agencies. Some of these are:

Job training and placement benefiting 4,000 people last year.

Head Start, which is serving 800 youngsters at any given time.

Rodent control which has resulted in

a substantial decline in the incidence of rat bites.

Atlanta's super summer, which last year provided 13,000 jobs for young people in the public and private sectors, served lunch to 12,000 youngsters, and involved 100,000 kids in recreational programs.

The revised manpower and job program. EOA is working with the city of Atlanta to make sure that disadvantaged people get their fair share of the training and placement assistance.

Health services, such as extending the services of Grady Memorial Hospital into neighborhoods and helping to arrange for resources for volunteer health clinics. The highly regarded South Side Comprehensive Health Service Center in Atlanta is a spinoff program from EOA.

These are examples of the constructive changes and services made possible by programs in which EOA is involved. In my judgment, the agency's budget of \$2.9 billion is a wise and prudent investment.

Equal Opportunity Atlanta, and the Office of Economic Opportunity at the Federal level, certainly deserve significant credit for helping to reduce the rate of poverty in the Atlanta area. In the decade of the 1960's, the rate of the decline of poverty in metropolitan Atlanta was three times greater than in the average urban community in the Nation. The rate of poverty in the area, now estimated at 12 to 13 percent of the population, is now below the national average.

These kinds of results, Mr. Speaker, are ample justification for continuing community action programs and extending services to the poor.

STEWART ALSOP

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sympathy that I rise to address this chamber on the passing of a great American and a truly great human being, Stewart Alsop.

Mr. Alsop's career as a man of words was distinguished by his ability to view and report on national and world affairs with wit and understanding, wisdom and sensitivity.

His work was never tainted by personal prejudice or his own beliefs regardless of the actions on which he was reporting. He was always concerned for the future of his country, which he loved so very deeply.

I wish to offer my personal sorrow and prayers to his family, and Mr. Speaker, ask that my colleagues pause for a moment in their hectic schedule to meditate on the accomplishments of this man.

I wish to enclose at this time the editorial printed yesterday in the Washington Post which sums up my feelings:

Stewart Alsop's execution by leukemia at the age of 60 could be delayed no longer, not even by doctors at the National Institutes of Health. Refusing a blindfold, he watched death's approach for more than two years. He reported its encroachment as he reported national and world affairs—with wit and wisdom, sensitivity and understanding. Contemporary letters offer no more courageous chronicle than one of the last things he wrote, his book "Stay of Execution, a sort of memoir." In it, he looked forward reluctantly to the end of his road and backward happily to landmarks along the way of a good life.

Mr. Alsop was an extraordinary journalist. No ideological tag quite fitted him. He was neither conservative nor radical in any conventional sense. His view of affairs was his own, unique and persuasive. His facility with words—the elegant phrase, the right literary quotation, the apt historical reference—was part of it, but not all of it. His special gift was a degree of common sense uncommon in the market place of political ideas. His articles for The Saturday Evening Post and, later, his columns for Newsweek won approval all across the ideological spectrum. Readers of conflicting persuasions sensed that he was a writer unencumbered by immutable prejudice, capable of looking the facts and the public men who acted upon them squarely in the eye. His opinions were fresh but not quirky, different but not for the sake of difference.

As scores of posthumous biographies of writers attest, it is usually better not to know too much about the private lives of authors one admires. The men behind the words too often prove to be neurotic, unpleasant or inordinately vain. Mr. Alsop was the ultimate exception to this rule. He was a gentleman not because he was the scion of a sturdy old Connecticut family, a graduate of Groton and Yale and possessor of a distinguished war record, but because he was truly a gentle man. He cherished his family and his friends and was cherished by them. He insisted upon regarding his own earlier life, especially his World War II service in the British and American armies, part of it behind enemy lines in German-occupied France, as something of a lark. His reaction to recent American history was far more serious.

In the last chapter of his book he wrote: At the beginning . . . I described that trapped and desperate feeling that came over me after I had been told that I would die quite soon. [Later], when I felt so sick, I felt rather sure that I would die quite soon, and perhaps very soon, within the next day or so. I did not at all welcome the prospect, but it filled me with no sense of panic . . . Why the difference?

Perhaps the state of the nation had something—a little something—to do with the difference. For weeks now I have been haunted and depressed by a sense that the American system, in which I have always believed in an unquestioning sort of way, the way a boy believes in his family, is really falling apart; by a sense that we are a failed nation, a failed people. And Watergate is surely a peculiarly depressing way to say farewell to our greatness. It is a whimper—a sleazy little whimper, a grubby little whimper—rather than a bang.

The thought has occurred to me quite often in recent weeks that this is a good time to bow out. No doubt it was the state of Alsop, far more than the state of the nation, that caused this thought to occur to me so often.

It was like Stewart Alsop to blame his dire forebodings on his own condition more than the country's. His tendency was optimistic, as indicated elsewhere on this page today by a fragment from an earlier book

about Washington, "The Center," which was written when the state of Alsop was sturdier. But he was always realistic and tough-minded and his worries about the state of the nation, as his recent columns showed, were constant, not reflections of the ups and downs of his health. He was concerned for the future of his children and for everybody else's children. He was concerned, in other words, for the future of his country—for he was profoundly a patriot, though not in the mindless, love-it-or-leave-it way that passes for patriotism. His love of country was in no way weakened by amusement at the way it worked, or impatience with its faults, or anguish over its failures. Stewart Alsop was a man who believed in facing up to things, including his own death. And so he died as he had lived—gallantly.

A LOOK AT THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL CITIES

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I want to share with my colleagues a letter I recently received from Dolph Frisius, city manager of Woodlake, Calif. Woodlake is a small city in my congressional district which, like many other small cities throughout the Nation, has experienced and continues to experience a number of problems. In his letter, Mr. Frisius discusses some of the major problem areas facing our small California towns. For example, he wrote:

Small cities have the same type of problems as the larger cities and less financial capacity to solve those problems. Why should these small cities once again be relegated to a position of second class citizenship? Why shouldn't the small cities of America be given at least the same benefits as the large cities?

Mr. Frisius has written an excellent letter in which he discusses the impact of inflation on small cities, the effects of frozen revenues due to State laws, the impact of increased costs due to State laws, grantsmanship, and the financial problems facing small cities.

I commend this letter to the attention of all Members of Congress:

CITY OF WOODLAKE,

Woodlake, Calif., April 30, 1974.

Congressman ROBERT MATHIAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MATHIAS: Thank you for meeting with Don Kemp, City Manager of Exeter, and myself recently. In the meeting, we discussed the financial problems of small cities, which are compounding because of a series of outside forces over which we have no control.

At the conclusion of our meeting, you requested an outline of these forces which particularly affect the small cities. Accordingly, the following outline highlights most of the reasons for the current dilemma of small cities in California:

1. INFLATION

The impact of inflation on the small city cannot easily be overstated. Smaller cities generally provide only the basic, necessary services. Since these services cannot be cut out, or even significantly reduced, small

cities must increase revenue to offset the added burden of inflation.

2. FROZEN REVENUES DUE TO STATE LAWS

The California State Legislature has virtually frozen the sources of revenue for all California cities. The smaller cities are dependent on state subventions for most of the revenue pie, and these subventions are tied directly to the economy. In a declining economy, these sources of revenue decline proportionately.

Yet the demand for local government services does not decline during an economic slowdown. On the contrary demand for services often increases during a slowdown.

3. INCREASED COST DUE TO STATE LAWS

The California State Legislature has passed many laws in the past three or four years which *mandate* higher costs to California cities. Yet, the state does not provide increased revenue to pay for these costs.

The law which froze property taxes, SB90, stipulates that the State will provide the revenue to cities to meet the cost of any state mandated program. However, it hasn't worked that way. Since passage of SB90, most state laws mandating increased costs to cities contain a "disclaimer clause", disclaiming the obligation of the state under SB90 to provide the money—"for this particular bill".

This is obviously unjust. The state obligates itself to pay for increased costs it mandates on the cities, yet denies that the obligation exists for most mandated programs.

4. GRANTSMANSHIP

Large cities have always had a clear and distinct advantage over smaller cities in applying for state and federal grants. The reason for this is simply that the large cities can afford the staff required to go through the extensive requirements for these grants, while the small cities cannot. The result of the grantsmanship game is that large cities receive the overwhelming majority of grant funds from the state and federal governments.

SUMMARY OF CITY FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

In summary, cities across the nation are being squeezed between the pincer's of rising costs and declining revenues in the trend of a possible inflation-recession situation that faces the nation. As the main providers of domestic public services, cities will be called on to increase their expenditures greatly to meet the problem of a recession. Yet the revenues available to cities will decline as the demands increase. Moreover, California cities face the additional dilemma of a state law which effectively freezes their capacity to increase revenues.

Small cities face most of the same problems faced by the large metropolitan cities. The numbers are different but proportions are about the same. Yet the big cities have historically had a very significant advantage in obtaining state and federal grants.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LAW

The cities of this nation are being called on to provide an increasing number of services, including an emphasis on social services. The enactment of the General Revenue Sharing Act of 1972 has been the dramatic and welcome expression by the Congress and the Administration of the new emphasis on bringing more government to the city level.

We believe that this emphasis is an important and highly beneficial one, for we sincerely believe that it will result in a more responsive government because the people have more direct and immediate access to their city councilmen than to the state or federal officials.

The financial problems faced by this nation's cities are very real. Although cities are now receiving general revenue sharing funds, this benefit has been offset by the cessation of the block grants since January 1973. The

loss of the block grants has meant the death of many highly important water, sewer and development projects. These large projects cannot be financed solely from local revenue of most cities. This is especially true of smaller rural cities, which don't have sufficient tax base.

We understand that three bills are being considered in Washington, D.C., all dealing with community development entitlement programs. These three bills are for the purpose of assisting cities with the financing of community development projects. Therefore, any of the three bills would be of great assistance to cities in financing large projects. All three bills have many outstanding features.

However, there is one major problem. All of the bills provide an "automatic entitlement" feature in which all of the cities automatically receive funds for community development... *except* cities under 50,000 in population. We strongly believe that this exclusion is unjust. Once again the large cities are given a tremendous advantage over small cities, even though the large cities already had a strong advantage in obtaining federal funds in the past.

Small cities have the same type of problems as the larger cities, and less financial capacity to solve those problems. Why should these small cities once again be relegated to a position of second class citizenship? Why shouldn't the small cities of America be given at least the same benefits as the large cities?

Much of the crime, racial disturbance, pollution, drug abuse and other serious problems found in large cities is a byproduct of dense population... too many people squeezed into a confined space. Therefore, why not change our national priorities to place "decentralization" as one of the highest goals?

The community development act which ultimately becomes law should give small towns and cities at least equal treatment. The law should *not* exclude small cities under 50,000 in population from automatic entitlement for those funds. The small cities should not be placed in the position of having to compete with other small towns for so-called "discretionary funds".

Block grants should be made directly to units of general purpose local government without regard to population size. Please support us by requesting that the community development act be modified to eliminate the clause which excludes cities under 50,000 population from automatic entitlement.

Thank you for your concern for the problems faced by the small cities, particularly in rural America. We believe that the quality of life can be improved through a policy of decentralization in which small cities are provided with their proportionate share of federal development funds.

Your support on this important matter will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

DOLPH FRISIUS,
City Manager.

MRS. EUGENIE FORDE

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following profile of Mrs. Eugenie Forde, a lady who has spent a life of loving commitment as nurse, midwife, mother, and community leader.

In a 50-year career, Mrs. Forde has assisted in over 4,500 births in the Virgin

Islands. After studying at the municipal hospital's training school in St. Thomas, she began to practice nursing in 1920 when the majority of births occurred in the home. She walked miles and waited hours to welcome the newborn into the light.

As modern medical discoveries influenced theories and techniques of childbirth, Mrs. Forde grew with her profession. She continued her studies at Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore, Freedmen's Hospital in Washington, and Columbia University in New York. These years of experience and education were rewarded in 1953 when Mrs. Forde was named supervisor of the obstetrical ward of the newly constructed Knud Hansen Memorial Hospital. The increased space and staff provided by this new facility brought most expectant mothers into the hospital to give birth. Mrs. Forde remained at this position until her retirement in 1970.

To complement this career, Eugenie Forde maintained an active role in such community organizations as the Catholic Daughters of America, the Friends of Denmark, and the Women's League. Her civic and professional contributions were acknowledged with the following awards: "Woman of the Year" by the Business and Professional Women's Club, and "Nurse of the Year" by the Women's League.

As if this public activity was not enough to dominate her time, Eugenie also raised a family of 4, and is now the proud grandmother of 13.

Mrs. Forde is a truly extraordinary woman whose inexhaustible humanity has touched the hearts of her fellow Virgin Islanders. I would like to add my most sincere thank you for the talent, energy, and love she has given so freely to our community.

A detailed profile of Mrs. Forde from the May 12 issue of the Virgin Islands Post follows:

[From the Virgin Islands Post, May 12, 1974]

MRS. EUGENIE FORDE

(By Judith Ottley Hoston)

The story of Mrs. Eugenie Forde can be summarized in just a few words... a loving mother and nurse, who taught, counseled and pioneered with kind-hearted concern for the people she served.

At the time when Mrs. Forde became interested in the nurse-midwifery training program, in 1917, the Municipal Hospital was not quite as modern as the Knud-Hansen Memorial Hospital is today. Except for the mothers who had complications, a great many women at that time had their babies delivered in the home.

This is where Mrs. Forde stepped in. She recalls that many times she was called upon to go into the rural areas to deliver babies, the roads were as narrow as paths, allowing travel on horseback or donkey.

The lack of electricity on the island made it increasingly difficult for home deliveries. It was danger to do a delivery by candlelight or lamp. The light from the kerosene lamp or candle was the only means of illumination available for the procedure. In the town area, house calls were made by car or on foot.

The hardships of midwifery were seldom weighed by Mrs. Forde in these early times. The joys experienced by welcoming the newborn into this world far surpassed the hardships or inconveniences experienced while on some delivery calls. Mrs. Forde remembers

many a time she would have to go without meals for twelve or more hours while waiting for a newborn arrival. "At one time I did not lay my head on a bed for 72 hours" she recalled.

4,500 babies, now adults, including this writer, have Mrs. Forde to thank for their safe journey into this world. Many of these babies have grown up to become doctors, lawyers, nurses, businessmen, senators and teachers.

Experience alone did not make Mrs. Forde such an excellent nurse. She graduated from the highest grade in the Catholic Night School. At that time she received merit for being first in the class and for good behavior. Mrs. Forde taught fourth grade at the Catholic School for a year before beginning her formal training in nursing. In November of 1917, she entered the Municipal Hospital's training school in St. Thomas, for three years. She received basic nurses training, then practiced as a graduate nurse until February 1921. In 1948 Mrs. Forde attended a post graduate course for Nurse Midwives at Maryland County offered by Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore, and she later obtained training at Freedmans Hospital under Howard University in Washington, D.C. For the purpose of keeping up with modern trends she attended another course at Columbia in New York, oriented around nurse midwifery.

In 1953 Knud Hansen Memorial Hospital was built. Its modern labor and delivery rooms, made it possible for all patients to be treated at the hospital. Shortly after Mrs. Forde was named nurse-midwife supervisor of the obstetrical unit. She served in this position for 17 years. Her objective was not only to meet the total needs of the mothers and infants she nursed, but to help to comfort and console the members of the families.

When it came to the delivering of a baby and the caring of a mother, Mrs. Forde explains, "the best of care was given to all patients alike, regardless of race, color and social status."

Mrs. Forde thinks nursing was her call to duty. She regards the field of nursing as a dignified, philanthropic profession. The nursing profession awarded her that sense of satisfaction that comes from being able to help your fellow man in every way. "If I had to live my life all over again, I would become a nurse midwife again," declared Mrs. Forde. There were times of despair but Mrs. Forde was never discouraged to the point of regret. Religion has always played a great job in her life and throughout her career, in moments of despair, she received great comfort from the "higher power."

Mrs. Forde loves to travel. She has traveled extensively to the neighboring Caribbean Islands. As a child, with a strong religious background, Mrs. Forde always wished to see the land where the Savior walked. Today she is thankful that her prayers as a child were answered. In 1972, Mrs. Forde visited many places in Europe, including Italy, France, Spain, Portugal and Israel.

Mrs. Forde has been a very active and involved woman throughout her years, even though nursing took up the majority of her time. She joined every society within her church. Today she is still active in the Catholic Daughters of America, and the Friends of Denmark.

Mrs. Forde has also been an active member of the Women's League which at one time honored her as "Nurse of the Year". For two consecutive years, she was honored as Woman of the Year by The Business and Professional Women's Club of which she is still a member.

Mrs. Forde's husband died many years ago. She has four children and 13 grandchildren.

Mrs. Forde was retired from midwifery profession in 1970. Today the facilities are more advanced and Public Health Services and Clinics made midwifery somewhat outmoded. Nevertheless, Mrs. Forde looks at it as a con-

tinuing experience comparable to no other profession. She encourages young people in high school, boys as well as girls, to go into this humanitarian profession of nursing and health care.

Mrs. Forde feels the profession as a whole has not changed much. There are still very well trained nurses who enjoy helping people and don't mind the hard work. "I have had people from the U.S. and Europe, who have been treated at the local hospital and comment on the remarkable care they have received," she notes.

VENEZUELA AMENDMENT

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the amendment to be offered when the U.S. Sugar Act is considered on the floor early in the coming month, which amendment would suspend a sugar quota for Venezuela until such time as that country's oil pricing policies return to a responsible economic level, it is important that the thrust of the amendment be considered in terms of the broader global economic situation confronting the United States and the necessity to formulate a clear economic response and policy by the United States.

The overall perspective that guides the authors of the amendment and our objectives are authoritatively set forth in an accompanying article by renowned economist Eliot Janeway in a manner which we believe best describes the purposes and hoped for effects of the amendment if adopted.

Because I believe Mr. Janeway's views are worthy of the attention and careful thought of my colleagues, I include at this point the full text of an article by Mr. Janeway as it appeared in the Sacramento Bee of Sunday, February 10, 1974, under the heading, "Agriculture: Potent U.S. Weapon for Oil Showdown."

[From the Sacramento Bee, Feb. 10, 1974]
AGRIPOWER: POTENT U.S. WEAPON FOR OIL SHOWDOWN

(By Eliot Janeway)

"The Year of Europe" was the slogan Secretary Of State Henry Kissinger proclaimed as a promise of peace and prosperity to America in 1973. Instead, 1973 turned out to be a year of isolation for America. Now 1974 looms as a year threatening disaster for the world.

This threat can be averted if—but only if—Washington moves quickly and effectively to get her own back from her former clients overseas. It is not blind nationalism to recognize that what's good for the American economy is best for the world for international stability is impossible so long as America remains off balance in her international dealings.

RESOURCES "WASTED"

The danger is not of a worldwide depression precipitated by a fuel shortage. The oil scare was never anything but a cover for the price push, and the risk of depression will remain even though the oil will flow. The problem lies in America's refusal to recognize that she is wasting her own resources internationally, instead of bargaining with them. Her failure to bring her distinctive

sources of economic strength to the trading table is preventing a solution.

Economic geography has been immeasurably more bountiful to America than to the Arab world, and America has done immeasurably more with it here at home. The facts of economic geography stand as a warning to the Arab petro-politicians that playing America as a "pitiful, helpless giant" is tricky politics and bad business.

WORLD'S AGRIPOWER

America's commanding position as the world's sole agripower offers her a golden opportunity to emerge again as a decisive, international force for peace and prosperity.

The world protein revolution depends on our production of foods and feeds. It is too far advanced to be stopped. But its acceleration has been supported by the bargain basis on which American food products have been available.

Now the revaluation of world oil prices is inviting a counter-revaluation of American farm prices. This will not slow down the world protein revolution. But it will bring an overdue correction in America's terms of trade with all her customers. It will also reassert her economic bargaining power and remind the world how powerful a political weapon this is.

NO OTHER SOURCE

Months before the Yom Kippur war triggered the oil revaluation, the Saudis were offering to key their allocations of oil to the premium price commanded by US rice. There is no other source, and even last summer they were unable to buy as much as they needed.

More than incidentally, the Arab petropowers admit to being at least as dependent on America's proprietary technology as they are on her agripower.

The revolution responsible for the ferment racking the Arab world is also increasing Arab demand in the world's sold-out meat markets at a whirlwind pace: Here, as is not the case with oil, the shortage is real; and as is the case with rice at one end of the supply spectrum and technology at the other, America is the sole supplier of last resort.

NO HOLY WAR

Anyone still laboring under the misimpression that the oil price push is a holy war will do well to remember that the Arab outfits exploiting the oil crisis do no fighting, and that the Arab outfits doing the fighting are food have-nots as well as oil have-nots. But both sides of the class division in the Arab world stand in equally urgent need of American food products—whether beef for the rich or rice for the poor—and the technology that supports it.

Any who doubt the potency of the technological leverage America can bring to bear on the petropowers will do well to ponder the meaning of the offer from the Venezuelans to cut back their new selling prices in return for price concessions on the American products and services their oil industry needs. After all, the Venezuelans were the organizers of the oil producers' union.

PRICE BARGAINING

A retaliatory U.S. export-price increase would be the effective response. If combined with a parallel one for the proprietary agri-technology Venezuela is so hungry for, the price-bargaining between the petropowers and all their customers would take a dramatic and reassuring new turn back toward the stability the world economy needs if it is to be spared a depression.

Suggestions that Russia would take up any slack left by an American resolve to bargain with food for fuel reflect the popular disposition to see giants across the bargaining table from America and a pygmy in the mirror. Russia herself is trying to support her protein diet without a corn belt, and no one can. Thanks again to providence, Amer-

ica is the only power in the world to have been endorsed with one.

WHEAT NOT ENOUGH

Wheat alone would not furnish a protein diet to Russia's human population—even if she had the transportation to move it; and wheat will not support her animal population. How then could she supply the Mideast? And any such effort would invite China to take advantage of the offbalance position Russia is determined to avoid.

Speaking of China, the proof of America's agri-power potency is implicit in Peking's purchases in the Chicago farm-futures markets, and in the commitments she has been making to buy agri-power potential in the form of high-powered fertilizer plants which only U.S. agribusiness can provide.

At the peak of last summer's food-price panic, China made a big buy of Canadian wheat. She has been taking a third of the Australian crop. Now her buying has just bid the American market up to still new highs, because neither Canada nor the rest of the world combined can come close to meeting her needs.

REALISTIC CHINA

China has been showing herself to be the most resolute and realistic customer in the world for the proprietary products of American agri-power, asking no political favors and counting herself lucky to pay her money, accrue the going rate of interest and get her deliveries.

The rest of the communist world, the Arab world and Japan have no choice but to follow (Japan particularly, now that the threat of polluted waters is endangering her historic fish diet).

Washington has been content to let American agricultural exports subsidize a cheap diet abroad. It has been permissive in tolerating the resultant inflation at home. It is still relying on cut-price exports to fight the farm depression it inherited; and it has yet to awaken to the opportunity to cash in on the farm boom, which is only beginning to grow. Washington's naive acceptance of the prevailing economic wisdom led it to be caught napping by the spectacle of a farm boom coinciding with a financial bust-up.

A counter-revaluation of American food-export prices will be a bargain for everyone if it keeps supplies flowing internationally and brings into play a counter-force against the strangling power-play of the petro-politicians.

TRUST FUND

The technique to employ is the familiar one of the trust fund, which has been used for years to finance our highways, social security and railroad retirement. Last summer I presented a proposal to the International Finance Subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee aimed at adapting and extending the institution of the trust fund as a surcharge on exports of proprietary American farm products and other proprietary raw materials.

The questioning prompted by my proposal revealed a keen and constructive interest in implementing it. Expressive of this, Sens. Jacob Javits and Adlai Stevenson III have sponsored legislation (which I endorse) earmarking the proceeds of the export surcharge for school-lunch and other welfare programs inescapably being shortchanged as the result of inflation and especially by the intense inflation in foods.

TIME IS RIGHT

The timing of an American push to check the oil gougers could not be better: food prices are poised on the verge of another takeoff. Item: the Italians, drained of dollars by the oil outrage, nevertheless bid the latest California tuna auction up by a breathtaking 25 percent. A Pax Agricola (carrying the proprietary brand of the Eagle will be immeasurably more long-lived and more fruitful than the late Pax Americana was at its most generous.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ACT OF 1974

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the importance of H.R. 14449, the Community Services Act of 1974, to the American people can be weighed by the type of support it has generated across racial lines, economic lines and class lines. By placing the following letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I hope my colleagues will see for themselves the broadbased support for H.R. 14449 and understand the importance of this legislation:

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF

ARCHITECTS,

May 22, 1974.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Institute of Architects, I wish to express our support for Section 126 of H.R. 14449, the Community Services Act of 1974.

The Institute, the national society for the architectural profession representing 24,000 licensed architects, has a deep public interest and professional concern for community development assistance programs. Responsible community development can only be ensured through total community involvement in the development process. Yet total involvement necessitates organizations that are responsive to and comprised of the community residents they serve. Programs lacking these elements are superficial and in the long run prove to be insensitive, unresponsive, and unproductive.

Our support for Section 126, Design and Planning Assistance Programs, is based on our belief that citizens must have access to design and planning assistance just as they now have access to legal services and health care. This assistance can serve to help them understand the terms and processes of community development, as well as to help translate their needs and desires into working plans for that development. With these services available, communities have the opportunity to make constructive input into the physical/environmental development of their neighborhoods. This input results in plans which can be implemented and are responsive to the needs of the community.

Under the authorization of Section 221 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Office of Economic Opportunity granted research and demonstration funds to several existing community-based architectural and planning workshops known as Community Design Centers. These centers, of which there are currently 75 now operating in 60 cities across the country, provide free design and planning technical assistance to indigent communities.

Staffed by architects, landscape architects, planners, engineers, other design professionals, and VISTA graduate architects and planners, the centers work on projects varying from minor renovation work on individual dwelling units to the development of comprehensive planning documents for the future growth of neighborhoods. This unique combination of technical assistance—social planning—and community organization has become the hallmark of the Community Design Center movement. They have succeeded in beginning to answer the cries so desperately voiced from the community.

The OEO funding of the three design and planning centers was a clear success, as an OEO evaluation report on the combined project "Community Design Centers/What We Have Learned", March 1971, states:

"They have done an effective job of helping community groups bring about changes in

public plans and policies. They have aided the poor in producing those changes by constructive rather than destructive methods, by negotiating rather than rioting. They are beginning to show that they can help community groups develop to the point where they become their own advocates and planners."

Aside from the OEO funding of the three centers, no other satisfactory source of funds has been found to provide design and planning services to the poor. Without any national funding, the centers across the country have had to rely on the sporadic support of local foundations and private contributions.

In the past, a few local centers have been able to obtain Department of Housing and Urban Development (Section 701) Comprehensive Planning grants through their regional or state planning authority and also some contracts with the Model Cities program. But too often, these funds have been bogged down by local bureaucracies and red-tape, thus severely hampering the performance of the centers. In addition, the HUD 701 and Model Cities programs provide funds only for specific projects and do not represent a source of daily operational revenue. This limits the abilities of the centers to respond to other issues and needs arising in the community.

Financial assistance was authorized by Section 226 of the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1972, and was intended to provide community-based design and planning organizations with the continuing source of basic operating and overhead funds that they critically need.

We believe the continuation of the design and planning assistance authorization, as provided in Section 126 of H.R. 14449, is urgently needed to assure the continued existence of the community design centers, and we urge your support of this provision.

Sincerely,

ARCHIBALD C. ROGERS,
FAIA President.

THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
WASHINGTON OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1974.

MEMORANDUM

To: The New York City Congressional Delegation.

From: Bruce Kirschenbaum.

Subject: City's Position on H.R. 14449.

During the past several months, Mayor Beame has reiterated the City's strong support for continuation of Community Action programs. H.R. 14449, due to be voted upon this week, would accomplish the goal of continuing these important programs.

New York City receives approximately \$20 million annually in federal anti-poverty funds from OEO and contributes a like amount in local funds. If the necessary authorizing legislation is not enacted before June 30, 1974, the following will happen:

1. The City's Council Against Poverty, the Community Action Agency in New York City, will not have sufficient funds to complete its program year which ends on September 30, 1974, nor will it be able to continue into its next program year.
2. Approximately 2,500 employees will be out of work on July 1st.
3. Over 100,000 poor people will have direct services eliminated on July 1st.
4. A majority of Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees will have no place at which to report or work, even though Summer Youth money is available.
5. Disruption of a network of 26 community corporations and over 250 delegate agencies which provide a broad spectrum of services and activities.

It is therefore crucial that Congress continue these programs in a viable and effective manner, such as contained in H.R. 14449.

Therefore, the City would appreciate your support of H.R. 14449 without amendment.

Washington, D.C., May 17, 1974.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Although we have reservations about certain provisions of H.R. 14449, the community action legislation reported by the Education and Labor Committee, it represents a responsible effort to deal with difficult issues. On behalf of the UAW, I urge most strongly that you support H.R. 14449, as reported, and oppose all weakening amendments.

The UAW has consistently supported our nation's anti-poverty program since it was first enacted. We would have preferred legislation simply to extend the Economic Opportunity Act, retaining a separate anti-poverty agency and maintaining the 80-20 matching arrangement and other aspects of the program. But modifications have had to be made in order to reach a compromise which would command sufficient support to be enacted into law. H.R. 14449 is such a compromise. In our judgment, it deserves your strong support.

Your consideration of the UAW position on this important and needed legislation will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

JACK BEIDLER,
Legislative Director.

KELLY STREET BLOCK ASSOCIATION,
Bronx, N.Y., May 22, 1974.

Congressman CHARLES RANGEL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Kelly Street Block Association, is asking your full support for the continuation of the community action programs.

We beseech you to do all in your power to help the thousands of us who will be crippled by the discontinuation of O.E.O. Model Cities, and all Community Action Programs that have become a vital and necessary part of our communities.

We thank you in advance.

Staff of Kelly St. Block Association.

NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION REQUESTS LIMITATION ON CON- STRUCTION ACTIVITIES OF THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION'S GAR- RISON DIVERSION UNIT

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the administration has requested an additional \$10,555,000 for work on the Bureau of Reclamation's Garrison Diversion Unit in fiscal year 1975.

The most serious questions have been raised about this project. Continuation of the project may result in an environmental disaster throughout much of North Dakota. The Canadian Government is most seriously concerned that the project will downgrade the quality of water flowing into Canada; the Canadians have asked, as strongly as possible, that the project be suspended. Completion of the project may actually hurt more small farmers than it can help. The project is a heavy consumer of energy. In addition, Congressman REUSS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources, has just received a GAO report that indicates extremely heavy and unauthorized cost increases in the project.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will order that new starts on this project be delayed until these serious cost/benefit and environmental questions can be answered.

I would like to enter in the RECORD at this point a news release from the North Dakota Farmers Union of May 3, 1974, in which the union calls for limiting construction activities to those presently underway until the numerous questions surrounding the project have been answered:

NEWS RELEASE

JAMESTOWN.—The North Dakota Farmers Union has requested that construction activities of the Garrison Diversion Project be limited to those presently underway and that the Bureau of Reclamation change its land acquisition policies.

North Dakota Farmers Union President E. W. Smith made the request to Bureau of Reclamation Commissioner G. G. Stamm following a special meeting of the farm organization's board of directors on April 30th.

In a resolution adopted by the North Dakota Farmers Union board, the farm organization's directors requested the "monies appropriated for the Garrison Diversion Project be used to complete construction activities presently underway and that no new land be opened for canals and so forth until the air is cleared of doubt as to the probability of its completion."

Smith said that the North Dakota Farmers Union board felt that "it is not reasonable to begin construction work on the next reaches when the future of the project is in doubt. The burdens facing land owners in replacing land and the effect on their farm operations should be adequate reason to limit construction activities to previously opened land."

Smith said the North Dakota Farmers Union Board of Directors further requested in the resolution that "no further land acquisition be made unless the Bureau of Reclamation both locates and provides comparable replacement land for the affected farmers, because of the high cost of replacing land and the difficulty of securing replacement land. Farmers who have lost land due to previous land acquisition should be given the same consideration by the Bureau of Reclamation."

The North Dakota Farmers Union President stated, "Farmers unable to replace land taken by the Bureau find themselves in a very difficult problem with the Internal Revenue Service and it will cost them a tremendous amount of money. The Bureau should also locate and secure replacement land for these individuals."

In addition to the request to the Bureau of Reclamation, Smith outlined the land replacement problems to the state's Congressional delegation, urging their assistance for farmers caught in the problems of replacing land acquired by the Bureau.

"RAMPANT INFLATION THREATENS FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIETY": BURNS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Arthur Burns, has warned of "the debilitating effects of inflation on the Nation," stating that—

If long continued, inflation at anything like the present rate would threaten the very foundations of our society.

Dr. Burns made this statement at the commencement exercises at Illinois College last Sunday. His talk was sobering, especially in view of the tendency of others within Government to minimize the dangers of inflation to our economy and our Nation. All citizens in private and public life should read and heed his warning. For that reason, I am placing the text of his statement in today's RECORD:

THE MENACE OF INFLATION

(By Arthur F. Burns)

It is a pleasure to be with you today here in the heartland of America. As graduates of this College, you are launching your careers at a challenging but troubled time. Confidence in established institutions, particularly in our government, is at a low ebb. And hopes for the future of our economy have been shaken by the debilitating effects of inflation on the nation's businesses, workers, and consumers.

Inflation is not a new problem for the United States, nor is it confined to our country. Inflationary forces are now rampant in every major industrial nation of the world. Inflation is raging also in the less developed countries, and apparently in socialist countries as well as in those that practice free enterprise.

The gravity of our current inflationary problem can hardly be overestimated. Except for a brief period at the end of World War II, prices in the United States have of late been rising faster than in any other peacetime period of our history. If past experience is any guide, the future of our country is in jeopardy. No country that I know of has been able to maintain widespread economic prosperity once inflation got out of hand. And the unhappy consequences are by no means solely of an economic character. If long continued, inflation at anything like the present rate would threaten the very foundations of our society.

I want to discuss briefly with you today the sources of our inflationary problem, the havoc being wrought in the economy, and the steps that must be taken to regain general price stability and thus strengthen confidence in our nation's future.

A large part of the recent upsurge in prices has been due to special factors. In most years, economic trends of individual nations tend to diverge. But during 1973 a business-cycle boom occurred simultaneously in the United States and in every other major industrial country. With production rising rapidly across the world, prices of labor, materials, and finished products were bid up everywhere.

To make matters worse, disappointing crop harvests in a number of countries in 1972 forced a sharp run-up in the prices of food last year. The manipulation of petroleum supplies and prices by oil-exporting countries gave another dramatic push to the general price level last autumn and early this year. The influence of these factors is still being felt in consumer markets.

Recently, our price level has also reacted strongly to the removal of wage and price controls—a painful, but essential adjustment in the return to free markets.

These special factors, however, do not account for all of our inflation. For many years, our economy and that of other nations has had a serious underlying bias toward inflation which has simply been magnified by the special influences that I have mentioned.

Ironically, the roots of that bias lie chiefly in the rising aspirations of people everywhere. We are a nation in a hurry for more and more of what we consider the good things

of life. I do not question that yearning. Properly directed, it can be a powerful force for human betterment. Difficulties arise, however, when people in general seek to reach their goals by means of short cuts; and that is what has happened.

Of late, individuals have come to depend less and less on their own initiative, and more on government, to achieve their economic objectives. The public nowadays expects that government to maintain prosperous economic conditions, to limit such declines in employment as may occasionally occur, to ease the burden of job loss or illness or retirement, to sustain the incomes of farmers, homebuilders, and so on. These are laudable objectives, and we and other nations have moved a considerable distance toward their realization. Unfortunately, in the process of doing so, governmental budgets have gotten out of control, wages and prices have become less responsive to the discipline of market forces, and inflation has emerged as the most dangerous economic ailment of our time.

The awesome imbalance of the Federal budget is probably the contributory factor to inflation that you have heard the most about. In the past five years, total Federal expenditures have increased about 50 per cent. In that time span, the cumulative budget deficit of the Federal government, including government-sponsored enterprises, has totaled more than \$100 billion. In financing this deficit, and also in meeting huge demands for credit by businesses and consumers, tremendous pressures have been placed on our credit mechanisms and the supply of money has grown at a rate inconsistent with price stability.

I am sure that each of you in this graduating class is aware of some of the troublesome consequences of inflation. The prices of virtually everything you buy have been rising and are still going up. For the typical American worker, the increase in weekly earnings during the past year, while sizable in dollars, has been wiped out by inflation. In fact, the real weekly take-home pay of the average worker is now below what it was a year ago. Moreover, the real value of accumulated savings deposits has also declined, and the pressure of rising prices on family budgets has led to a worrisome increase in delinquency rates on home mortgages and consumer loans.

Many consumers have responded to these developments by postponing or cancelling plans for buying homes, autos, and other big-ticket items. Sales of new autos began to decline in the spring of 1973, and so too did sales of furniture and appliances, mobile homes, and newly built dwellings. The weakness in consumer markets, largely engendered by inflation, slowed our economic growth rate last year some months before the effects of the oil shortage began to be felt.

Actually, the sales of some of our nation's leading business firms have been on the wane for a year or more. Their costs, meanwhile, have continued to soar with increasing wage rates and sharply rising prices of materials.

The effect on business profits was ignored for a time because accountants typically reckon the value of inventories—and also the value of machinery and equipment used up in production—at original cost, rather than at current inflated prices. These accounting practices create an illusory element in profits—an element that is not available for distribution to stockholders in view of the need to replace inventories, plant, and equipment at appreciably higher prices. Worse still, the illusory part of profits is subject to the income tax, thus aggravating the deterioration in profits. This result is especially unfortunate because of the shortage of industrial capacity that now exists in

key sectors of our economy—particularly in the basic materials area.

By early this year, a confrontation with economic reality could no longer be put off. Major business corporations found that the volume of investible funds generated internally was not increasing fast enough to finance the rising costs of new plant and equipment, or of the materials and supplies needed to rebuild inventories. Businesses began to scramble for borrowed funds at commercial banks and in the public markets for money and capital. Our financial markets have therefore come under severe strain. Interest rates have risen sharply; savings flows have been diverted from mortgage lending institutions; security dealers have experienced losses; prices of common stocks have declined; the liquidity of some enterprises has been called into question; and tensions of a financial nature have spilled over into international markets.

Concerned as we all are about the economic consequences of inflation, there is even greater reason for concern about the impact on our social and political institutions. We must not risk the social stresses that persistent inflation breeds. Because of its capricious effects on the income and wealth of a nation's families and businesses, inflation inevitably causes disillusionment and discontent. It robs millions of citizens who in their desire to be self-reliant have set aside funds for the education of their children or their own retirement, and it hits many of the poor and elderly especially hard.

In recent weeks, governments have fallen in several major countries, in part because the citizens of those countries had lost confidence in the ability of their leaders to cope with the problem of inflation. Among our own people, the distortions and injustices wrought by inflation have contributed materially to distrust of government officials and of government policies, and even to some loss of confidence in our free enterprise system. Discontent bred by inflation can provoke profoundly disturbing social and political change, as the history of other nations teaches. I do not believe I exaggerate in saying that the ultimate consequence of inflation could well be a significant decline of economic and political freedom for the American people.

There are those who believe that the struggle to curb inflation will not succeed and who conclude that it would be better to adjust to inflation rather than to fight it. On this view, contractual payments of all sorts—wages, salaries, social security benefits, interest on bank loans and deposits, and so on—should be written with escalator clauses so as to minimize the distortions and injustices that inflation normally causes.

This is a well-meaning proposal, but it is neither sound nor practical. For one thing, there are hundreds of billions of dollars of outstanding contracts—on mortgages, public and private bonds, insurance policies, and the like—that as a practical matter could not be renegotiated. Even with regard to new undertakings, the obstacles to achieving satisfactory escalator arrangements in our free and complex economy, where people differ so much in financial sophistication, seem insuperable. More important still, by making it easier for many people to live with inflation, escalator arrangements would gravely weaken the discipline that is needed to conduct business and government affairs prudently and efficiently. Universal escalation, I am therefore convinced, is an illusory and dangerous quest. The responsible course is to fight inflation with all the energy we can muster and with all the weapons at our command.

One essential ingredient in this struggle is continued resistance to swift growth in money and credit. The Federal Reserve System, I assure you, is firmly committed to this task. We intend to encourage sufficient growth in supplies of money and credit to

finance orderly economic expansion. But we are not going to be a willing party to the accommodation of rampant inflation.

As this year's experience has again indicated, a serious effort to moderate the growth of money and credit during a period of burgeoning credit demand results in higher interest rates—particularly on short-term loans. Troublesome though this rise in interest rates may be, it must for a time be tolerated. For, if monetary policy sought to prevent a rise in interest rates when credit demands were booming, money and credit would expand explosively, with devastating effects on the price level. Any such policy would in the end be futile, even as far as interest rates are concerned, because these rates would soon reflect the rise in the price level and therefore go up all the more. We must not let that happen.

But I cannot emphasize too strongly that monetary policy alone cannot solve our stubborn inflationary problem.

We must work simultaneously at lessening the powerful underlying bias toward inflation that stems from excessive total demands on our limited resources. This means, among other things, that the Federal budget has to be handled more responsibly than it has been in the past.

Incredible though it may seem, the Congress has been operating over the years without any semblance of a rational budget plan. The committees that consider spending operate independently of the committees that consider taxes, and appropriations themselves are treated in more than a dozen different bills annually. All of this means that the Federal budget never really gets considered as a whole—a fact which helps explain why it is so often in deficit.

Fortunately, after many years of advocacy by concerned citizens and legislators, this glaring deficiency in the Congressional budget process is about to be remedied. Bills that would integrate spending and taxing decisions have passed both the House and the Senate. This is a most encouraging development, and we may confidently expect final action soon by the Congress on this landmark legislation.

Procedural changes, however, will mean little unless the political will exists to exploit the changes fully. And this can happen only if the American people understand better the nature of the inflation we have been experiencing and demand appropriate action by their elected representatives.

As you leave this hall today, I urge you to give continuing thought and study to the problem of inflation. If it persists, it will affect your personal lives profoundly. Where possible, I urge you to assume a leadership role in getting people everywhere interested in understanding inflation and in doing something about it. In the great "town hall" tradition of America, much can be accomplished if people organize themselves—in their offices, trade unions, factories, social clubs, and churches—to probe beneath the superficial explanations of inflation that are the gossip of everyday life. Productivity councils in local communities and enterprises, established for the purpose of improving efficiency and cutting costs, can be directly helpful in restraining inflation.

While I am on the subject of what individuals can do to be helpful, let me note the need for rediscovery of the art of careful budgeting of family expenditures. In some of our businesses, price competition has atrophied as a mode of economic behavior, in part because many of our families no longer exercise much discipline in their spending. We have become a nation of impulse shoppers, of gadget buyers. We give less thought than we should to choosing among the thousands of commodities and services available in our markets. And many of us no longer practice comparative price shopping—not even for big-ticket items. Careful spending habits are not only in the best interest of every family; they could

contribute powerfully to a new emphasis on price competition in consumer markets.

I do not expect that the path back to reasonable price stability can be traveled quickly. Indeed, our government will need to make numerous steps to reduce the inflationary bias of our economy besides those I have emphasized. The forces of competition in labor and product markets need to be strengthened—perhaps by establishing wage and price review boards to minimize abuses of economic power, certainly through more vigorous enforcement of the anti-trust laws, besides elimination of barriers to entry in skilled occupations, reduction of barriers to imports from abroad, and modification of minimum wage laws to improve job opportunities for teenagers. Impediments to increased production that still remain in farming, construction work, and other industries need to be removed. And greater incentives should be provided for enlarging our capacity to produce industrial materials, energy, and other products in short supply.

But if inflation cannot be ended quickly, neither can it be eliminated without cost. Some industries will inevitably operate for a time at lower rates of production than they would prefer. Government cannot—and should not—try to compensate fully for all such occurrences. Such a policy would involve negating with one hand what was being attempted with the other.

But government does have a proper ameliorative role to play in areas, such as housing, where the incidence of credit restraint has been disproportionately heavy. The special burden that has fallen on homebuilding should be lightened, as is the intent of the housing aids which the Administration recently announced. And my personal judgment is that it would be advisable, too, for government to be prepared, if need be, to expand the roster of public-service jobs. This particular means of easing especially troublesome situations of unemployment will not add permanently to governmental costs. And in any event, it would conflict much less with basic anti-inflation objectives than would the conventional alternative of general monetary or fiscal stimulus. A cut in personal income taxes, for instance, would serve to perpetuate budget deficits. Not only that, it might prove of little aid to the particular industries or localities that are now experiencing economic difficulty. Much the same would be true of a monetary policy that permitted rapid growth of money and credit. There is no justification for such fateful steps at this time.

In concluding, I would simply repeat my central message: there is no easy way out of the inflationary morass into which we have allowed ourselves to sink through negligence and imperfect vision. But I am confident that we will succeed if the American people become more alert to the challenge. I hope that the members of this graduating class will join with other citizens across the country in a great national crusade to put an end to inflation and restore the conditions essential to a stable prosperity—a prosperity whose benefits can be enjoyed by all our people. This objective is within our means and is essential to our nation's future.

BAR ASSOCIATION VIEW ON ABORTION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I place in today's RECORD a letter to Senator BIRCH

BAYH, chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee, from Orville H. Schell, Jr., president of the New York Bar Association, concerning the Senate Joint Resolutions on Abortion. I agree with Mr. Schell that the Supreme Court decision affirming women's right to an abortion should be allowed to stand.

Mr. Schell's letter indicates that numerous members of the legal profession believe the abortion decision has had positive effects. It should be useful to my colleagues as a reflection of public opinion on this question.

The letter follows:

THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR,
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, May 15, 1974.

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH, Jr.,
Chairman, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Russell Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAYH: I am writing with reference to the hearings on abortion, and particularly with reference to the Hearings on Senate Joint Resolutions 119 and 130, now being conducted by you. We believe the provisions of the above-mentioned resolutions are unwise and should be disapproved.

Senate Joint Resolutions 119 and 130 would abrogate the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973) asserting the right of women to abortion. We think this decision is correct and should not be disturbed.

Data released by the Health Services Administration of New York City, as well as other areas, giving statistics on the time elapsed since *Roe v. Wade*, *supra*, was decided January 22, 1973, show the significant favorable impact this decision has had on maternal and infant mortality and morbidity. There is now an important alternative to women for whom childbirth would be a high risk—the very young, women who have had many previous pregnancies, women who are nearing menopause and women with medical handicaps, as well as for those women whose offspring risk death in infancy.

This data also shows a concomitant increase in maternal and child health with fewer out-of-wedlock births. In New York, enrollment in public maternity shelters has fallen off considerably. The number of children being placed for foster care or abandoned by their mothers has declined markedly.

Since legalization of abortion, there has been an unprecedented decline in the number of women hospitalized due to "botched" abortion. Prior to legalization of abortion, hospitals admitted thousands of women annually with complications resulting from incomplete abortion begun outside the hospital in abortion mills with no safeguards of supervised medical conditions. In New York City, alone, hospitals and clinics have provided care to more than half a million women over the last three years.

In California, prior to the institution of legal abortion, the major, single cause of maternal deaths was illegal abortion.

Legalized abortion makes a procedure which studies show would have taken place anyway, safer, less expensive and open. A disproportionate number of those who obtained abortion prior to its legalization were white and affluent.

The net result of a constitutional amendment which would outlaw abortion without regard to stage of pregnancy and other interest would be inconsistent with the rights protected by the Due Process and Equal Protection clauses of the 14th Amendment.

Historically, the fetus was not considered a person under the common law in both the

tort law and the criminal law. As to the status of a fetus under the Constitution, Federal and State courts have overwhelmingly rejected the suggestion that the unborn child is entitled, under the 14th Amendment, to equal protection and due process. (*Byrn v. N.Y.C. Health and Hospitals Corp.*, 31 N.Y. 2d 194, 335 N.Y.S. 2d 390, 286 N.E. 2d 887.)

We believe that the moral strictness of a segment of society should not be imposed on the whole of society. Anti-abortion laws would have that effect.

Overall, in view of the positive health results prevailing in communities since legalized abortion and the constitutional guarantees of privacy and liberty, we see no reason to turn the clock back and force women to bear children they do not want.

The views expressed in this letter result from a careful study by the Association's Committee on Sex and Law. We trust you will make them available to the distinguished members of your Subcommittee.

Respectfully yours,
ORVILLE H. SCHELL, Jr.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. PATMAN, a bipartisan group of 44 House Members has indicated concern about the new community development funding formula authorized in title I of H.R. 14490, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1974.

This legislation, now being marked up by the Banking Committee, establishes a new program of community development block grants starting in 1975 to replace existing HUD categorical programs such as urban renewal, model cities, open space, and water and sewer grants. Direct funding is provided on a formula basis to certain urban counties, central cities and all cities over 50,000.

Communities that have been funded for community development at a rate higher than their formula allocation—calculated on the basis of population, poverty, and overcrowding—are protected in part against a cut in Federal aid during the first 3 years of the new program through a "hold harmless" provision. During the second 3 years, however, their funding level is phased down to their formula allocation.

While the new title I block grant will mean fewer Federal restrictions and greater flexibility in program development, the title I funding system, we feel, will result in serious inequities. The formula allocation will be a boon to those cities that are not currently using Federal community development assistance. But the formula will mean a sharp decrease in funding for more than 100 cities now actively involved in urban renewal and/or model cities programs.

In a letter to Chairman PATMAN, we urge the Banking Committee to take the necessary steps to protect communities against these major funding cuts.

A copy of the letter follows:

MAY 22, 1974.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Banking and Currency Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We want to indicate our serious concern about the community development funding formula authorized in Title I of H.R. 14490.

Under H.R. 14490, many cities will experience a steady decrease in federal community development support after the new Title I block grant program is implemented. More than 80 cities, in fact, may find that their annual community development funding level has been cut in half by the sixth year of the new program.

In effect, this legislation is telling many cities, particularly those actively involved in urban renewal and/or model cities programs, that they must start cutting back local rebuilding efforts. It is difficult for us to justify this reduction in federal support during a time when so many of these cities are battling to maintain a healthy urban environment for their residents.

We urge the Banking and Currency Committee to take the steps necessary to prevent this major loss in community development program capacity, by strengthening the "hold harmless" protection provided in Title I of H.R. 14490.

Sincerely,

Brock Adams, John A. Blatnik, William Clay, Silvio O. Conte, John Conyers, Jr., Ronald V. Dellums, Charles Diggs, Thaddeus J. Dulski, Joshua Ellberg, Hamilton Fish, Jr., Donald M. Fraser, Robert Giaimo, Sam Gibbons, Bo Ginn, Ella Grasso, William J. Green, Michael Harrington, Orval Hansen, Frank Horton, Peter N. Kyros, Thomas Luken, and Parren J. Mitchell.

Edward J. Patten, Richardson Preyer, Melvin Price, Ogden R. Reid, Donald Riegle, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., William Roy, Ronald A. Sarasin, Paul S. Sarbanes, Patricia Schroeder, John F. Seiberling, Garner Shriver, Gerry E. Studds, Frank Thompson, Jr., Robert Tiernan, Bob Traxler, Morris Udall, Al Ullman, Jerome R. Waldie, Charles W. Whalen, Jr., G. William Whitehurst, and Andrew Young.

"A LAW ISN'T ENOUGH" BY CHARLES A. VANIK

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, the March/April edition of Hearing and Speech News, published by the National Association of Hearing and Speech Agencies, contains an illuminating article on the difficulties of the Federal program to rehabilitate the handicapped under the Nixon administration.

The article, "A Law Isn't Enough" was written by our distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable CHARLES A. VANIK. My colleagues are all aware of Mr. VANIK's strong support of programs for the handicapped as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and this article is further evidence of the leading advocacy role for the handicapped adopted by the gentleman from Ohio since he came to Congress, 20 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman VANIK effectively describes many of the difficulties, since the current administration came to office in 1969, of the 54-year-old vocational rehabilitation program for the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, the article to which I have referred follows:

A LAW ISN'T ENOUGH

(By HON. CHARLES A. VANIK)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, signed into law on September 26, 1973, contains five major sections.

1. The first section provides for continuation of the basic vocational rehabilitation services designed to aid handicapped persons "prepare for and engage in gainful employment to the extent of their capabilities."

2. This is a fairly standard research and training section in which funds are provided for developing better methods of training.

3. This section provides for "special federal responsibilities." Included in this are grants and contracts to assist in the construction and initial staffing of rehab facilities and the establishment of special programs for deaf-blind youths and adults and for others with special difficulties.

4. This program and project evaluation is designed to determine which programs and approaches are helpful, and which should be dropped in favor of new programs.

5. The final section—the one which Representative Vanik believes has the most potential if vigorously used—deals with Civil Service employment of the handicapped, further effort for removal of architectural and transportation barriers for the handicapped, fair employment of the handicapped by government contractors, and nondiscrimination against the handicapped by federal grantees. In short, this is the Civil Rights section of the bill and is designed to make it easier for the handicapped to obtain justice.)

Although many people are aware of the difficulties encountered in passage of the vocational rehabilitation bill, a detailed history can be important to an understanding of the problems that supporters of vocational rehabilitation will encounter in the future. Many people know that the bill was vetoed once by President Nixon, but fewer realize that the President vetoed the measure twice, despite overwhelming support in both houses of Congress. Closer examination shows that the federal government has pursued an undeclared policy of neglect that is apparently designed to eliminate federal vocational rehabilitation programs completely. The proposed alternative is a vendor system that would require the handicapped to identify their own needs and seek out services. Federally allotted money would be used to pay the bills.

In late 1970 Congress passed legislation to extend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act through June 30, 1972. Although the beginning of Administration neglect was apparent in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's and the Office of Management and Budget's lack of recommendations or reaction in response to Congressional deliberations, President Nixon did sign the bill into law on December 31, 1970. That Presidential signature was to be the last positive response to the needs of the physically handicapped for almost three years.

In May of 1971 Congressional consideration of new extending legislation began. Since previous authority ran until June of 1972, the Select Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee did not start hearings until January of 1972. At those hearings, in spite of requests by the subcommittee, proposals by the Administration—needed as a gauge of the Administration's position—were not forthcoming. Testimony by Administration representatives, however, was basically favorable and certainly gave no hint of the fate the legislation eventually would meet. Administration proposals still had not been received when the bill was reported out of committee in late February.

On March 20 the bill was passed in the House of Representatives, 327-0. A popular mandate if there ever was one!

The House-passed bill was considered by the Senate. Despite several more months of available time, Administration proposals still were not presented. On September 26 the Senate bill passed, 70-0, making the vote in both houses unanimous.

Despite this overwhelming Congressional support for the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the President vetoed the measure October 27. As soon as the bill was vetoed and the override attempt failed, the Select Education Subcommittee and its Chairman, John Brademas, attempted to solicit from the Administration specific objections to the bill so that the committee could make alterations to ensure enactment. These efforts met with little Administration cooperation.

Committee consideration of a second vocational rehabilitation bill encountered the same Administration reluctance. Administration witnesses would not object categorically to the proposals and provided little help. The colloquy between subcommittee Chairman Brademas and Administration witnesses from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare brought home the futility of attempts to move ahead by cooperating with the Administration.

Mr. BRADEMAs. But Mr. Kurzman [Asst. Secy. for Legislation, DHEW], let me ask you this question. You said that the Administration enthusiastically supports this program. I must say I found it very difficult, as chairman of this subcommittee, to get anything but rather generalized responses on the part of the Administration of their objections to the legislation that Congress unanimously approved.

Why is it so difficult for you to tell us what you want?

Mr. KURZMAN. I don't think it is so difficult at all, Mr. Chairman. We tried to get through to the Congress on this.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Do you have a bill you could give us today?

Mr. KURZMAN. As soon as the Senate approves the nomination of our Secretary, and we are in a position to present legislation to the Congress, we will be happy to send our bill up. At this point I am testifying on our position as to last year's bill and as to why the President vetoed it. I think our responses are specific.

Mr. BRADEMAs. The HEW Secretary-designate, Mr. Weinberger, was the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, wasn't he, at the time of the veto?

Mr. KURZMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I assume he knew about the bill, did he not?

Mr. KURZMAN. I assume so.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Well, this is February. We want to work. We want to move. Now, where is your bill?

Mr. KURZMAN. As soon as I said, Mr. Chairman, as the Senate sees fit to confirm Mr. Weinberger's nomination as Secretary, the department will be in a position to send up its bill.

Despite attempts to solicit Administration cooperation in construction of a second vocational rehabilitation bill that could reasonably satisfy both sides, the President vetoed the measure a second time on March 27, 1973. The President was again ignoring overwhelming Congressional support for the bill. The measure had passed the Senate, 86-2; it passed the House on an unrecorded voice vote. An attempt by the Senate to override the Presidential veto in early April failed to gather the necessary two-thirds margin. The vote was 60-36.

Legislative consideration of a third vocational rehabilitation bill proceeded very quickly. Since committee members had gone over identical ground twice before, the bills were soon reported to the House and Senate. Votes in both chambers were again overwhelmingly positive, although not quite unanimous this time. On September 26, after two Presidential vetoes and protracted Administration inaction and noncooperation

the President, perhaps finally aware of the program's tremendous popular support, signed the Vocational Rehabilitation Act into law.

But the national sigh of relief turned out to be premature, since implementation of the law is proceeding at only a snail's pace. Under the law, interim regulations were to have been published within 90 days: by December 25, 1973. But they did not appear in the Federal Register until January 3, 1974. To me, this is an indication that the Administration policy of inaction and bureaucratic inertia is still in effect. We can get Cost of Living Council and Energy Office regulations out overnight, but there seems to be little push to get the ball moving on behalf of the handicapped.

Congressional oversight hearings by the House select subcommittee in late November of 1973, over two full months after enactment of Public Law 93-112, showed further that the Administration's vocational rehabilitation policy had not changed. Attempts by Chairman Brademas to extract precise information on dates that the interim regulations would be available generally elicited incomplete answers. Congressman Brademas went so far as to chastise the Administration witnesses by saying:

"[I] would be less than candid if [I] did not observe that another purpose of the hearing is to educate some of the members of the Executive branch who may be new to their responsibilities of the means by which laws are to be made and administered under the American constitutional system of government. That intent has been and will continue to be to provide a learning experience so that members of the Executive branch will understand that our Constitution assigns to Congress the responsibility for the passage of legislation and to the Executive branch the responsibility for administering that legislation in accord with the intent of the Congress."

I followed up on Chairman Brademas efforts. In a further attempt to ensure federal agency compliance with the regulations of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, I sent letters to 35 federal departments—the Social Security Administration, the Department of Defense, and the Rehabilitation Services Administration, among others—asking them to inform me of how they intended to implement, in particular, title V of the law, which forbids discrimination against the handicapped in employment policies and which requires that the handicapped be given an opportunity to participate in federally supported programs. The 35 letters, mailed October 30, resulted in only 24 responses by mid-January. Content of the replies was as disappointing as their scarcity.

While most of the agencies professed a "firm commitment" to employment of the handicapped, no agency was able to cite specific plans to meet the mandate of Public Law 93-112. All of the agencies were waiting for Administration guidelines in the form of a directive from the Civil Service Commission. The agency replies indicated variously that guidelines were expected by December 26, by December 28, by the end of the year, or on January 1. Inquiries at the Civil Service Commission revealed that their proposed guidelines would not be ready on any of these dates. And indeed, it was January 11 before anything came from the Civil Service Commission to Congressional offices. This sequence of events provides more testimony about the unfortunate bureaucratic difference between the concept and practice of vocational rehabilitation.

It is very clear that as supporters of vocational rehabilitation we cannot afford to drop our guard now that the bill is finally public law. The delayed arrival of the interim regulations indicates that we must give effort to ensuring that the final regula-

tions are established properly and on time. Administration witnesses at the November oversight hearings could not estimate when these would be ready.

Federal agency compliance with Civil Service Commission guidelines is due March 20. It is important that we monitor that compliance as well as the Civil Service Commission review and approval process that will follow.

And of course we all know that Federal Register regulations are just the first step. In many ways these regulations are like bureaucratic "New Year's Resolutions." A nice list may not mean anything. Will the field programs actually be funded, or will there be more impounding of funds even though the courts have consistently struck down agency impoundments? Will the strong legislative language on nondiscrimination and program participation actually be enforced, or will it molder in the law books, unused and forgotten.

In matters of nondiscrimination in Civil Service hiring, equal structural access to public buildings, and participation in federally funded programs, what happens to the handicapped is in large part—perhaps totally—up to those of us who are qualified to use the new provisions and who are interested in their use. In view of the history of the vocational rehabilitation program and the reluctant bureaucratic response, the only way we can be sure that the new measures will be used successfully is by constant nagging—by inquiries to the agencies involved and by complaints about noncompliance to federal enforcement offices and Congressional committees.

The type of nondiscrimination provisions now in the law are not self-administering. The benefit of these provisions will not be gleaned automatically or even always, easily. There will be no federal bureaucrat knocking on the door to say that the education or manpower programs that once excluded the handicapped. The handicapped and those interested in helping the handicapped will have to go out and demand their rights under the new law.

In the meantime, while regulations are still being developed, letters of inquiry and concern can do much to indicate our expectations. Write to Caspar W. Weinberger, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; James Burress, Acting Commissioner, Rehabilitation Services Administration; and James S. Dwight Jr., Administrator, Social and Rehabilitative Service. Diligent oversight on the part of Congress and the American public is essential to assuring national commitment to vocational rehabilitation.

KEEPING AN EYE ON UNCLE SAM

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it appears that even though the United Nations has imposed sanctions against South Africa, the United States continues to consider South Africa a legitimate member of the world community. Such a policy is an affront to black Americans who have been betrayed by a government who is willing to ignore the morally reprehensible system of apartheid for short-term economic or even longer term military gain.

Black concern over a current U.S. policy appeared in the Amsterdam News of Saturday, May 11, 1974, in an article by H. Carl McCall which I place in the

RECORD at this time for the attention of my colleagues:

KEEPING AN EYE ON UNCLE SAM

(By H. Carl McCall)

Last week, newspapers and television had a field day pouring over the transcripts of the barroom conversations held in the Oval Office between President Nixon and his aides. Dell Publications and Bantam Books burned up their presses to get the material into the hands of the reading public, although the New York Times already ran the whole series.

In those transcripts, there's a lot of talk about "national security." It is now obvious, from the President's own released-and-approved words that "national security" is an umbrella thrown over anything the administration wants to hide from the electorate.

AN INSIDE PEEP

Which brings us to a revealing article in The Washington Post a couple of weeks ago. The Washington Post has a proud history of pulling the lid off the administration's Watergate secrets. Now an article by Ted Szulc, former Post correspondent in Portugal and currently a free-lance writer, gives us a peep at how Uncle Sam is playing his hand with regard to the freedom and independence of our brothers and sisters in mother Africa.

Quite simply, the United States sees the recent takeover of the Portuguese government by the military junta as a threat to its own self-interests. It remains to be seen how the junta will actually come to terms with the spirit of liberation and independence in Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea. But, at least, there's a hopeful new potential with the overthrow of the former oppressive and racist dictatorship.

U.S. READY TO HELP

As the junta was taking over in Lisbon, Portugal, the racist Nationalist Party of South Africa, headed by John Vorster, was returned to power by the all-white voters with an increased majority in the Assembly. And, as Mr. Szulc points out, the United States stands ready and waiting to support that white-supremacy, apartheid government.

The United States fears that the strengthening of Black power in Angola and Mozambique poses a threat to the stability of South Africa. Such a threat endangers the sea lanes around the Cape and to the Indian Ocean. Says Mr. Szulc, "Among the fears is that lack of access to southern Africa may deprive the U.S. and NATO countries of raw materials, ranging from uranium and other strategic metals to gold." To add to United States fears, the Soviet Union and China have long supported Black rebel efforts in Mozambique. With a shift in Black power, it's quite clear which countries would be rated highest on the list of friends.

SECRET PLANS

Mr. Szulc says that a year ago the United States and NATO started drawing up "secret contingency plans for air and naval defense of South Africa." The plans went to the drawing board when it appeared that Black rebels were gaining strength in Mozambique.

Specifically, in June, 1973, NATO's Defense Planning Committee told the Atlantic Supreme Allied Commander, based in Norfolk, Va., to develop plans for an allied air-naval task force to stand ready and waiting to defend South Africa should the need arise.

MILITARY AID

In addition, the United States has been providing "non-lethal" military equipment to Portugal, like jeeps, radio systems, spotter planes and defoliants. If defoliants are "non-lethal," the plants haven't heard about it yet!

Mr. Szulc also points out that the United States "has trained Portuguese officers in counter-insurgency at the jungle warfare

Army school at Ft. Gulick in the Panama Canal Zone and helped in training Portuguese pilots at bases in West Germany."

So, you see, those are the kinds of things covered-up by the President's pious phrase "national security." When one reads the President's transcripts and notes the little racial slurs and innuendos, it's quite clear that the President and his Pentagon would do anything in their power to uphold and support South Africa's racist government.

Ads urging volunteers to sign up for military service say, "The new navy wants to join you." And military spokesmen say the volunteer military may turn out to be 25 per cent Black.

We need to know how that "new navy" is being used. And if it's used to maintain and support the oppression of our brothers and sisters in Africa, we sure don't want to join it!

THE DEFENSE BUDGET

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor, in an editorial, recently expressed the view that the United States should not go on indefinitely as it has over the last 30 years automatically giving the Pentagon more or less everything it seeks. It calls for some serious rethinking of American military posture, which could lead to more security, not less. And it points out that since World War II, Congress—in a default of will and responsibility—has fallen into the habit of voting almost anything the Pentagon wants.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues this call for a reasoned and careful reappraisal of our defense needs. The editorial follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 20, 1974]

THE DEFENSE BUDGET

As surely as the swallows return to Capistrano (so far) the defense debate becomes acute in Washington in the month of May. The new military budget year begins on July first, only six weeks away. Congress has not yet completed the budget for the new defense year. It is the moment for the annual argument over how much military strength the United States needs to reach its annual climax. It is at climax now.

Symptomatic in the flow of a single day's news are two news items from opposite sides of the argument. Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt Jr., about to retire from the U.S. Navy's highest professional post, Chief of Naval Operations, contends that the Soviet Navy has now reached the ability to break the U.S. Navy's control of the sea-lanes of the world.

From the opposite side of the argument Paul C. Warnke, an Assistant Secretary of Defense in the Johnson administration, contends that the proposed new budget of \$85.8 billion "involves waste, continuance of unwise past programs, and unsound efforts at pump priming."

As always in the annual defense debate the basic question is how much money for what purpose, and the issue is not really drawn clearly between the Zumwalts and the Warnkes. Admiral Zumwalt is not really saying that the Soviet Navy is more powerful than the American. He is saying that in his

professional opinion the U.S. has lost the ability to control all the major sea-lanes of the world. It did have that power. The rise of Soviet sea power has turned at least some of the sea-lanes of the world into no-man's water. In case of a nonnuclear surface war the U.S. and Soviet navies would have to fight for control of individual sea-lanes.

But then, how likely is a nonnuclear surface sea war between the U.S. and the Soviets—or with anyone else for that matter?

Mr. Warnke has several good points in his argument that the proposed defense budget is too high. It is indeed loaded with non-military items some of which are more concealed than others. Economic pump priming is involved. So too is the subsidization of companies (often aircraft) which would probably go bankrupt without Pentagon support. President Eisenhower spoke out against the "military-industrial complex."

How much of the defense budget actually goes for support of shaky and noneconomic companies, and how much is just plain economic pump priming, and how much is actually for foreign policy purposes (Vietnam) rather than true American "defense" purposes?

The truth of the matter is that because of the "cold war" Congress has fallen into the habit, ever since World War II, of voting almost anything the Pentagon wants. It is the only budget which usually sails through Congress each year more or less untouched. It is the great sacred cow of these times. Other departments have fallen into the habit of loading as much of their projects onto the defense budget as possible. For example, the State Department couldn't get a penny out of Congress just now for Vietnam. Actually this year even the Pentagon can't get as much as the White House wants for that purpose, but it can still get something.

The result is that for the first time in American history the U.S. has not reduced its military budget and its military posture substantially after a major war (although it is down in percentage of GNP). The present military budget is about the same as that for the last year of World War II (in dollars). The military strength of the U.S. is still far above anything maintained by this country in previous between-wars times. World War II ended nearly 30 years ago. The U.S. has maintained the largest, strongest, and most expensive military position in the world over that length of time.

Obviously, there isn't time between now and July first to reappraise all the assumptions which lie beyond this military posture. The proposed budget will have to be approved more or less as it stands. There is no practical alternative.

But over the next year or two there really should be a serious rethinking of the American military posture. If the world truly is on the threshold of a generation of peace—does the U.S. need 16 Army and Marine Corps divisions, 39 tactical air wings, 508 naval vessels, and 506 strategic bombers? Is it vital that the U.S. Navy have control of all the major sea-lanes of the world? Should foreign policy and domestic economic ends be sought through the defense budget?

These are not easy questions to answer. We are not sure of any one of the answers. Neither the U.S. Government nor the U.S. people have really taken time out since the outbreak of the Korean war to think deeply into these questions. Conceivably, a serious rethinking would end in a conclusion that the U.S. needs more, not less, military power than it has. Yet, the thinking should be done, thoroughly. The U.S. should not go on indefinitely as it has over the last 30 years automatically giving the Pentagon more or less everything it seeks. It's time to question more carefully and thoughtfully.

BINARY CHEMICAL WEAPONS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, several of our colleagues are waging an effective and needed campaign to eliminate from the fiscal 1975 defense appropriation, moneys earmarked for procurement of the binary chemical weapons system.

The gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS) delivered a persuasive statement May 21 before the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on this subject. Previously, Mr. OWENS appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments chaired by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) and I had an opportunity to hear and question him.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the binary program is the wrong program at the wrong time being pursued for the wrong reasons. Testimony before committees with jurisdiction over this matter has been very useful in pointing this out. Mr. OWEN's statement is an excellent example of this testimony. I insert the statement following these remarks:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE WAYNE OWENS

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to appear before you today. I have been interested in the issue of our chemical warfare policies for many months, and have come to realize that the objectives of the Congress with regard to support of particular policies are probably most affected by the appropriations process.

There are other forums where the policy implications of Congressional and Executive decisions can be best examined. The House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on National Security Policy, for example, just last week concluded five days of hearings on H. Res. 679, which I introduced along with 45 cosponsors, calling for a comprehensive review of U.S. chemical warfare policies.

The hearings provided a review of the national security implications of our chemical warfare policies, including a thorough examination of the proposed new binary nerve gas system—which, although it has the small initial investment of \$5.8 million in the FY '75 budget, will end up costing an estimated \$1 to \$2 billion to replace our current stockpile.

I would hope that the information accumulated in those hearings would be studied and taken into account in your evaluation of that portion of the budget related to chemical warfare activities. Chemical warfare needs to be examined not just as a weapon system, but in terms of its international implications, and the effects our policy is having on the current negotiations at Geneva. With coordinated efforts of both committees examining this matter, the Congress can best make a decision on whether it is wise to proceed with an entirely new system of chemical warfare.

I am in favor of a delay in the approval of the Army's request for \$5.8 million dollars to begin the necessary first stages of what will become a more than \$200 million initial procurement program of binary chemical munitions to add about a 20% increment to our current chemical warfare stockpile.

I am fully aware of the arguments which

the Army has presented on the necessity for having this \$5.8 million approved in this year's request. Nowhere in these arguments have I heard any really convincing statements that the national security would be threatened if the proposed procurement program should be delayed. At the recent Foreign Affairs hearings DoD witnesses admitted that the money might not even be spent this year should some change take place in the current Executive policy as a result of the re-evaluation of U.S. chemical warfare policy now underway. This type of logic escapes me entirely. If there is a possibility that a definite decision to spend the money has not really been made, for whatever reason, then it seems irrational to me to put in the request just in case they might need the money. This type of fiscal planning is what bloats appropriations unnecessarily. If approved by the Congress, this type of planning almost forces a program to continue. It seems to me that a requested budget item should be supported by a full and complete evaluation including testing before a definite expenditure is requested. Yet, the Army has indicated that there was some possibility that the money would not even be spent. The statement was made in other hearings, for example, that a definite decision to initiate procurement has not been made. There is no doubt that the money is in the request for funds—if the decision has not been made to begin procurement because of incomplete testing or other factors, then it seems difficult to understand why the money has been requested. It is my opinion that this money should not be approved this year.

The reason for my position has been presented to the Congress in the Record a number of times. It is also important to note, however, that most of the witnesses testifying on this problem before the Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee were in agreement that Congressional approval of this funding request at this time would be interpreted by the world as meaning that Congress supports a position of modernization and expansion of U.S. chemical warfare stockpiles at the very time that the U.S. has also stated at Geneva that we are seriously interested in proposals to gain control over the prohibition of stockpiling and production of chemical weapons. This seems to me and to these experts to be irresponsible foreign policy. In fact, on the last day of the Foreign Affairs Committee hearings, it was terribly and embarrassingly obvious that the Department of State has not yet reached agreement within that Department as to just what this Nation's chemical warfare policies should be with regard to negotiations at Geneva. There appears to be serious disagreement between the Department at the Secretary's level and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I suspect that this disagreement is fostered in part by Department of Defense positions, or lack of definite position, on this same issue.

I believe that this disagreement within U.S. Executive policy-making groups is sufficient justification in itself to warrant postponement of Congressional approval for the initiation of procurement of the binary chemical weapons system. When we add to this disagreement the obfuscation produced by Army discussions on this issue, I believe that there is little question about the position which Congress should take on this issue. Certainly, the reactions with regard to the potential impact on current arms control negotiations have not been adequately studied. Witnesses before the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee such as Dr. Baxter, an eminently known scholar in the field of international law, and Dr. Price, the president of the American Chemical Society, a highly knowledgeable and professional chemist, both presented very logical arguments to point out that an assessment of

the probable effect of procurement of the binary system is not as clear and unequivocal as some Executive agency witnesses would have us believe. Other Executive agency witnesses agree with the private witnesses.

I must add also that despite their effort to justify a policy of chemical warfare deterrence as a necessary posture to counter a chemical warfare threat from other Nations, the Department of Defense does not present a very convincing case. The urgency for procuring the binary system as presented by DoD witnesses at the Foreign Affairs Committee hearings certainly was not well described. There was some indication that current stocks of munitions were not as adequate as might be desired, but the logistics problems associated with this problem were not discussed in any way so as to support the procurement of the binary as being the only method of solving this problem. There are many tons of nerve agent in bulk containers. These bulk agents could be transferred to munitions of conventional types in a real emergency.

I personally do not know what sort of emergency situation could be visualized wherein the enemy would wait until we either moved more munitions overseas from domestic sites or during which our forces could resist a strong chemical attack and survive without resorting to nuclear weapons. Much of the logic of the DoD seems to be based upon some sort of situation in which the chemical attack would be made in a modest or gentlemanly fashion which would permit us to retaliate in a limited fashion with chemical weapons, reach a stalemate, and then go on to some other type of warfare. I believe that any enemy desperate enough to launch a chemical attack will do so only with an overwhelming attack which would require immediate nuclear retaliation or a total loss by our forces on the battlefield. Certainly the DoD briefings emphasize a Soviet capability to use chemical weapons on such a large scale if they do so at all.

This type of desperate situation leads me to the next point of concern which I would like to discuss. In addition to the obvious and serious differences of opinion about our chemical warfare disarmament policies which exist in the Executive branch, the Department of Defense was quite openly frank during the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee hearings in pointing out that there is a serious disparity between the chemical defensive capabilities of the Soviet Union forces and those of the United States. When the equipment is compared, the U.S. seems to come out behind. What is particularly serious about this difference is that it seems to be most readily apparent in the abilities of the operating forces. That is, the Soviet forces seem to train intensively with good equipment available to all soldiers, while I gather from what I have heard in the testimony, our forces are not similarly equipped or trained.

There are a number of reasons why this disparity may be present. It is certainly not due to a lack of Congressional support of programs for research, development and test of defensive equipment. It may be due in part to a belief on the part of our field commanders that the chemical warfare threat is not as potent as described here in Washington; this could lead in turn to a lack of enthusiasm to inculcate the chemical warfare defensive discipline that is necessary for adequate defense, or it could mean that we simply have not funded the procurement of adequate quantities of defensive equipment so that all of our forces are equipped with the necessary gear—as a part of their regular equipment, not stored in some warehouse for contingency planning—so that our forces can operate with confidence with this equipment.

If it is a lack of conviction on the part of the operating forces of the seriousness

of the threat, then the corrective action is one of education and indoctrination. If, however, the disparity is one of inadequate procurement then the necessary corrective action is equally obvious. On the basis of what I have learned, it appears that the problem is in large part due to a failure to translate the results of research, development, test, and evaluation of defensive equipment into standardization and procurement of sufficient quantities to fully equip each and every one of the men in our forces.

I suggest, therefore, that we have an opportunity at this time to correct a serious and acknowledged deficiency in the chemical defensive posture of our forces by recommending that the funds requested for the beginning of the procurement of the binary munition be used instead to purchase such additional quantities of defensive chemical warfare equipment as are required to correct the quantitative deficiencies which have been acknowledged by our armed forces representatives during various testimonies before the Congress. This improved defensive posture is needed regardless of any decision which may be made at Geneva—and in fact, should enhance our negotiations posture.

We could thus accomplish two objectives. We could require the Executive Branch to come forward with an agreed upon analysis of the overall foreign policy implications of the proposed procurement of the binary chemical warfare munition before funds are approved for this purpose (and in the meantime produce an atmosphere more conducive to disarmament negotiations at Geneva). We could also direct our Armed Forces to immediately correct the currently inadequate chemical defensive posture of our forces. As noted by other public statements by expert witnesses, a strong defensive posture is a strong deterrent to the use of chemical warfare agents. I have already expressed these sentiments to the Secretary of Defense by letter. I offer a copy of this letter for inclusion in the record of the hearings. I am also offering a letter for the record of the hearings which I received from a well known former Advanced Research Projects Agency employee who offers a number of ideas about new techniques of chemical defense which seem to warrant investigation.

Finally, I believe that these proposals which I am offering will emphasize to the Executive that the Congress has no intention of continuing to support an offensive chemical warfare program aimed at modernization and expansion of our stockpiles until all aspects of the current internal disagreements in chemical arms control policies, including the difficulties associated with the ratification of the Geneva Protocol in the Senate and the need to maintain CW stockpiles at all, have been fully resolved and explained in a manner satisfactory to the Congress.

THE CASE FOR A FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION—NO. 36

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, opponents of the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation charge that FOGC would destroy the very element it is supposed to bring to the oil industry—competition.

Speaking to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, W. T. Slick, Jr., senior vice president of Exxon USA, charged that the Corporation would ultimately destroy competition in the energy indus-

tries. Mr. Slick was quoted as saying in the Pecos Enterprise:

Backers of the Consumer Energy Act insist they don't intend to kill private enterprise, yet they are proposing, as an integral part of the Act, the establishment of a potential replacement—to be known as the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation.

As an executive in one of the world's most powerful energy industries, Mr. Slick surely is aware of the anticompetitive nature of the oil industries. Several studies have pointed out that the role played by the major oil companies in oil and other related industries hardly encourages competition.

As a new element in the energy industry, the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation—a publicly owned Corporation—would compete with the major oil companies, and would restore competitive influences in a field where they are sorely needed.

In further criticism of the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation, Mr. Slick said:

Lacking operating and technical experience—to say nothing of the motive to make a profit—the new government company could hardly develop production as rapidly as private operators who otherwise would be developing the same leases.

Private companies, however, have not proved themselves to be responsible developers or marketers. While consumer gasoline use dropped during the energy crisis this winter, prices reached alltime highs and the major oil companies reported astronomic profits.

The consumer deserves to have a representative in the energy industry. Research and development of alternate sources of energy must begin now, and a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation could make important inroads and encourage private development.

One of the most important features of the proposed Federal Oil and Gas Corporation, however, is that it would act as a standard for evaluating major oil company production and profits. It would neither destroy free enterprise in the industry nor limit American energy production. The Federal Oil and Gas Corporation would merely add competition to the industry and lend perspective to major oil company profits.

VIABILITY AND ABORTION

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, in the September 1970 issue of California Medicine, the official journal of the California Medical Association, there appeared an editorial favoring abortion entitled "A New Ethic for Medicine and Society." The editorial contained the following paragraph:

The process of eroding the old ethic and substituting the new has already begun. It may be seen most clearly in changing attitudes toward human abortion. In defiance of the long held Western ethic of intrinsic and equal value for every human life regardless of its stage, condition or status, abortion is becoming accepted by society as

moral, right and even necessary. It is worth noting that this shift in public attitude has affected the churches, the laws and public policy rather than the reverse. Since the old ethic has not yet been fully displaced it has been necessary to separate the idea of abortion from the idea of killing, which continues to be socially abhorrent. The result has been a curious avoidance of the scientific fact, which everyone really knows, that human life begins at conception and is continuous whether intra- or extra-uterine until death. The very considerable semantic gymnastics which are required to rationalize abortion as anything but taking a human life would be ludicrous if they were not often put forth under socially impeccable auspices. It is suggested that this schizophrenic sort of subterfuge is necessary because while a new ethic is being accepted the old one has not yet been rejected.

Semantic gymnastics are not the only characteristic of the proabortionist arguments; convoluted logic is their major characteristic, as evidenced by the 1973 decision of the Supreme Court Roe against Wade. Dr. John T. Noonan, professor of law at the University of California, pointed out that—

The Court declares that if those trained in medicine, philosophy, and theology are unable to arrive at a consensus as to when life begins, then "the judiciary is not in a position to speculate as to the answer" Wade, p. 44). Incompetence in the area is avowed.

Three pages later, Justice Blackmun describes the abortion statute of Texas as "adopting one theory of life" and rejects that theory as a ground for regulating abortion. Is this the Judiciary "speculating as to the answer" or is it not? How can Texas—and the other states with comparable statutes—be wrong in protecting fetal life against arbitrary extinction unless the majority of the Court knows better when life begins? ...

Beneath the avowal of incompetence is a commitment to a particular theology or theory of human life. Life is an interest worthy of state protection when it acquires the characteristic of "viability" or "the capability of meaningful life outside the mother's womb." At this point, state protection has both logical and biological justification." (Wade, p. 48). At this point, in short, life has characteristics that other humans may recognize. At this point, functionally, the Justice says human life begins.

The situation existing in the Wade decision and ever since is that a confessedly incompetent Court has made a decision overturning a century of legislation protecting the right of the unborn child to life.

This, unfortunately, is not the only absurdity in the Court's Wade decision. The criterion of human life, according to Justice Blackmun, who says he does not know, is viability, the "capability of meaningful life outside the mother's womb." It is imperative that this judicial speculation as to the beginning of life be given closer examination. Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary defines viable as "1: capable of living; esp.: born alive with such form and development of organs as to be normally capable of living; 2: capable of growing or developing; ... 3: workable." Now obviously the third meaning is irrelevant to this discussion, and so we eliminate it without further ado. Let us consider the second meaning first.

An unborn child can be considered viable according to the second meaning, for it is quite obvious that it is ca-

pable of growing or developing. Thus the unborn child passes the test of viability in the second meaning. But does it pass the test of viability in the first sense "capable of living?" Since the unborn child is actually alive, it is capable of living. But the first meaning does not stop with "capable of living"; it proceeds to give a special meaning: "born alive with such form and development of organs as to be normally capable of living."

First, I would like to point out that any child born with a defect is not "normally capable of living," and thus is not viable under this definition. The argument that such children should be killed has often been made, particularly by the ancient Greeks, who were not influenced by Christianity. More important, however, is the absurdity of this test of viability. For obvious reasons an unborn child cannot pass the test of viability if the test entails being born in a certain condition. Isn't the test of viability in this sense a bit like testing air for its solidity, and upon finding it to be rather insubstantial, declaring it not to be air? A test of an unborn child that requires it to be born is nonsense.

There is another absurdity in the test of viability. The abortionists assert that the unborn child flunks the test of viability, that is, that it is not capable of living. However, the child is already living. So the abortionists recommend a procedure which makes the child non-viable: they kill it. If the child were indeed not capable of living, the procedure recommended for achieving its death would not be needed. The child would be already dead, or would in the normal course of events die.

That it is not and does not prove that it is indeed viable. The test of viability is merely a subterfuge, a rationalization, for the actions the abortionists are determined to perform anyway. The test is an absurdity. But one should always ask the purpose of nonsense, and not stop at exposing the nonsense. The purpose of this bit of nonsense about viability is becoming increasingly clear: by it the abortionists hope to justify their practice of homicide.

Justice Blackmun in the Wade decision gave his own definition of "viability," a definition quite similar to the one given by Webster which we have discussed above; "born alive with such form and development of organs as to be normally capable of living." Justice Blackmun's definition, "capability of meaningful life outside the mother's womb," is so vague that it is nearly meaningless, in addition to being absurd as a test for unborn children. Yet the Justice offers his definition as the basis for determining when the law shall take effect, when a person comes under the protection of a law. What is the meaning of meaningful?

I suggest that meaningful is not a word which conveys any understandable content in this context. Like the word "social," it is a corrupting word. Justice becomes social justice, life becomes meaningful life. Social justice and meaningful life replace justice and life. By this substitution we are supposed to conclude that social justice is somehow different from and superior to justice, and that meaningful life is somehow different from

and superior to life. How they differ, and how they are superior, we are not told. That is anybody's guess. And that is why such words, when accepted as formulas for political or jurisprudential action, are so dangerous: anybody may plug any content they wish into such a phrase as meaningful life. In the hands of the government, such a criterion for deciding who shall live and who shall die, who is protected by the law and who is not, is perhaps the most dangerous of all situations. The editorial in California Medicine to which I referred earlier began with these words:

The Traditional Western Ethic has always placed great emphasis on the intrinsic worth and equal value of every human life regardless of its stage or condition. This ethic has had the blessing of the Judeo-Christian heritage and has been the basis for most of our laws and much of our social policy. The reverence for each and every human life has also been a keystone of Western medicine and is the ethic which has caused physicians to try to preserve, protect, repair, prolong and enhance every human life which comes under their surveillance. This traditional ethic is still clearly dominant, but there is much to suggest that it is being eroded at its core and may eventually even be abandoned. This of course will produce profound changes in Western medicine and in Western society.

What is not yet so clearly perceived is that in order to bring this about hard choices will have to be made with respect to what is to be preserved and strengthened and what is not, and that this will of necessity violate and ultimately destroy the traditional Western ethic with all that this portends. It will become necessary and acceptable to place relative rather than absolute values in such things as human lives, the use of scarce resources and the various elements which are to make up the quality of life or of living which is to be sought. This is quite distinctly at variance with the Judeo-Christian ethic and carries serious philosophical, social, and economic and political implications for Western society and perhaps for world society.

Our civilization is being challenged at its very heart by the demand for liberalized abortion. The distinction between guilt and innocence has been replaced by the distinction between viable and nonviable, meaning and meaningless. Social justice is replacing justice; meaningful life is replacing life. We are jettisoning the rule of presumed innocence, in favor of the rule of presumed nonviability, a substitution that must result in the hideous slaughter of the innocent so characteristic of modern and ancient totalitarian regimes. Under the rule of law a man's life, property, and liberty could be taken legally only if guilt were established beyond reasonable doubt in a court of law. But the Supreme Court in the abortion decisions abandoned the rule of law and substituted the rule of personal whim. The Court has declared that certain classes of people, women and physicians, have the right to kill members of another class, unborn children. No evidence of the guilt of the victim need be presented for this extrajudicial killing to occur, no confrontation of witnesses required, no trial by one's peers permitted.

If private individuals may engage in such activities, the Government has recognized a standard of justice other than guilt or innocence. It is this new standard

of justice that will overcome the standard of guilt or innocence, or be itself overcome. No legal system can long survive which accepts two conflicting standards. Where the categories of guilt and innocence are discarded, then one can be certain that the innocent will suffer. That is why the Court's abortion decisions are so revolutionary; they undermine the foundations of our legal system, and herald the end of our civilization. It is of the greatest importance that Congress act to overturn the Court's decision now.

SOVIETS LOBBY FOR DÉTENTE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have grown callous toward the high-pressure lobbying carried on in their Nation's Capital. But last week's lobby operation by a Soviet pressure group must go down in history as a first.

Like all other foreign lobbyists, the Communists from Russia were looking for special interest treatment, which like most other operations in our foreign policy, means dollars from the paychecks of the American people.

A related news clipping follows:

[From the Washington Star-News, May 24, 1974]

SOVIETS LOBBY FOR DÉTENTE

(By Oswald Johnston)

A high-ranking Soviet delegation has wound up an unprecedented lobbying operation on behalf of the Nixon administration's detente and trade policies with a flood of goodwill rhetoric but with, apparently, few congressional minds changed.

The visitors, billed as an eight-man delegation of Soviet parliamentarians, was headed by Boris N. Ponomarev, a Politburo alternate member and an adept official ideologist. They included representatives of Pravda, Izvestia, Tass and Literaturnaya Gazeta. Most were trusted Communist Party Central Committee members.

The visit itself was billed as a demonstration of detente in action.

Nevertheless, congressional managers of trade bill amendments demanding Jewish emigration rights as the price for trade and credit benefits professed to see the visit as a last-ditch lobbying campaign on the eve of President Nixon's hoped-for Moscow summit next month.

The Soviet delegation met with President Nixon yesterday and, during a 20-minute session alone with Nixon, Ponomarev gave the President a personal message from Soviet leader Leonid I. Brezhnev. The White House is keeping the message secret, indicating a possible connection with the summit.

The White House has not provided any firm information about the trip yet, and Nixon has been urged by some members of Congress to put off the visit until the impeachment proceedings are completed.

But deputy press secretary Gerald L. Warren said he saw no reason to think the President would be in a weak negotiating position if he meets Brezhnev while the House impeachment proceedings are still under way.

Members of the Soviet delegation's target committees—foreign relations and finance in the Senate, foreign affairs and finance in the House—were less apt to brand the visit an administration plot. But, as one House

staff aide observed, nobody had any doubt the Soviets would take advantage of a chance to lobby against the Jackson Amendment at this time.

In addition to Ponomarev, a key Communist party official since 1936, the main persuaders on the delegation were the three leading ideologists and publicists with the group: Zamyatin, a veteran diplomat who is now director general of Tass, the Soviet news agency, and who accompanied Brezhnev to Washington at last June's summit; Lev N. Tolkunov, chief editor of Izvestia; and Georgiy A. Zhukov, special political correspondent for Pravda.

Zhukov especially, congressional sources reported, tended to put a polemical cast on his declarations, at one point warning in obvious reference to Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., and his supporters that "the dangerous momentum of the cold war is still with us" raising the "ghosts of past fears with their mystical threats."

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM IS IMPERATIVE

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, as a junior Congressman from Utah and a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I have been in a unique position over the past 2 years to observe the steady erosion of public confidence and trust in government. I am not only speaking of the tragic affair which has become known as Watergate, but the dismal and disheartening ability of Congress to reform itself.

We are at what the historians will observe as a turning point in the constitutional government of this great country. Watergate, as painful as it is, has marked this point in our history and demonstrated that the American people wish to find the truth about their country so that they can correct deficiencies. Congress, however, has yet to live up to the American people's ethic when it comes to its own reform. Congressional reform is just as important as "clearing up Watergate" in the executive branch of Government. We must bring Congress role in the Government of this country back to its historical perspective, and return the public's confidence and trust in their Government.

OPEN LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURES

One of the most critical areas for reform is opening up the operations of Congress to public scrutiny. Nothing can better facilitate the return of the public's confidence and trust in its Government than an open Congress where business is conducted in full view and not behind closed doors labeled "executive session." In fact, opening the Government agencies to the public as well as congressional committees would be a tremendous step in the right direction.

In an open Congress, procedures could be developed to insure that congressional committee meetings concerning matters which legitimately relate to national security or the internal management of a committee would remain closed. Any committee meeting which would reflect

adversely on the character or reputation of an individual or may divulge matters required to be kept confidential could also be closed to the public under the appropriate safeguards. I have cosponsored legislation in this area, and I believe that it should be first in priority for any meaningful congressional reform.

OPEN FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

Another top priority is legislation which would require disclosure of financial interests by Members of Congress and employees of Congress. Financial information could be contained in annual reports which would be filed with the Comptroller General and made available for public inspection. Full disclosure of the amounts and sources of income, value of assets held, and substantial business transactions would certainly improve the image of Members of Congress and promote public confidence in the legislative branch of Government. I have done this the last 2 years on a voluntary basis, but only a small minority make this disclosure.

BUDGET REFORM

There is a compelling need for Congress to reassume full control over the purse which has slowly slipped out of congressional hands. Serious erosion of Congress constitutional role in this area has been accomplished by consistent escalation of Executive influence over budget and fiscal policies, and the imbalance of power if allowed to continue threatens a most basic part of our Constitution. Both the House and the Senate have passed similar versions of a budget reform bill to replace the chaotic, fragmented congressional procedures now used to consider the budget.

First, a procedure would be established whereby the President must notify Congress whenever he impounds funds which have already been appropriated. Congress would either approve the President's decision or require the President to cease such action if congressional power over spending is to be maintained.

Second, a division within the legislative branch which is comparable to the Office of Management and Budget would be established with an adequate number of expert personnel responsible only to Congress. This Congressional Budget Office would significantly help Congress exercise responsible oversight of the executive branch of government with respect to the preparation and administration of the budget, the raising of revenue, the expenditures of moneys, the preparation and presentation of legislative proposals concerning the same, and the implementation of legislative programs enacted by Congress. In addition, such a division could undertake other responsibilities Congress finds necessary or desirable to maintain the independence and constitutional prerogatives of the legislative branch.

Third, the proposal would establish budget committees in both houses to set

spending targets and force Congress to reconcile national outgo with income before voting on the separate appropriations bills. The appropriations committees must base their many separate budget decisions on this comprehensive consideration of budget priorities by the budget committees.

This strong system to bring Federal spending under control will soon be forged into law. For the first time Congress will operate with a comprehensive picture of revenues coming in and expenditures going out.

COMMITTEE REFORM

Committee realignment is long overdue. Since the last major realignment in the House in 1946, committee jurisdictions and the problems Congress should be addressing have shifted. In vital areas such as energy, environment, and transportation, jurisdiction is fractured among numerous committees and subcommittees. This has resulted in misplaced priorities, proliferation of conflicting programs, or in some cases, legislative stalemate. In other areas such as health, action has been stalled due to excessive committee workload.

A select House committee headed by Congressman RICHARD BOLLING has conducted a thorough review of committee jurisdictions and has suggested recommendations to eliminate overlap. Unfortunately, this proposal has been delayed by Members of the House who guard longstanding positions of power. The response to the Bolling report is a perfect example of the difficulties Congress faces in reforming itself. I hope that Members will recognize the need to bring the congressional framework up to a modern level and implement some meaningful committee reform this year.

Opening Congress operations to the public, disclosure of financial interests of employees and Members of Congress, budget reform, and committee reform are some of the most important areas for congressional reform. They require immediate attention. However, reform does not and cannot stop with these four areas. Many others require serious and thoughtful consideration by Congress to improve its image and return the public's confidence and trust in their legislative branch of Government.

While a complete list of the needed areas of congressional reform would be lengthy and extensive, I would like to make a partial list of those other areas which I believe are important, and where reform legislation has already been proposed either by myself or other Members of Congress.

SENIORITY

First, one of the traditions which must be overcome to strengthen Congress is the rigid adherence to the seniority system. Most drafting work of legislation occurs in the various committees of both Houses. This is a crucial stage in the legislative process, and chairmen of committees have great power in determining the final outcome. A Member's responsibilities on a committee and his access

to committee staff assistance is currently determined primarily by length of service, not by measure of ability. I suggest that committee chairmen and the ranking minority committee members be elected by secret ballot in the party caucuses. Both the committee chairmen and committee members would know that leadership had been decided on merit, not on longevity. I also suggest that committee chairmen give up their position at the age of 65.

OVERSIGHT

Second, Congress not only has the responsibility of writing the laws of the land, but it must also see that the executive branch carries them out. Through oversight, Congress is supposed to determine whether Federal programs are administered in a manner which satisfies the intention of Congress. However, the most Congress has done about oversight is to overlook it as an obligation.

I have introduced legislation to review the impact of legislative actions. My proposals would establish legislative review subcommittees within each standing committee of Congress to conduct continual oversight functions. Separate committee staff would be employed to concentrate solely on legislative oversight and review. Oversight priorities would be set, programs evaluated, and reforms recommended. Implementation of these proposals would help satisfy the critical need for legislative oversight.

POLICY RESEARCH

Third, Congress is not equipped to perform the necessary research and analysis required for presentation of a legislative program similar to the President's. Most of the significant legislation which goes through the legislative process is initially researched and proposed by the executive branch. Congress must reverse this trend if it is ever to become a co-equal branch of Government. I have therefore proposed legislation to provide policy committees for the two major parties in both Houses with the expert staff and resources so that Congress can exhibit some initiative and introduce fresh ideas in our lawmaking process. This will bolster the leadership's access to expert advice and eliminate Congress passive role in continually accepting and ratifying executive branch proposals.

CONGRESSIONAL OMBUDSMAN

Fourth, an Office of Congressional Ombudsman should be created to investigate actions and operations of the various agencies of the U.S. Government. Such a congressional ombudsman would be responsible only to Congress, much like the Congressional Research Service and the Government Accounting Office. He would, principally, do constituent case work at the request of Members of Congress, with the help of a staff trained in the different casework areas; that is, social security, veterans, and military. Because staff members would become expert in the law, regulations, and procedures in a given area, they could move more effectively than a caseworker in an individual congressional office.

COMMUNICATIONS AND COMPUTERS

Fifth, an Office of Congressional Communications should be established to maintain a video-tape library of important public interest broadcasts, provide closed-circuit telecasts of committee proceedings, arrange for each Member of Congress to view such documents in his own office, and further modernize the communications information services available to the Congress.

In addition, Congress should utilize modern computer technology as a research device. Information retrieval systems should be programmed to include the status of legislation, congressional schedules, and background materials on issues of national concern, with a computer terminal in every Congressman's office.

CITIZENS' COMMITTEE

Finally, a citizens' committee to study Congress in order to assist in an appraisal of itself as an institution would be essential to encourage positive public interest in making changes in Congress at a time when there is strong public sentiment favoring reform.

CONCLUSION

We have in Congress an organization with structures and procedures that were designed to solve problems which no longer exist. The current lack of public confidence in Government performance must motivate Congress to undertake some critical self-analysis and to follow through with effective reforms. Congress must have the tools to deal with today's complex problems and to uphold its part of the balance between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

Reform in all of these areas and many others would improve the image of Congress and help return the public's confidence and trust to their legislative branch of Government. It is imperative that Congress undertake a major exercise in self-improvement. Congress must regain the policymaking authority which it has increasingly abdicated to the executive branch. I will work for improvement and continue to suggest reforms in an attempt to transform Congress into an effective, up-to-date institution.

SOCIAL SECURITY—THE GREAT RIPOFF—NO. 3

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in part three of a series concerning social security, reporter Warren Shore of Chicago Today points out that the majority of today's younger workers will not become aware of the inequities of the system until their middle years. He writes,

By then, it will be too late.

The questions they should be asking right now, states Mr. Shore, include:

Why should the cost of protection during my healthiest years (22 to 45) come to more than \$50,000?

Why should that bill be going up every year when the protection I'm promised is going down?

Why should my wife (in the case of a male worker who dies or becomes disabled) be faced with government-imposed alternatives that are so bad she might not be able to claim her benefits?

Mr. Shore concludes that,

The real answer is that Social Security is not insurance at all. In spite of federal publications describing Social Security's "benefits" or "contributions" or the existence of a special insurance trust fund, the system is emphatically unlike insurance.

What social security officials euphemistically call a "contribution" is, states Mr. Shore,

A \$100 to \$120 a month worker/employer payroll tax which if unpaid would result in federal prosecution. If you're covered by the system, you can't get out.

Warren Shore has spent many months examining the social security system, how it works, and how it affects those who are dependent upon it.

Chicago Today is performing an important public service in bringing this material to the attention of the American people. I wish to share this series with my colleagues and today am inserting part three, which appeared in Chicago Today of May 1, 1974 in the RECORD. The previous parts of this series have already been inserted into the RECORD and the subsequent parts will be placed into the RECORD at a later time.

THE VICTIMS OF SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Warren Shore)

(NOTE.—Is Social Security a ripoff for young people? Reporter Warren Shore has spent months examining the federal law, talking to recipients, representatives in the field, and insurance experts. He went so far as to set up a special computer program from which many of the startling figures in this series are based. In fairness Chicago Today next week will make space available to the Social Security Administration to respond with its side of the story.)

For most of today's young wage earners the real inequities of the Social Security system won't become clear until their middle years. By then it will be too late.

The questions they should be asking right now include:

Why should the cost of protection during my healthiest years [22 to 45] come to more than \$50,000?

Why should that bill be going up every year when the protection I'm promised is going down?

Why should my wife [in the case of a male worker who dies or becomes disabled] be faced with government-imposed alternatives that are so bad she might not be able to claim her benefits?

The real answer to all these questions is that Social Security is not insurance at all. In spite of federal publications describing Social Security's "benefits" or "contributions" or the existence of a special insurance "trust fund," the system is emphatically unlike insurance.

What the Social Security Administration calls a contribution is, in fact, a \$100 to \$120-a-month worker/employer payroll tax which if unpaid would result in federal

prosecution. If you're "covered" by the system, you can't get out.

As for the trust fund, it's simply a myth. More about that in another installment.

While the middle, child-raising years are the time when most couples need the greatest protection, it's also the time when Social Security can be the cruelest.

Mrs. Marion Poteka found out the hard way. When her husband, Joseph, died recently of a heart attack at age 39, Mrs. Poteka was left with the couple's two sons, mortgage payments and some hard decisions.

"When Joe died," she recalls, "I was in a fog for a few weeks. But when I came home from the Social Security office, I was sick all over again."

The family benefit check, Mrs. Poteka learned, was not computed on the insurance value of what Mr. Poteka paid in taxes or even the family's need. It's based on the "average contribution" Joseph Poteka made to Social Security during his entire working career.

The difference is critical. Poteka was earning more than \$14,000 a year when he died, but there were many leaner years before that.

The "average" for all those years came to slightly more than \$6,600, which meant that the total family benefit check, for Mrs. Poteka and her two sons (ages 10 and 8), would be \$435 a month.

"That would have helped a lot," Mrs. Poteka said, "but then the man explained that I couldn't get it."

What the Social Security representative explained was the system's incredible "earnings test." Because Mrs. Poteka is making \$145 a week as a food store checkout clerk, the family benefit check must be "reduced," he said.

What he should have said was that the benefit would be all but destroyed. The law says that a widow cannot receive full benefits if she earns more than \$2,400 a year. That's \$200 a month.

Thus, because Mrs. Poteka earns \$7,540 a year as a checkout clerk [now the family's only source of income], her \$435-a-month benefit is "reduced" to \$220.

"I couldn't believe it when he told me," Mrs. Poteka recalled. "Joe and I were both working to make ends meet. Now this man tells me I'll have to quit my job and live on \$435 a month—or keep my job and lose over \$300 a month in benefits. What kind of choice is that?"

Mrs. Poteka, like a lot of others, chose to keep working and take the tiny benefit "so maybe I can get ahead on the job and keep us above water," but she still says bitterly, "Joe's Social Security money was wasted."

In fact, the choice Marion Poteka faced was worse than she knew—and even more cruel. Had she "retired" to take the full \$435 she would have lost valuable years on the job needed to qualify for Social Security retirement benefits.

By law, she will collect the family benefit [even the reduced amount] only as long as she has a child under 18 [22 if in college]. That's less than 13 years for Mrs. Poteka. She will get nothing more until she turns 62—a 12-year gap.

Mrs. Poteka [and everyone else born after 1929] needs to work at least 10 years to qualify for retirement benefits. Even a fraction less than the full amount means she gets nothing on retirement.

Thus, if she had chosen to stop working to collect her full death benefit she might have lost her chance at collecting any retirement money at all.

At last count almost 40 per cent of American widows drawing Social Security benefits get a reduced amount because they earn more than \$1,680 a year.

For those young workers entering the job market now, the deal is even worse. Rising Social Security taxes mean they will have paid more than \$20,000 [and their employers a like amount] by the time they reach the age when Joe Poteka died.

Those they leave behind then will have the same choices as Marion Poteka. Benefit increases are tied to the cost of living and by law will rise only the same as the Social Security tax increases.

Since a widow can only collect death benefits while she has children under 22, the value of Social Security for a stable family shrinks every month.

This is because the money needed to pay for monthly death benefits grows less as the youngest child in a family approaches 22. Yet Social Security taxes for the family will grow every year.

FISCAL YEAR 1975 APPROPRIATIONS AND THE BINARY NERVE GAS SYSTEM

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months I have provided a number of statements for the RECORD which were intended to inform the Members of the House about actions which I and a number of other Members have been taking to secure an examination of U.S. chemical warfare policies. Although these efforts have been relatively modest in comparison with several other legislative programs of concern to the Congress, I do believe that there has been some success in bringing congressional attention to bear on an issue which could lead to increasingly complex problems if not resolved at this time.

If I may, I would like to summarize very briefly for the benefit of all the Members, the events which have led us to the crucial point we now face in our considerations of the Department of Defense fiscal year 1975 appropriations bill.

Last summer, the U.S. Army proposed to transfer toxic nerve agents from the Rocky Mountain Arsenal to another storage site for destruction. One of the proposed sites was the Tooele Storage Depot in my district. A number of Representatives joined me in questioning the advisability of such a transfer. We also were disturbed to note that a task which had been thought to have been well underway had not even been started. I introduced legislation at that time, H.R. 9745 and other bills, and was joined by a number of cosponsors on this legislation, which was intended to prevent the transfer of these chemical agents and avoid any danger to the residents of towns through which such deteriorating munitions would have been transported. Hearings were held on these bills before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Armed Services Committee in October 1973. During these public hearings, the Army reversed its position, decided that the toxic

nerve agent munitions could be destroyed on site and that the bulk agent was surplus to our national security requirements and could also be destroyed on site. I believe that my legislation and the public examination of these bills in hearings were directly instrumental in accelerating the U.S. Army decision to dispose of these materials on site.

During this same period, I learned that the Army was planning to begin the procurement of a new series of nerve agent munitions—the binary chemical weapons system which has now been discussed quite thoroughly in the RECORD and in the public media—see for example, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD "Binary Nerve Gas," Extensions of Remarks, March 20, 1974. Of more interest to the Members is the fact that this procurement is intended for immediate initiation—the sum of 5.8 million dollars is included in the fiscal year 1975 Department of Defense appropriations bill. This relatively small sum will eventually lead to a minimum expenditure of about \$200 million for the conversion of about 20 percent of our CW munitions stockpile to the binary artillery shell.

Normally, the modernization of a weapons system is considered to be a fairly routine development as technological capabilities evolve. In the case of the binary munition, however, I believe that we are in a unique position in history. At this precise moment, this country is engaged in arms control negotiations at Geneva which have not been proceeding as well as could be expected. In past years, we have been relatively successful at these negotiations and this country was instrumental in securing the acceptance by the United Nations of a Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Biological Weapons. It had been the hope of the participants at the Geneva Conferences that a similar convention could be secured for the control of chemical weapons. At the same time, we have been struggling to secure the ratification in the Senate of an older treaty on the prohibition of the use of both biological and chemical weapons—the Geneva Protocol of 1925. The desire of the President to establish an understanding that herbicides and riot control agents should be excluded from the U.S. ratification of this protocol has produced such serious disagreement between the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the President that the protocol has been stalled in the Senate for more than 3 years. Further, there were many indications that if the U.S. Army were to proceed with their plans for the procurement of the binary chemical system, the current Geneva negotiations on chemical arms control would be essentially negated. Since I wished to have more details on these problems made publicly available, I asked the Congressional Research Service to prepare a summary report so that all Members might have this information; that report contains details which I do not wish to repeat at this time. See Congressional Research Service Report "Chemical and Biological Warfare: Is-

sues and Developments During 1973," December 18, 1973. James M. McCullough, Specialist in Life Sciences. CRS Report 74-21SP.

As you will note in that report, the Biological Convention, also submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for ratification, has received no action; I understand that this delay has been caused by the failure of the President to respond to a letter from that committee on the problems associated with ratification of the Geneva protocol.

All of these events led me to believe that the Congress had reached the stage where once again a public evaluation of the problem was necessary. I believed that we were at a crucial point in our determinations on this issue. I introduced additional legislation, along with 45 cosponsors, calling for a comprehensive review of U.S. chemical warfare policies. The House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on National Security Policy has just concluded 5 days of hearings on House Resolution 679 during which CW policies were examined in detail. I urge every Member to examine the report of these hearings just as soon as it is available. The hearings provided a review of the national security implications of our chemical warfare policies, including a thorough examination of the proposed new binary nerve gas system. More recently, I and several other Representatives, addressed this same issue before the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee during which we asked that the committee consider a delay of approval for initiating procurement of the binary chemical weapon. My justification for this position may be outlined briefly as follows, although all of the Members are certainly aware that this is a very complex issue.

In the first place, I have not insisted that the United States unilaterally disarm itself of its current chemical warfare stockpiles before the U.S.S.R. or any other nation agrees to a similar disarmament procedure, although I have expressed my doubts that a stockpile of chemical munitions is actually an effective deterrent to the use of chemical munitions by another aggressive nation. It is the fact that there is no current CW arms control agreement that does concern me a great deal in this matter. The Soviet Union is not required to reduce its CW stockpiles or production any more than is the United States or any other nation in the world because there is no international agreement on this CW issue. The Soviets have ratified the Geneva protocol of 1925, however, in which they are joined by some 100 other nations, in declaring that they will not initiate the use of chemical weapons in war—although most of these nations have reserved the right to retaliate if chemical munitions are used against them.

The United States is one of the few nations which has not ratified this protocol. This deficiency makes us particularly suspect in any of our actions in the chemical warfare issue, and we must be alert to this problem. This is a major

reason why the decision by the Army to begin producing new CW weapons is so critical. The protocol has nothing to do with either Soviet or United States considerations of development, production, or stockpiling. In fact, then, the presence or absence of proof regarding past Soviet stockpiling of chemical weapons really is not an issue in my comments on our proposed production of binary weapons.

As I have pointed out on several occasions, according to the information provided in open testimony by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, this Nation now possesses stockpiles of CW munitions or nerve agent in bulk quantities which are essentially adequate to meet the deterrent policies enunciated by the President. As I have also stated, I was very impressed with the careful security and storage precautions taken at Tooele Storage Depot to protect the public health from the danger from these stockpiles.

It was this impression that strengthened my opinion that the safety aspects of the binary munition are not sufficiently imperative at this time to justify their immediate production for a restructuring of the CW stockpile. This aspect of the binary would obviously be important if a final decision still indicated that adoption of the binary is absolutely essential to the national security; a decision which has not been clearly enunciated in any of the hearings thus far. I have only indicated my concern about potential dangers to public health from current CW stocks when proposals were made to transport deteriorating munitions and excess stocks on common carriers through towns rather than destroy these munitions on site.

I have said that we need a full and public examination of our CW policies. I fail to see the logic of maintaining a stockpile as a deterrent to the use of chemical weapons by another nation when we possess an enormous nuclear retaliatory capability; we do need a more effective CW defensive capability to operate in a toxic environment than we apparently now have. I have expressed my concern about this latter problem in public hearings and in a specific letter to the Secretary of Defense outlining my recommendations for remedial actions.

I have been troubled by what is an obvious inconsistency in the record between announced U.S. policy of negotiations on an arms control policy and the U.S. Army's proposals to restructure our chemical munitions stockpiles. The public hearings thus far have demonstrated that, even within the executive branch, there is disagreement as to the potential impact of this Army proposal. The evidence of this disagreement on U.S. negotiations at Geneva and the potential effect of the proposed procurement of the binary is further support for the justification for delay of procurement of the binary weapon.

It is my opinion, and this is an opinion shared by the cosponsors of my legislation and by many witnesses in the recent hearings on CW policies, that the CW arms race must be slowed, and if at all possible, eliminated. We must take this

problem seriously. Our Nation began the examination of this issue in 1969. The issue continues to this day. We are apparently at a stalemate position with regard to chemical weapon parity; to disturb this parity at this critical time could well destroy attempts at negotiation and set off a new arms race. This seems to me not to be in the best interest of our Nation or world peace. We are strong enough militarily, indeed we have the moral strength and obligation, to make the first real gesture toward CW arms control.

I have suggested that we delay the adoption of the binary chemical system and devote the talents of our best and most highly placed policymakers to our negotiations on both CW and nuclear arms control. We do not jeopardize the status quo of current CW capability by delaying the binary chemical munition; it delivers the same nerve agent we currently have in our stockpile. We do not give any technological edge by delaying further engineering and testing of the binary—we have been working on and proof testing the system for almost 20 years. We may encourage not only CW arms but discourage other nations from embarking on their own increased production of CW weapons if we, as world leaders, indicate our willingness to take more time to discuss this issue before committing our resources to further CW weapons construction. I have urged that we strengthen our effort on maintaining and developing our defensive posture since this posture is an effective deterrent in itself.

I agree wholeheartedly with the point that any CW arms control agreement can be meaningful only if all parties to the agreement abide by its limitations. If we can first, secure ratification of the Geneva protocol; second, prepare a proposal which can become the subject of negotiations at Geneva with regard to controls over the development and stockpiling of chemical agents; and third, reach an understanding on verification of compliance with such a treaty, we will have achieved gigantic strides towards lessening one more subject of world tension.

In summary, then, what I have asked for is a delay in development and production of the binary munition until the Congress, responsible under our constitutional system of self-government, is given an opportunity to give direction to our national policies with regard to chemical warfare. I have simply asked for a more rational approach to this problem and the opportunities for open public debate on our CW policies. The recent hearings before the Armed Services Committee, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee, and the House Appropriations Committee have provided these opportunities. I hope that my proposals will save the Nation millions of dollars and contribute to a lessening of world tension. The Congress has an opportunity in its consideration of the current Defense appropriations bill to make a momentous decision regarding the course of

action which this country will follow in its chemical warfare programs. The reports of the hearings held in the past 6-8 months provide a wealth of background information on which to make this decision. I urge all the Members to become familiar with these data and to make an informed decision with regard to the proposals in the DOD appropriations bill. I will be happy to provide any help I can to any Member who desires more information on this subject.

A FULL EMPLOYMENT ECONOMY

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, in many of my talks before college, business, labor, and academic groups I focus attention on the pernicious unemployment crisis which has beset this country for the past 5 years and the manner in which it is not only undermining the economy but also seriously exacerbating a number of economic and social problems confronting the Nation. I note that the goals of the Employment Act of 1946 have never been achieved and that the objective of full employment—defined as some type of work for every man and woman seeking a job—has never been actively sought.

Aside from the fact that the private sector has demonstrated its continuing inability to generate sufficient employment opportunities for all persons looking for work, I am convinced that there is no real desire to reduce the level of unemployment. Much of this can be attributed to the preoccupation of most economists and planners with the findings of Prof. A. W. Phillips—known as the Phillips Curve—who claimed that unemployment rates below 2½ percent would cause wages to rise faster than productivity and would presumably be accompanied by rising prices. What many fail to realize is that we have been in a period of both high levels of unemployment and rising prices simultaneously. These "experts" also tend to ignore the many unfilled needs in the public sector which could be met by significantly expanded employment by government at all levels or the economic benefits which would flow from affording people the opportunity to pay part or all of their own way in lieu of continued dependence on public institutions. Inherent in much of this negative attitude toward the concept of full employment is a not-so-subtle discrimination toward the Nation's minorities, the disadvantaged, the dispossessed, the "have nots" of our society.

Recently a well-written and very perceptive argument in support of the full employment concept appeared in *America* magazine. As the author, Harold X. Connolly, has aptly noted:

The development of a full employment policy and budget has been thwarted on economic, political and ideological grounds.

Observing that unemployment "affects only a minority of people directly," including blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, and others which may be economically dispensable according to some economists, Mr. Connolly quite accurately declares that—

Faced with a . . . choice between inflation and unemployment, the sage politician and the secure employee will both opt for minimal inflation and an "acceptable" level of unemployment.

Contrary to the meaningless rhetoric and vacuous claims of the White House and the Labor Department I do not see the unemployment crisis improving and I believe that we must give careful consideration to what Mr. Connolly has written. I insert his article, from the May 11 America, in the RECORD and commend it to our colleagues' attention:

WHY NOT ACTUAL FULL EMPLOYMENT?

(By Harold X. Connolly)

On March 2, 68,417 applicants appeared for a New York City civil service examination to fill 100 current vacancies in the Sanitation Department and a projected 6,000 more during the next four years. In his State of the Union message, President Nixon stated unequivocally: "There will be no recession in the United States of America"—a sentiment reiterated in subsequent press conferences. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported an unemployment rate of 5.2 percent for the first two months of 1974, up sharply from the 4.8 percent of last December. A recent study by the Joint Center for Political Studies listed 93 Congressional districts in which poverty would be a primary issue in the fall elections. An estimated 250,000 workers have lost their jobs due to the energy [choose one] a) problem, b) crisis, c) crunch, d) squeeze. On March 1 and 2, the National Conference on Public Service Employment and the Urban Center of Columbia University sponsored a conference and workshop on full employment policy. The connective tissue binding these vignettes together is, of course, employment or its opposite, unemployment.

Occasional Congressional pronouncements, tax and investment incentives and training programs have never coalesced to form a comprehensive, systematic national policy designed to accomplish, or even approximate, full employment in the United States. In anticipatory anxiety about a postwar recession or worse, Congress considered full employment legislation between 1944 and 1946, at which time it passed and President Truman signed the Employment Act of 1946.

Its declared policy required the federal government "to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy . . . to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining in a manner calculated to foster and promote free enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities . . . for those able, willing and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production and purchasing power."

Quite clearly, this was not a full employment policy but a vague, qualified statement—what Robert Lekachman has termed a "pious aspiration." It differed significantly from earlier draft legislation, which had stated that "all Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular and full-time employment."

Between 1946 and 1961, the federal government relied upon built-in fiscal stabilizers and Federal Reserve monetary and credit policy to support employment levels. The Kennedy-Johnson era added manpower training and retraining programs to the government repertoire of employment policies. Spurred by a number of acts (Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, Vocational Education Act of 1963, Economic Opportunity Act of 1964) implemented through such programs as Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, On the Job Training, Concentrated Employment Program, assisted by a foreign military adventure, the government succeeded in 1965 in reducing the annual unemployment level below 5 percent for the first time since 1957. War industry, space programs, the military draft, antipoverty programs continued this "boom" through 1969, but unemployment again exceeded 5 percent in 1970.

The employment record of the United States over the past 25 years clearly indicates the incapacity of American private industry and existing governmental employment and manpower programs to provide gainful work for all able and willing Americans. Except in times of war, the unemployment level has generally remained sticky above the 5 percent level. The United States, according to Leonard Woodcock, remains "the only industrialized country in the non-Communist world which deliberately has a policy of no full employment."

The development of a full employment policy and budget has been thwarted on economic, political and ideological grounds. Orthodox economists have generally adopted an either-or position that logically limits the available options. In its simplest form, they have asked the American people to decide which economic poison they wanted, less inflation or unemployment. Given the posing of such a joyous option, it seems scarcely surprising that economics remains known as the "dismal science." In other words, traditional economics links decreasing unemployment with rising inflation, and low inflation with rising unemployment. The classic expression of this economic law is found in what is called the Phillips curve.

The symbiotic, antagonistic relationship between the rates of inflation and unemployment has suffered significant stress during the recent past, with soaring inflation joined uncouthly by rising unemployment. This has led to the coining of a new economic term, "stagflation," that is, a combination of economic stagnation and inflation, or what might more conventionally be called a recession, at least as President Nixon himself has defined the word.

It is eminently clear that over the years the federal government has accepted and acted upon the assumed dichotomous relationship between price stability and full employment by allowing unemployment to remain well above full employment levels, while generally restricting inflationary pressures. While economic theory might buttress such policy decisions, it seems probable that much of the rationale for adopting such a plan flowed from politics and not economics.

Unemployment, at worst (even during the Depression), affects only a minority of people directly. Furthermore, unemployment is unevenly distributed demographically and geographically. Among its primary victims are such "no account" groups as blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, American Indians, recent immigrants, women, the elderly—all dispensable, at least economically. In addition, individual members of these groups—often poor, uneducated, non-English speaking, ignored—have not always participated extensively in the political process through voting, and con-

sequently have not achieved political power and influence commensurate with their numbers and need. Thus, unemployment may be viewed as a minority issue; if 5.2 percent of the civilian labor force is unemployed, 94.8 percent is employed. Contrariwise, inflation is a majority concern; it affects the unemployed, to be sure, but it also affects the employed masses.

Thus faced with a solemn choice between inflation and unemployment, the sage politician and the secure employee will both opt for minimal inflation and an "acceptable" level of unemployment.

Ideologically, the commitment to a free enterprise system and the stigma connotatively associated with public employment programs have combined to thwart the implementation of a full employment program based on the only feasible approach—public service jobs.

Recently, however, economists (Robert Lekachman, Eleanor Gilpatrick, Thomas Vietoris, for example) have seriously questioned the viability of the Phillips curve and offered alternative models that do not demand such severe tradeoffs. Furthermore, job creation is indeed a majority issue; it would reduce fierce divisive competition for limited job opportunities among racial, ethnic and sex groupings; with a reduced surplus labor pool, it would place workers in a more favorable position vis-a-vis management; it would reduce welfare rolls, poverty, criminal environment, while expanding ambience, the general welfare, personal productivity, options and worth and the gross national product. Finally, since the private sector cannot provide full employment and since there are numerous unmet needs in the nation, ideology cannot legitimately be raised to defend a non-full-employment economy.

President Johnson's National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress urged a policy of permanent public job creation for the sake of both the public work to be done and the people eager to do it whom the private sector could not employ. The Emergency Employment Act of 1971 and the Comprehensive Manpower and Training Act of December, 1973, accepted this concept only marginally, viewing public service employment as "transitional" and appropriating grossly insufficient funds to cope with the problem.

President Nixon's proposed budget continues this minimal approach, with proposed manpower programs absorbing but one percent of the total budget. If the money were distributed on the basis of a modest \$7,000 per public service job, it would reduce unemployment only about 10 percent. A marginal subsistence wage of \$5,000 would leave 86 percent of the unemployed still in that category.

What is needed, then, is a genuine war against poverty and unemployment; a wartime mentality that commits all resources to victory, and castigates those not offering full support as slackers or even worse; a comprehensive program complete with adequate financing. What is needed is a combined WPA-PWA-CCC-NYA program. At their peak, these New Deal programs employed 4,000,000 workers in a vast variety of tasks. While many a hole may have been dug and refilled and many a shovel leaned upon, these agencies constructed such diverse structures as the Triborough Bridge, Bonneville Dam and Mount Hood's Timberline Lodge. They employed scholars and artists to collect and catalog historical records, enliven public buildings with murals and mosaics and offer live professional performances of theater and music throughout the nation.

Despite obvious technological advances since the 1930's, many of the problems confronting contemporary America are amenable to labor-intensive amelioration, if not so-

lution. The removal of trash from city streets and abandoned automobiles from the nation's roadways; the construction of adequate housing for all persons; the upgrading of roadbeds to permit high-speed rail transportation; the increase in supportive services to allow libraries and museums to maintain longer hours; the provision of better health care and educational services through paraprofessional personnel; these and innumerable other large and small projects could absorb most of the nation's unemployed and improve the total human and physical environment.

Travelers have often commented on the greater civility of London compared to New York City or any major urban center in the United States. London's level of municipal housekeeping results, not from managerial magic, but from a substantially larger staff than that employed by New York City. The London underground, for example, employs twice as many maintenance and station-operating personnel per passenger as does the New York subway system. Not unexpectedly, stations are cleaner and breakdowns less frequent in London.

Similarly, one of the great horticultural landmarks in the United States is the New York Botanical Gardens, which includes a huge turn-of-the-century glass conservatory. Every year, hundreds of the building's 17,000 panes of glass crack and need to be replaced. Where once 20 of the finest gardeners in the country labored, the Botanical Gardens can now afford a staff of only three to five. Multiply the difficulties and opportunities of this one major institution by several thousand across the land, and one can begin to understand the possibilities for this kind of public service employment.

What is suggested, therefore, is the creation of what Frank Reissman has called a "human services society" keyed to people's needs, a society in which "the right to employment opportunities is guaranteed to everyone able and willing to work," as Congressman Augustus Hawkins' proposed full employment legislation states. A nation and economy that have developed more diversified methods to consume fossil energy must now prove themselves committed to the creative utilization of human energies and potentials. A politics and an economy geared to a scarcity of jobs, goods and amenities would yield to those of planned abundance and ambience. Given existence and anticipated shortages of raw materials and inevitable inflationary pressures, some of the benefits accruing from a full employment policy would be in less tangible but nonetheless real terms.

The cost of such a comprehensive plan need not be excessive or bankrupting in a country with an anticipated federal budget in excess of \$300 billion, a military budget of nearly \$90 billion and a significant source of potential revenue from a reorganized and genuinely progressive tax structure. A war on poverty that seeks anything less than full employment would be a cruel hoax, a Band-Aid in place of radical surgery.

NUMBER OF TAX LOSS FARMING MILLIONAIRES IS INCREASING

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the 1969 Tax Reform Act, the Congress attempted to close the tax loss farming loophole.

Apparently we failed—and a new effort must be made to close this tax loophole.

The Treasury Department's "Individual Statistics of Income" for 1971 clearly show that the American millionaire continues to do a very good business by means of very poor farming.

For the 1971 tax year, under the provisions of the 1969 Tax Reform Act, only 35 American millionaires made \$2,022,000 from farming. But for that same year, 102 millionaires managed to lose \$13,675,000 for an average loss of \$134,068 on their farming operations.

In 1969, during the last year of the old tax loss farming law, 136 millionaires lost an average of \$66,448 from farming. The 1971 tax advantage for these people was more than twice that of 1969, the final year preceding the alleged closing of the loophole.

Moreover, the 1971 figure of 102 millionaires losing an average of \$134,068 is even greater than the 1970 figure of 94 millionaires losing an average of \$128,149.

These millionaire farmers—who would seem to be losing their shirts—are not really farmers or ranchers. In fact, many of them probably never get west of the Hudson River. Yet in a sense they are farmers—tax farmers, who through manipulations of the tax code, harvest a bountiful crop of dollars from the Treasury and the rest of the Nation's taxpayers. Several years ago, a Wall Street Journal writer parodied these "farmers" using the song, "The Old Cowhand From the Rio Grande."

I'm a rich cowhand of the Wall Street brand;
And I save on tax, to beat the band.
Oh, I take big deductions the law allows
And I never even have to see my cows.
Yippee-yi-yo-ki-yay.

It is estimated that the total tax advantage going to urban "tax loss farmers" is running at about \$860 million per year.

How does one "lose" hundreds of thousands of dollars in farming and still survive. The secret lies in accounting or the creation of "paper losses."

In an effort to save the farmer the labor and extra work of the bookkeeping chores involved in keeping track of inventories and using the accrual method of accounting, farmers are permitted to deduct most expenses in the year in which they occurred—and are taxed on the income from a crop or an animal in a later year, when that produce is sold.

The importance of the special rules can be seen from the following example. A taxpayer sells \$1,000 worth of a product which cost him \$800 to produce. The \$1,000 in farm income can be treated as capital gains, while the \$800 is deducted against ordinary income. In other words, the sale is taxed at capital gains rates, about 25 percent, while the cost is deductible at the taxpayer's marginal tax rate—up to 50 percent and even more. If the taxpayer in this example is in the 50-percent bracket, his tax saving is \$400 on the deduction of the costs. If the product he sold is taxed at the 25-percent capital gains rate, his tax is \$250. This means a net reduction in taxes of \$150—

despite the fact that actually, economically, a \$200 gain was realized.

Unfortunately, the 1969 Tax Reform Act—while billed as having closed much of this loophole—failed to stop the growing use of tax loss farming by millionaires.

There are two major problems with the use of tax loss farming gimmicks. First, of course, it is an advantage available mostly to the rich and allows them to reduce their taxes, thus destroying efforts to provide a progressive and just tax system.

Second, these tax inequities spawn the phenomenon of agri-business which effectively drives up the cost of land and grossly distorts the agricultural market. While the real farmer is most immediately victimized by these inequities, the American consumer is not far behind.

In his recent book, "The American Food Scandal," William Robbins writes of tax loss farming:

An ingenious device is being used to bring still more money into the takeover of farmland. It is one that clearly results now in increased corporate control, with side effects that are likely to cause severe dislocations and higher consumer costs in the years ahead.

The trick is a tax gimmick that is used by promoters who buy, or contract to buy, large assemblages from independent farmers. The promoters form syndicates and print prospectuses that they then mail to professional men, such as high income doctors and dentists. . . . Oddly, the chief attractions offered are the losses that the prospective investors can be promised.

The statistics of income clearly show that these farming losses not only still mean huge tax savings to wealthy individuals, but the tax savings have been increasing since the 1969 Tax Reform Act was enacted.

The tax loss farming loophole remains a deceptive, unjust aspect of our tax code which only makes the rich richer while exploiting the real farmer and, in turn, the consumer. Robbins writes of the tax loss farmer:

In terms of the consumer's interest, what they have achieved is an enormous increase in the costs of farming that translates into extra billions of dollars that Americans must pay for their food.

The loophole remains wide open, and thorough tax reform in this regard is needed more than ever.

I am introducing legislation today which would lower the amount of allowable deductions which may be taken by a taxpayer engaged in the business of farming. Under my amendment, the total deductions which could be claimed cannot exceed the sum of the gross income derived from the business of farming for the taxable year and, in the case of an individual, the higher of either \$15,000 or the amount of a series of special deductions designed to protect real farmers from hardship losses caused by drought and casualties.

Under present law, limitations on tax loss farming are only imposed on individuals with more than \$50,000 in non-farm income and \$25,000 in farm losses. Under my proposal, all individuals are

