

May 31, 1974

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

17203

QUORUM CALL

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on May 30, 1974, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2662) to authorize appropriations for U.S. participation in the International Ocean Exposition '75.

ORDER FOR YEA-AND-NAY VOTES ON MONDAY NOT TO OCCUR UNTIL THE HOUR OF 3:30 P.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if any rollcall votes are ordered prior to 3:30 p.m. on Monday next they not occur until the hour of 3:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I do not anticipate it, but such could occur.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene at 11 a.m. on Monday next. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, Mr. CURTIS will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, to be followed by Mr. GRIFFIN for not to exceed 15 minutes, to be followed by Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statement limited therein to 5 minutes each.

Upon the conclusion of the transaction of routine morning business the Senate will resume consideration of S. 3000, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1975 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Yea-and-nay votes could occur on amendments thereto on Monday. Privi-

leged matters could be called up at any time, as well as other measures on the Legislative Calendar or the Executive Calendar that will have been cleared by that time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 2:24 p.m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 3, 1974, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 31, 1974:

THE JUDICIARY

William H. Orrick, Jr., of California, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of California vice William T. Schweigert, retired.

Henry F. Werker, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York vice Sylvester J. Ryan, retired.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. George S. Boylan, Jr., xxx-xx-... FR (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. James A. Hill, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 31, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Robert Ellsworth, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

David P. Taylor, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

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

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance

and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be Lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. James D. Hughes, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following officer to be placed on the Retired List in the grade indicated under the provisions of Section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Albert P. Clark, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following officer for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be brigadier general

Col. Harry C. Aderholt, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be Lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Ralph Longwell Foster, xxx-xx-... U.S. Army.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be Lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. John Alfred Kjellstrom, xxx-xx-... Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be Lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. John Howard Elder, Jr., xxx-xx-... U.S. Army.

Col. Dana G. Mead, XXXX U.S. Army, for appointment to the position of permanent professor at the U.S. Military Academy under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 4333.

IN THE NAVY

Adm. James L. Holloway III, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Chief of Naval Operations for a term of 4 years pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5081.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps nominations beginning Francis B. Clements, to be second lieutenant, and ending Samuel Mauch, Jr., to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 8, 1974.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"LOWER THE COST OF HIGHER EDUCATION," AN ARTICLE BY HOWARD R. BOWEN

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the REC-

ORD the text of a most thoughtful article entitled, "Lowering the Cost of Higher Education," by Howard R. Bowen.

The article was originally published in the New York Times.

Howard Bowen, chancellor of the Claremont University Center, is an economist who specializes in the economics of higher education.

He has written "Efficiency in Liberal Education," and "Evaluating Institutions for Accountability."

The text of his article follows:

LOWER THE COST OF HIGHER EDUCATION

(By Howard R. Bowen)

One of America's greatest issues is how the rising costs of college should be financed—how much of the expense of higher education should be borne by students and their families, how much by government and philanthropy.

It is a pressing question for both individual and society, and it has stirred wide debate.

For the family, sending a student to col-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

lege is an investment comparable to buying a house. The 4-year outlay for tuition, board and room, transportation and incidentals, may range from \$8,000 to \$20,000 or more, depending on whether the student lives at home or on campus, attends a public or private college, selects a low-cost or high-cost institution and whether he receives student aid.

Including lost income for the student who might otherwise have been working—perhaps \$20,000 over the four college years—the total investment for college education may approach \$30,000 to \$40,000.

This large investment pays off handsomely in personal satisfactions, intangible benefits to society and higher lifetime income. The U.S. Census Bureau has just reported that a man with a college degree can expect to earn \$758,000 during his lifetime, whereas a man with only a high school diploma can expect to earn \$479,000.

But the fact that the investment probably will pay off in the future does not lessen the pain of raising the money in the present. And the price has been rising sharply, along with the prices of gasoline, bread and postage.

College charges for tuition, fees, board and room have nearly doubled since 1960, from \$850 a year to \$1,800 in public institutions, and from \$1,600 to \$3,300 in private schools. (Personal expenses and transportation bring the total even higher).

These high college costs are a major worry to millions of families of all income levels—the families from which come the 6.5 million full-time college students, and the families containing the remaining 18.5 million persons in the 18-24 age group who might be college prospects.

How high tuitions should go, and what sort of student aid should be provided, have been analyzed and argued in at least six major reports by distinguished commissions in the past several months, including the Carnegie Commission headed by Clark Kerr, a Department of Health, Education and Welfare task force, a federal commission and an elite business group.

The general thrust of these studies is that tuitions should be raised, that student aid should be expanded and that the aid increasingly should be in long-term loans rather than outright grants.

In effect, these reports say that America's historic policy of low tuitions is no longer tenable. They propose instead that families shoulder more of the burden, and that students themselves take out loans to be repaid out of future earnings.

But requiring young persons to go heavily into debt—as much as \$15,000 to \$20,000—for their education is less than generous toward youth. It is unbecoming for those in middle age who received their educations without such debt to say, in effect, to the next generation, "We got our education; now get yours on the cuff." In addition, lending is a cumbersome way to get money to support higher education.

I do not suggest eliminating all grants based on means tests, or all loans to students. But the nation should go slowly in raising tuitions to levels that will require intensive use of means-based grants and heavy indebtedness. Such a system would break down both politically and administratively.

Fairness also suggests low tuition. The student and his family already bear two-thirds of the total cost of higher education, counting the student's lost time and forgone income. Institutional costs are only one-third of the total. Since education benefits society as well as students, it seems fair that a major part of institutional costs be borne by society—through government and philanthropy.

Private colleges and universities are indispensable: They add diversity, contribute to intellectual freedom, help set academic

standards. There competitive position undoubtedly would improve if tuitions were raised in public colleges.

But private colleges should be strengthened by lowering their tuitions, not by raising them in public colleges. This could be done by providing, from public funds, partial tuition payments to students in private colleges. The GI Bill was a kind of forerunner, giving veterans the money for tuition in whatever school they chose. Today, more than 30 states are experimenting with various kinds of grants to reduce or offset high tuitions at private colleges. Most of these programs do not have enough money, but the principle is valid.

America's historic policy of making higher education open and available with low or no tuition is still sound. This was the idea underlying the founding of hundreds of private colleges in the early 19th century, the Morrill Act of 1863 establishing the land-grant colleges, the GI Bill and the community college movement.

Why at this stage, when we still need to bring millions of young persons—many from ethnic minorities—into the mainstream of American life, and when much educational work remains to be done for all, including adults, are we shifting to a high-tuition philosophy?

Instead of putting more of the burden on the student and his family, Americans should stop the rising family cost of college by:

Holding down tuitions in public colleges.

Providing adequate state financing for public colleges and universities.

Reducing tuitions in private colleges through state tuition grants to students at those schools.

Providing adequate federal grants to low-income students.

Using loans sparingly as supplemental student support.

THE CHRISTIAN AND PATRIOTISM

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an article by the late Dr. H. C. Slade, former pastor of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church in Toronto, Canada, which appeared on May 23 in the Christian Beacon. In the trying times we are now experiencing, we must find encouragement where we can. I think we can obtain a great deal of encouragement and wisdom from this inspiring article, and I therefore submit it for my colleagues' inspection:

THE CHRISTIAN AND PATRIOTISM

In the context of our subject for this evening, we observe that a minister's office is two-fold. He must in his preaching declare and define man's relationship to two governments: the Divine government and civil government.

I.

First let us define our relationship to two governments. With respect to Divine government a minister of the Gospel has a definite commission to preach the Gospel of the Kingdom of God. This was the theme with which our Lord began His ministry in His inaugural address. His very words are recorded for us in the Gospel according to St. Mark, Chapter 1, verses 14 and 15: "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the Kingdom of God. And saying, the time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand: repent

May 31, 1974

ye, and believe the gospel." Under this distinctive subject we exalt the Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour, and that is our main business. His is a saving name. Before He was born in human flesh, the name was given to Joseph and to Mary. "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call His name Jesus: for He shall save His people from their sins."

The Apostle Peter later on in his ministry, after our Lord had ascended, declared, "This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."

Among all the great personages to appear in this world, or yet to appear, whether he be religious or otherwise, there is none who sustains the same relationship to human beings as does our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. We look in vain to anybody else for salvation. He alone died for our sins and rose again a mighty Conqueror over death, hell and the grave. He was delivered for our offenses and raised again for our justification. "For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him" (2 Corinthians 5:21). We not only exalt Jesus Christ as Saviour but we magnify Him as the King.

God's messenger, Isaiah, prophesied, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon His shoulder: ... Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon His kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this."

My friends, Jesus is King of kings and Lord of lords. When all other kingdoms and thrones shall have toppled and been crumbled to dust, this blessed One in all the blaze of His glory shall sit on the throne of the universe and reign forever.

"Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen." Thank God, His Kingdom of grace and glory is open to us. Concerning one person, Jesus said, "Thou art not far from the Kingdom." The way of entrance into this Kingdom is cited in clearest terms. It is by means of the new birth. I remind you of the words spoken by the Lord Jesus to a distinguished teacher in Israel by the name of Nicodemus, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." What a solemn thought: Those who fail the experience of a new birth will not even get a sight of God's kingdom much less ever enter therein. He said, "Ye will not see it." Oh, hear it from His lips again, "The kingdom of God is at hand, repent ye and believe the gospel." All those who believe on the Lord Jesus Christ are spoken of as having passed from death unto life, from darkness into His marvelous light. Yes, delivered from the power of Satan and translated into the kingdom of the Son of His love. I ask you, Has this grand transaction ever taken place in your life?

Next, we come to the matter of our relation and obligation to civil government. Our Lord's statement makes our duty in this connection perfectly plain. "Then saith He unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Concerning this relationship many sincere people are deeply concerned. In times of national events, such as a general election or of national crisis as a way, they find themselves quite confused as to what they should do. They only want to do their duty and stand for the right, but what their obligations may be under these circumstances they are not at all sure. If they could only know for certain, the teaching of the Word of God on the subject,

the matter with them would be immediately settled. There are others, of course, who are not even interested in the affairs of civil government for say they, "Our citizenship is in heaven."

Therefore, we do not feel any responsibility whatever toward the governments of the world; so by them responsibility in this relationship is altogether neglected and ignored. I read of one person who remarked, "They cannot blame me for failures in the government for I have not voted for 20 years." Probably, he is to be blamed most of all. On one occasion the inimitable C. H. Spurgeon was seen going to the polling booth to vote, and on his way he was met by a Christian brother who did not believe in voting. In a tone of amazement he said, "Mr. Spurgeon, are you going to vote?" Mr. Spurgeon replied, "Indeed, I am." "But have you forgotten the teaching of the Bible which commands us as Christians to crucify the old man?" Mr. Spurgeon answered, "That is exactly what I am doing. You know my old man is a deep-dyed Liberal, and I am determined this time to make him vote Conservative." According to the teaching of Scripture, citizens of the heavenly kingdom have also an earthly citizenship to maintain. Has Divine providence by means of birth or immigration brought you to this country? Then you have become a part of this great and favored nation. You have come to enter into the immense benefits provided by way of freedom, protection and prosperity. Friends, we ought to fully enjoy them all for in some countries of the world these liberties just do not exist. Do not say, therefore, that you have no responsibility whatever toward this country or to the affairs of its government.

Now, let us turn to our text and take the case of the Jewish people at the particular time Jeremiah wrote these words. Remember these people found themselves in a foreign country under the rulership of a heathen king. Actually, they were in a state of slavery and constantly exposed to provocation. Doubtless day by day they met with insults, persecution, and to add insult to injury we read the people of the land required of them a song; a song of mirth. Little wonder in their state of mourning they had hung their harps on the willow trees! Hence, the only reply they could give, "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?" Evidently, they did not know how to relate themselves to the Emperor, Nebuchadnezzar and his despotic form of government. Through Jeremiah, now residing in Jerusalem, God sends special instructions. "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, unto all that are carried away captives, whom I have caused to be carried away from Jerusalem unto Babylon; build ye houses, and dwell in them; and plant gardens, and eat the fruit of them; take ye wives, and beget sons and daughters; and take wives for your sons, and give your daughters to husbands, that they may bear sons and daughters; that ye may be increased there, and not diminished. And seek the peace of the city whether I have caused you to be carried away captives, and pray unto the Lord for it: for in the peace thereof shall ye have peace" (Jeremiah 29:4-7).

In the light of this directive Daniel, who as a young man was also carried into captivity, is set before us as a model. On the grounds that he did endeavor to be loyal and act the part of the good citizen, he was elevated to the highest possible position of government. It would seem that for a time he had been entrusted with the office of Prime Minister.

The situation of the Jews of this time was quite different from that of ours. We are not under a foreign power. We have not been led into slavery. As Canadian citizens, this country is our home. Hence, how much greater our obligation to the affairs of government than theirs! God adds in verse

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

11, "For I know the thoughts that I think toward you, saith the Lord, thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you an expected end." Thank God, He has thoughts toward us. They are very definite, specific thoughts. They are thoughts of peace. What God said to them in effect was this, "You submit to your situation and ultimately through your trial after 70 years have expired I will bring you back. I will restore you to your own land and prosper you again. I will give you another opportunity as a nation to begin anew."

II.

When we learn that civil government is an ordinance of God our obligation as Christians is made very clear. The inspired Apostle Paul affirms very positively that civil government, along with the family and the Church, is definitely a Divine institution. This fact he sets forth in a number of injunctions. First, to the believers in Rome, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God" (Romans 13:1). Rome at that time was the seat of the imperial government which ruled most of the then known world. The Jewish people, as such, who were under Rome's power lived in deep resentment and occasionally tried to resist it. "But Christians," said the Apostle, "are not to be enemies of a proper government." Later on along the same lines. In Chapter 3, verse 1, we read, "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work." Further teaching on this subject comes from the Apostle Peter. In his First Epistle, Chapter 2, verse 13, we read, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; Or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men."

After reading these passages can there be any doubt respecting our relation to our country? In the main, we have been here in Canada ever since we became a nation protected by wholesome laws, most of which, in principle, are based on the Word of God. We have enjoyed freedom, and best of all, religious freedom to a high degree. We have been given every liberty and opportunity to propagate the good news of the Gospel. In the Communist countries of the world, this is not so. Our concern at present is that there are enemies within our borders who, if they had the necessary power, would utterly destroy all these blessed privileges. Therefore, we consider it to be our bounden duty when an election is called—and one is called on the Federal level for October 30 of this year—to put forth every legitimate effort to elect men of high principle and trustworthy character in order that these precious, dearly-bought rights may be maintained. The particular mode of government I do not believe is here under consideration. The reference is more to the principles of government. There are various modes that have been adopted by the different nations or countries of the world, such as an absolute monarchy, a limited monarchy like the one in the United Kingdom at the present time, and a republic. The idea is that any government that provides order as against chaos and that gives due protection and freedom to its people must be upheld. Government, especially our form of democratic government, is a very beneficial appointment indeed. God never intended that man should be left in a state of brute creation. Can you suppose law being suspended in Canada for five days? There is no government, no policemen, no restrictions of any kind. Every man is left to do just what he feels inclined to do. Each is independent of his fellow. He is at liberty to follow the bent of his own inclinations with-

out regard to the welfare of others. There is no restraint on the part of any. What have you got? You have violence, misery, lust, cruelty, and dishonesty pervading the whole of our Dominion. There would be, I am sure, an outcry such as was never heard before in this country. Demands for the restoration of government would be heard from every quarter. I submit that no one after that experience would mind paying even income tax or any other kind of tax. Demonstrations of lawlessness among university students and strikers in numerous countries where leaders in government have lost control give us some idea what such a situation would be like.

My friends, well established government such as we have experienced in the past is of God. Its benefits are beyond calculations. The ruler, as the Apostle Paul states, is a terror to evil works, and he does not bear the sword in vain. It is indeed an instrument of blessing and comfort. Humanly speaking, we owe our safety and freedom, both religious and civil, to law and order upheld by properly constituted government.

III.

Lastly, we shall consider the nature of our responsibility. The fact that government is an order of God ought to be sufficient to convince any Christian of his duty to support it. Now, let me speak briefly to you about the nature of our responsibility. Although it is true we are not of the world, still we are in the world, and while here in the matter of promoting the highest welfare and good of all our fellowbeings we are under very heavy obligation. Look again at our text, "And seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried away captives, and pray unto the Lord for it: for in the peace thereof shall ye have peace." The fact is that government of any city or country where we may reside surely has a claim on us to obey its righteous laws. Yes, there is such a thing under certain relationships as having a claim on one another. Are you a husband? Your wife has a claim on you. Are you a wife? Your husband in the very nature of the sacred relationship of marriage has a claim on you. Children, parents have a claim on you. You also have a claim on them and have every right to expect something from them. Masters, you have a claim on your servants. Servants have a claim on their masters. The word of God gives explicit teaching in these matters. Above all, of course, there is One in heaven who sees all and before whom we all some day must stand and give an account. He has the highest claim of any, and upon us all. We are taught, "Render therefore to all their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor. Owe no man anything but to love one another for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law" (Romans 13:7 and 8). I would remind you that our Lord Jesus Christ Himself paid tribute to the Roman government; thus to Ceasar.

The spirit of disloyalty and lawlessness is something unthinkable with a Christian. There can only be one exception to the rule, and that is when and where laws may be adopted which run contrary to the laws of God. For example, if the time ever came when we would be forbidden to preach the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, with the early apostles our one answer would have to be, "We ought to obey God rather than men. The One who said, 'All authority in heaven and in earth is given unto me, go ye therefore and disciple all nations' has first claim and must be obeyed." But laws which are established on the principles of the Word of God are just and good and are to be by us strictly obeyed.

There is no inconsistency whatever between being a patriot and a true Christian. I can think of three great Christian gentlemen within my acquaintance from three

different countries of the world with whom I have rejoiced extremely in Christian fellowship who are or were greatly to be admired as outstanding patriots. I am thinking of Dr. Dubarry of France, Dr. McIntire of the United States and, of course, Dr. Shields whom you knew in this place as being a Britisher to the core. Loyalty to our country should involve the willingness to fight for it when it is engaged in a defensive war. Personally, I could have no respect whatsoever for the zombies who during the second world war went into hiding instead of taking their places as true and responsible patriots for the defense of our freedoms. When the necessity arose, even the patriarch Abraham went to war against Amraphel of Shinar, Arloch, King of Ellasar, Chedorlaomer, King of Elam, and Tidal, king of nations. He smote them and pursued them unto Hobah and he brought back all the goods and the women also and the people.

If our country were invaded by cruel, heartless and godless oppressors such as the Communist forces of Russia and China, the whole nation would naturally be involved, but there is a sense in which true Christian people would be affected most. Every passenger is concerned in the safety of the plane.

The employment of spiritual weapons is, of course, the most effective. The Jewish captives in Babylon were enjoined to ". . . seek the peace of the city whither I (God) caused them to be carried away captives, and pray unto the Lord it . . ." (Jeremiah 29:7).

Real peace is the fruit of righteousness. There can be none while the Divine order is violated and the will of the Almighty set at naught. We remember that Melchizedek who blessed faithful Abraham was first King of Righteousness and after that also King of Peace.

The Gospel is God's message of peace to the world. There are deep rankling wounds in the body politic which only the Gospel can heal. Apostasy as a dark cloud in the form of social immorality, domestic vice, economic injustice, crime—and young people are being trained in it—drunkenness and false teaching, has settled upon the earth. The Gospel of Jesus Christ alone can set things right. With the Apostle Paul we believe it to be "the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth."

Who did George Whitefield and John Wesley bring peace to England? It was by means of the Gospel. Christians are called the light of the world and the salt of the earth.

In seeking the peace of the city Jeremiah commanded the people of God to pray for it. In order that we might emulate this worthy example I shall read to you that very appropriate passage of Scripture found in 1 Timothy, Chapter 2, "I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men; for kings and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; Who will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." The promise given to Solomon is still true and awaits our most earnest appropriation. "If my people which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways then will I hear from heaven and will forgive their sin and will heal their land" (II Corinthians 7: 14).

My dear friends, it is righteousness that exalteth a nation. Sin is a reproach unto any people. I verily believe that if we will earnestly seek the face of the One who ever waits to be gracious He will turn back the tide of evil in this country and pour us out a blessing; even a flood-tide blessing that there will not be room enough to contain it. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteous-

ness and all these things shall be added unto you."

We shall sing for our closing hymn number 510 in the Hymnary. Allow me to quote the first and the last verses:

"From ocean unto ocean
Our land shall own Thee Lord,
And, filled with true devotion,
Obey Thy sovereign word;
Our prairies and our mountains,
Forest and fertile field,
Our rivers, lakes, and fountains
To Thee shall tribute yield.

"Our Saviour King, defend us,
And guide where we should go,
Forth with Thy message send us,
Till, fired with true devotion
Enkindled by Thy word,
From ocean unto ocean
Our land shall own Thee Lord."

"A 6-YEAR PRESIDENCY" BY THE HONORABLE MORRIS K. UDALL

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Members of the House will read with great interest the following thoughtful article by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable MORRIS K. UDALL, of Arizona entitled a "A 6-Year Presidency?"

Congressman UDALL's essay, which appears in the June 1974 issue of the Progressive follows:

A 6-YEAR PRESIDENCY?
(By MORRIS K. UDALL)

Following the twin outrages of Vietnam and Watergate, the idea of a single six-year Presidential term—once grist for undergraduate debating societies—must now be considered a serious proposal with a growing list of influential advocates. Among them are Senator Mike Mansfield, the majority leader, who presumably wants to put the collar on Presidential power, and President Nixon, who would augment it. The opposition, equally bipartisan, arrives at two conflicting conclusions: that the single term would (a) unacceptably broaden Presidential authority or (b) destroy it.

I see the potential for both, and almost none for the kind of benevolent monarchy for which so many of its advocates yearn. Opponents of the six-year term have been getting the short end of the publicity lately, and thus it would be well to review their misgivings.

Traditional critics of the longer term lean heavily toward the argument cleverly expressed in Clark Clifford's oft-quoted comment: "A President who can never again be a candidate is a President whose coattails are permanently in mothballs." How is the President, such opponents ask, to deal with a recalcitrant Congress, particularly one controlled by the opposition party, if he is in effect a "lame duck" upon inauguration? Worse, how is he to get a handle on that immovable object, the Federal bureaucracy?

The truth of this criticism is at least partially borne out by Richard Nixon's all-out invasion of the executive agencies following his re-election: a kind of domestic Cambodian policy wherein he used (sometimes illegally) brute power, in this case the fact of incumbency, to overrun and occupy bureaucratic sanctuaries which he sensed would grow less responsive as his retirement day approached.

The position taken by Clifford, Harry Truman's White House counsel and Lyndon Johnson's Secretary of Defense, in my view is an effective argument not only against the single term but also against the Twenty-second Amendment, both of which imply the divorcing of the Presidency from politics. The difference is that promoters of the six-year term openly favor this division, while the fathers of the two-term limit produced the divorce unwittingly. The fact is that Dwight Eisenhower, the only President to serve a full second term under the Amendment's limitation, was politically emasculated following re-election and could not control his own Cabinet, much less the Congress.

However, a different perspective is offered by those who fear the opposite result from a six-year term—not emasculation but imperialization. The reasoning runs along these lines: Had Ralph Nader attended the Constitutional Convention of 1787, we might well have ended up with a system of "accountability" rather than one of "checks and balances." For the framers had one thing in mind above all others—that the Executive could not rule with impunity. After prolonged debate, they decided against the Virginia delegation which proposed a lengthy single term because, in the words of William Houston of New Jersey, to remove the reward of re-election was "to destroy the great motive for good behavior." The President was at all times to be "accountable" to the electorate. So long as he satisfied the populace, why should he not be allowed to serve three or even more terms?

Of course, no President until Franklin Roosevelt served more than two terms, a fact which might have led advocates of the Twenty-second Amendment to tread more lightly on the Constitution. Nor does the history of the last two decades since the Amendment was ratified suggest anything like a repeat of the one-man dominance of the office. But advocates of the Amendment cut a wide swath in the fiber of "accountability" so carefully constructed by the framers, and it is not unreasonable to argue that a six-year term might destroy it completely.

Take the example of Richard M. Nixon. It is true that had he not faced a re-election campaign, the President would have had no motivation to unleash the kind of campaign which produced the Watergate scandals. But facing an election, Nixon did some other things. He brought American troops home from Vietnam, slapped on wage and price controls, went to China, and moved toward detente with the Russians—in each case reversing prior positions. In short, his greatest achievements grew out of the pressure of an approaching election. How many of these decisions would have been made had Nixon had two more years to serve in a single term?

The principle of accountability was at work, and Nixon felt uncomfortably wed to it. Now the psychology is reversed. Under the cloud of Watergate, he resists the demands of the public and the pleas of Republican Party leaders to disclose relevant evidence—all in the knowledge that he faces no political future and must only avoid a criminal one.

The current vacuum of Presidential leadership in the midst of political and economic crisis is argument enough against further impingements on the constitutional system of accountability. But there is one other bearing on the election process itself. While Americans live by the results of majority rule, it must be remembered that the chief protection we accord minorities is their ability to exert the leverage of their numbers as an important force in plebiscite.

During the traumatic outbreaks and demonstrations of the 1960s, the nation was once again reminded that minorities, believing they have little voice in governmental policies, can cause utter chaos by resisting them. We learned all over again that highway and poverty programs can be successfully pursued with fifty-one per cent support, but

that highly controversial policies, such as fighting wars and integrating schools, take a broad two-thirds to three-fourths consensus. And it is almost axiomatic that Presidents (like Nixon and Johnson) who have faced the hostility of minorities come to favor a single, longer term, wherein their policies are not held hostage to an election. At the heart of their belief is the mistaken paternalistic implication: "I am the President and I know better than the people what's good for them." This is dangerous heresy in a country that depends on the consent of the governed—a heresy that would be institutionalized by adoption of the six-year term.

Granted that something has to be done to tame this beast of Presidential power, are there not less dramatic, better-targeted reforms which would not tamper so destructively with our constitutional system? I believe there are such reforms:

Serious thought must be given to repeal of the Twenty-second Amendment. This, in my view, was a vindictive act of an earlier generation and has already proven to be a mistake.

An alternative to impeachment should be developed—one whose implications are not so painful. I am co-sponsoring one such proposal patterned after the parliamentary "vote of no confidence," with a general election to be held when two-thirds of the Congress finds, on carefully specified grounds, that the President is not properly performing his duties.

Congress must reform and modernize itself at a faster pace if it is to turn the tide of executive dominance. Of immediate importance is the adoption of the Bolling Committee's jurisdictional streamlining of the archaic House committee system.

We must search out new ways for the "loyal opposition" to present its programs and criticisms of the incumbent in forums that will approximate those the President receives. The President should have ready access to the country, but he should not be allowed to monopolize political communication.

The press must insist that all future Presidential candidates pledge themselves to frequent and regularly scheduled press conferences.

Most importantly, Congress must enact tough election reforms to begin to recapture the confidence of an angry public in its political institutions. Topping the list is a sound system of publicly financed campaigns and a Federally sponsored effort to get unregistered voters on the rolls.

A final answer is to work for change in public attitudes toward the Presidency. Many American mothers want their children to grow up to be Presidents like Jefferson and Lincoln, but they don't want them to become politicians in the process. The mythology of statesmanship is such that we forget that like Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon, Presidents Jefferson and Lincoln were living, breathing, sweating politicians, whose success in large measure was due to their political skill. Those who would isolate the Presidency from everyday politics might bear that in mind.

O. R. STRACKBEIN WRITES ABOUT PRESS CAMPAIGNS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1974

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, O. R. Strackbein is one of the Nation's leading authorities on matters relating to the role played by the news media in our

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

society and in our system of democracy. Under leave to extend my remarks I include an article he recently wrote on the subject. It is timely, objective, and thought provoking. The article follows:

PRESS CAMPAIGNS

(By O. R. Strackbein)

The press over the years has devoted itself to campaigns for or against an innumerable variety of causes, candidates, programs, and public issues.

Since the press by its very nature gained access to the public more frequently and possibly in a greater proportion of the population than any other instrument of access to the public, it was a handy medium that could be utilized not only as a carrier of news, which was presumably its leading reason for being, but also as a medium of whatever else lent itself to dissemination in the form of print applied to paper. Newspapers, indeed, came to draw no small share of their income from a variety of advertising and from the use of their press for jobs of commercial printing. Again, it was the nature of the instrumentality and its accidental versatility that combined to make of the press a means of livelihood through publication of newspapers.

In the early days the press had but a short radius of circulation. While its influence could not be measured to any precise degree, it was sought by those who wished to influence the public, and it came to be used for that purpose. In political campaigns it was a common experience in communities to behold one newspaper in the camp of one candidate and an opposing newspaper in the camp of the other. If there were several newspapers a diversity of opposition and support was quite sure to add zest, life and fury to the contest.

Such contests, of course, were good for the newspapers concerned. Partisans of both sides avidly read reciprocally about the sins and rascality of the other in the news columns, editorials and cartoons of the opposing press. One side could and would answer the other. Vehemence of expression, wild charges, pious denials and counter charges all came out in the wash. Because of the power of the printed word the favor of the press became a highly prized quarry.

The experience of early Colonial America with the despotism of monarchical practices made the framers of our Constitution alert to the value of a free and "untrammeled" press to the aspiration of democracy.

The subject of the press was, however, not foremost in the minds of the delegates who met in Philadelphia. They were more concerned about devising a form of government that first and foremost would be made as poor as possible against the kingly abuses of governmental power with which they had become familiar historically and which they had been eager to escape.

They felt strongly that absolute power could not be entrusted to man. Unrestrained power, such as the divine right of kings, which had spread over Europe, was anathema to the colonists. As an antidote the Constitution-framers provided for the separation of powers, which is to say, a system of checks and balances within the very structure of government. This was so devised, or intended to be so arranged that the natural jealousy of power and the motivation flowing from the clashing of contending forces, would automatically check each other.

The three branches of government—not a brainchild of Madison, Hamilton and Hay or the other Constitution-makers, but an import from European political philosophers who had verbally plowed the ground back and forth and crisscross many times—the three branches of government were to balance one another and prevent gravitation of too much power into the hands of any one branch. The republic which was proposed presented a unique opportunity of putting

this very sensible philosophy into effect. Nowhere else than in what was to become the United States was there such a virgin opportunity, on such a hopeful and promising scale, free of hereditary entanglements and obstacles. The wayward tendencies and ambitions of greedy men who might seek an undue extension of power in the executive, legislative or judicial branch would soon be checked by the alert holders of power in the other two branches, or by the electorate. The latter would remain as the final check. The powers vested in each branch were spelled out by a process of enumeration and positive assignment no less than express injunctions.

The instrument was admittedly not perfect or complete. In a short time the first Ten Amendments were adopted, called the Bill of Rights, taking effect December 15, 1791. It was only then that the press was mentioned, and then only in a negative fashion, and in the same clause that proclaimed freedom of speech as a right that was not to be abridged by any law of Congress. It may be noted in passing that the press, because of its unique attributes and ownership was assured ascendancy over freedom of speech, which, having no amplifier compared with freedom of the press, languished and indeed could be held in tow at the mercy of the press.

Since the press in the early days was local in its circulation there was not much reason to be concerned about its power. There was no reason for incorporating its functions into the framework of government, or to provide for a system of checks and balances that would operate as a brake on its powers, should it ever wax sufficiently powerful to become the source of serious concern. Developments that were unforeseen at the time (1787-88) were naturally passed by, as, for example, the atomic weapon. It was always possible, in any case, to set up another newspaper as a check against budding rampancy of a particular newspaper. Jefferson and Hamilton did so in their bitter rivalry. George Washington complained strongly against attacks upon him by Jefferson's National Gazette; but there is no record of his setting up an opposing sheet. This all happened, of course, after adoption of the Constitution. The power of the press was still confined to inflicting irritation and outrage and did not produce widespread and deep concern over the perils of its abuse.

The press thus came along under the high privilege granted to it by the First Amendment. Congress was to make no law abridging its freedom. This negative injunction left the press largely to its own devices. Except in the matter of libel and commercial law it was left free of restraint. No handle of responsibility was placed in the hands of the public by which it might call the press to account; such as periodic elections by which editors or publishers might be replaced if their services were regarded as failing of public trust. No power of impeachment was placed in the hands of those whom the newspapers were to serve. This omission meant that there remained one sector in the field of popular self-government beyond the reach of the people themselves.

The time came when the circulation of newspapers ranged farther afield. While the high-speed press had not been foreseen it nevertheless was developed in time. With its use it was possible to print copies by the hundreds of thousands and even millions. With the help of advertising revenue and large-scale output it was possible to sell newspapers at a low price, thus assuring ever broader circulation. Today a few newspapers enjoy a national market. This achievement could be hailed as a contribution to the culture of the people and their increasing enlightenment, and no doubt justly so; but the equation is no longer so clear or without distinct minus signs. The number of newspapers had declined. Many have been merged in the same city, so that

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

today local and regional monopoly power is a reality in the ranks of the press. Efforts to expand circulation rather than being directed toward surpassing competitors in excellence of news service may lead newspapers to concentrate their appeal to the lower registers of the human character.

Today a press campaign, i.e., by one or more newspapers, represents a different dimension from that of the earlier times. All the resources of the press, news writers, commentators (columnists), editorial writers and cartoonists may be enlisted in a systematic drive. The newspaper, moreover, may own radio or television outlets. The press, if the newspapers are unified, or in a monopolistic position, then is committed to victory in whatever campaign it may mount. It may gather a formidable momentum by repetitive assault against what or whom it opposes or uninterrupted support for the object of its promotion.

While individual newspapers will claim objectivity and fairness in their news columns they may align themselves solidly, or nearly so (with some allowance for dissenting views), on their editorial pages through their columnists and cartoonists. This choice of sides had been generally accepted as legitimate journalistic practice as long as the news columns remained unsullied; but doubts and troubled concern have severely shaken complacency in recent times, especially in areas subjected to a press monopoly. A heavy shift toward opinion-saturated news items has given impetus to the dismay.

Too much power over the shaping of thought and images and in general the setting of the ethical and cultural climate, it is feared, lies dangerously within the power of the metropolitan press, not to mention television and radio. The advantage is seen not only in the wide circulation of like-minded newspapers but also in the growing coloration of the news items by reporters and copy editors who are enlisted in this or that campaign, and who wish not only to report events but to influence them. These workers of the Fourth Estate become advocates alongside of the editorialists. They write interpretative articles and also find means of infiltrating news accounts by a form of bias that is not readily detected by readers who are not sensitized by intimate or special knowledge of the subject treated.

Room for demagoguery expands as the reporters specialize and gain expert insight not shared by the workaday public. The practice of advocacy journalism, i.e., participating in campaigns, either openly or covertly, takes on the color of a one-sided presentation in support of the selected goal, much as advocates at law present only one side of a case in which the client is interested. It is not expected that the counsel of one side will make a presentation for the opposing side. Under monopoly journalism there may not be so much as opposing counsel! Concealment of bias may, indeed, be developed into a veritable art.

The specialization of reporters is not of itself an evil. It is most desirable if the enterprise has the financial capability to make it possible; but it is open to unacceptable practices. For example, on controversial subjects expert opinions may roam far afield from each other and still appear highly compelling when they are considered separately. Behold the dissenting opinions of Supreme Court justices! Unless the reader of one of these opinions is thoroughly grounded in the subject matter he could be convinced by the single opinion. If he then reads the other opinion he will learn a lesson in credulity, for the second opinion will seem as convincing as the one that had just convinced him! Now he must really study the opinions if he is to perceive which is right. Even then he will find that much depends on the point of view from which he takes his own departure.

Appraised in this context it is not difficult to perceive the advantage of the specialized reporter over the lay reader of his report, which is to say perhaps more than 99% of the public. Without attributing malfeasance or deception to the reporter, it is nonetheless quite obvious what a leeway he enjoys, including liberal quotations from one side and few from the other—a scope of options that lie at the mercy of his honesty as a journalist. It is to prop just such honesty with checks and balances that these were instituted in our governmental system; but they were not extended to the press. The honesty of the journalist is no doubt as good as any but he is exposed to a variable but possibly unacceptable degree of temptation if his employer has his heart set on winning a campaign. Acceptable or not, the public has no hold over the reporter such as it has over public officials and such as these have over each other, thanks to the separation of powers. The natural father of biased journalism is the press campaign.

To permit power over the dissemination of news to gravitate into the hands of a monopoly or near-monopoly of news media with no external rights of access represents a means of subverting the interests of democracy.

The clash of ideas, opinions and theories is recognized by us as a healthy exercise in a democracy. In the course of such interchange error may be exposed and reduced, if not eliminated, while truth is provided the maximum opportunity of shaping human affairs. Thomas Jefferson held that even error may be tolerated if reason is left free to combat it. Control of the means of moulding public opinion in a few hands, such as a monopoly press, or even in a combination of like-minded media, represents the introduction of a new type of dominancy over the public. Kings have never held a monopoly on monopoly.

The power of the theocratic State was broken and then also the dominance of the autocratic monarchs. One of the instruments by which the power of the latter was fettered on the way to divestment was the restraint of a constitution fastened on the monarch. These struggles ran over centuries. Today movement is mounted on a highly accelerated schedule; but the lust for power has not abated in the human breast. Dominancies all answer to the same god, which is power and gratification of the ego and enhancement of privileges. Newspapers and other media, electronic, for example, are not immune to the temptation. It would be naive to believe that journalists are more trustworthy in this respect than other mortals, as if they were of a different species. How the press by a process of veritable transubstantiation, was able to expand a sanctuary posted against trespass by the Constitution, a purely negative reservation, into an empire of growing dominancy over the fortunes of the people's supposedly uninhibited power of self-government must remain a question for further explanation.

Should the fort be finally taken by the press and its sister media the possibility of dislodgement would be de minimus. The weaponry at the disposal of the media is virtually impregnable once set in place. Its fire power, both in point of high frequency and in its reach and scope, so far exceeds that of the citizenry that it represents no contest.

Such an assertion would indeed represent an exaggeration but for one dominant fact: there is no way by which an objector can reach the press without incurring great risk of relegation to oblivion by the press itself. It has that power and is not notably loath at exercising it. From under the umbrella of the Constitutional injunction, designed to assure its freedom, the press has overrun the cities, where nearly all the people live, and great areas of the countryside or suburbs, where people go to flee the cities; and has entrenched itself. It has fortified itself by

freely exercising the advantage that it so loudly but properly denounces when it encounters an example of it in the civil, political or economic world apart from the press itself.

"FOOD RESOURCES OF THE SEA"
BY JOHN H. RYTHER

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the text of a most interesting essay by John H. Ryther entitled, "Food Resources of the Sea," published in the February, 1974, issue of the Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Food Resources of the Sea

(By John H. Ryther)

(Note.—John H. Ryther is a Senior Scientist at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution where he was previously Chairman of the Department of Biology. Mr. Ryther, who has been associated with WHOI since receiving his doctorate from Harvard in 1951, is currently director of a major sewage treatment-aquaculture project in which human wastes are recycled to grow algae as a source of food for shellfish. In addition to his duties at the Oceanographic Institution, Mr. Ryther has served as an active member of the corporations of the Marine Biological Laboratories and the Bermuda Biological Station; he was Scientific Director of the U.S. Biological Program, International Indian Ocean Expedition, and is currently acting as Commissioner of both the NAS-NRC National Resources Commission and the U.S. Marine Mammal Commission. A recent publication entitled *Aquaculture: The Farming and Husbandry of Freshwater and Marine Organisms*, written by John Ryther, John E. Bardach, and William O. McLarney, was nominated by the National Book Awards Committee for the 1973 science book of the year award.

In recent years, farming of the sea has been recognized as one of the most promising aspects of the world-wide effort to increase food production. The importance of cultivating aquatic food resources can perhaps best be seen in the context of the dramatic changes that have taken place in the global food situation over the past decade. Ten years ago, the literature was filled with dire forecasts of a breakdown in the world food economy. In their book, *Famine 1975*, published in 1967, William and Paul Paddock warned that the Malthusian nightmare was virtually upon us, that by the mid-1970's, the population would exceed the available food supply bringing with it "the time of famines." Toward the end of the 1960's, however, these doomsday predictions gave way to a far more optimistic outlook based partly on improved prospects for population control but largely on the advent of the much-heralded Green Revolution. Under favorable conditions, "wonder wheat" and "miracle rice" have, in fact, produced remarkable results. Yet like many other technological phenomena, the Green Revolution has failed to live up to the exaggerated promises of its prophets. Since the new seeds require fertilizer, irrigation, and modern equipment, they are limited in their application, particularly with respect to the situation in the developing world. As a consequence, the projected increase in agricultural production of as much as 5 per cent a year has never materialized.

Further difficulties have resulted from the severe weather of the past two years;

droughts in some parts of the globe and floods in others caused bad harvests in many areas and a drastic decline in agricultural yields throughout the world. Today, grain stocks are at their lowest point in twenty years and the general world food situation is more severe than at any time since the mid-1960's. As *Science* magazine stated some months ago, "pessimism is back in vogue" with respect to the world food situation.*

With renewed concern over the increasing demand for food has come the realization that agricultural production is constrained not so much by the availability of arable land and advanced technology but by the availability of fresh water. Sophisticated methods of irrigation have been supplemented by efforts to shift precipitation patterns and alter the flow of rivers. On another level, the untapped resources of the sea have been cited as the potential cure-all for a hungry world. Here again, however, the prospects for achieving ever-increasing yields have alternated between optimism and pessimism.

In the years immediately following the end of World War II, the fishing communities of the world were landing between 15 and 20 million tons of marine products; by the mid-1960's, the world fish catch had risen to between 60 and 70 million tons. This substantial increase over a twenty-year period gave rise to the overly optimistic belief that the sea could save mankind from hunger and starvation. By the end of the 1960's, however, it had become apparent to a number of scientists that the ocean was not the great reservoir of food it was once thought to be. By analyzing the basic factors governing marine food production, they concluded that most of the ocean was limited in nutrients and that productivity was centered largely in coastal areas. With 90 per cent of the ocean poor in terms of food resources, it was estimated that the total world harvest of fish, then close to 70 million tons annually, would peak at only 100 million tons.

At about the same time that scientists were reevaluating the potential food production of the ocean, the fisheries of the world were faced with a new problem. In the late 1960's, the total world fish catch registered a significant decline, the first in the postwar years. Since then, the annual catch has been fluctuating irregularly. In the early 1970's, for example, the landings of the great Peruvian anchoveta fishery, which at their peak represented as much as 20 per cent of the world's total fish production, suddenly fell sharply. One of the reasons for the drop was a shift in the pattern of ocean currents, a sudden cessation of the upwelling of nutrient-rich waters along the Peruvian coast. Yet, underlying this immediate cause was the fundamental problem of over-utilization of resources. In other parts of the world, herring, cod, haddock, salmon, tuna, and some thirty other species commonly used directly as human food are already "over-fished" or near full exploitation. Given this fact, it is possible that the total world catch may never even reach the current projected maximum of 100 million tons a year.

How important is the present contribution of the sea to human nutrition and to man's food needs in general? In terms of calories consumed, the contribution is virtually insignificant. Grains of different varieties still account for the largest percentage of human energy; only 10 per cent of our caloric input comes from terrestrial animals in the form of meat, eggs, and milk, and a mere 1-2 per

cent from fish. In terms of high-quality animal protein, however, the role of fish products is far more significant. Of the 70 million tons of fish now harvested annually, some 11 million tons, or 17 per cent, can be regarded as human food. The rest consists of either fish used for animal feed, fertilizer, and bait, or inedible shells, seaweeds, and other wastes. In terms of the protein requirements established by the FAO, the 11 million tons of edible fish represents about 25 per cent of the high quality animal protein needed by the 3.5 billion people living on the earth today.

Would the projected annual yield of one hundred million tons materially improve the world food situation by the year 2000? Unfortunately not. If present trends continue, there will be more than 7 billion people on the earth by 2000 and the contribution that commercial fishing will make to their protein needs will be less than it is today—some 18 per cent as compared with the current figure of 25 per cent. In other words, it is unlikely that commercial fishing, in itself, can ever provide more than a small fraction of our requirement for high-quality animal protein.

To improve and increase aquatic productivity, we must go beyond traditional fishing methods to farm the ocean scientifically. Primitive forms of aquaculture have been carried out in Southeast Asia for many years, even centuries in some instances. These sea farming systems are quite effective in producing fish and their implementation in other areas offers the promise of greatly expanded food supplies from the sea.

Along the coast of almost any country in Southeast Asia, one can find acres of farm ponds that have been constructed by clearing and excavating mangrove swamps with hand labor; slabs of mud are used to build up the simple dikes that form the pond. In most cases, the ponds are linked to an estuary or the ocean by means of various outlets, some of which allow water to flow in and out with each tidal cycle. In other cases, the ponds are cut off from the ocean except for an occasional change of water when they become too salty from evaporation or too fresh from the heavy rainfall. The nature and complexity of the pond system varies depending on the country, the traditional form of construction, and the species to be cultivated.

Once the ponds are completed, they are stocked with young organisms of various kinds; milkfish, mullet, and shrimp are typical of the species grown in this manner. Under present conditions, the fry are either captured in coastal ponds by opening the sluice gates on the incoming tide or, more likely, purchased from dealers who specialize in collecting and selling fry to fish farmers. The purchase of fry is currently the most expensive part of the farming process; it would be a great stimulus to the economy of these Asian countries if modern hatchery techniques could be introduced into the fish farming systems, thereby providing a reliable low-cost supply of juvenile organisms.

Initially, the fry are placed in small nursery ponds where they may be fed artificially. During this period, the main production ponds are prepared for stocking. The first step is to drain the ponds and dry them for a week or more. The bottom soil is then loosened and leveled by tilling and raking; it may also be fertilized lightly with manure, rice bran, or other inexpensive natural products. Next, the ponds are flooded to a depth of two or three inches and allowed to stand for several weeks. In time, a community of algae, bacteria, worms, and other small invertebrates grows on the bottom of the ponds; blue-green algae, in particular, are encouraged because their nitrogen-fixing capacity permits the pond to become self-sufficient in terms of its nitrogen sources. This dense mat of algae and associated organisms constitutes the main food of the fish stocked in the ponds.

As soon as the fry attain fingerling size, they are transferred into the production ponds where they are left to grow for several months to, at most, a year at which time they become marketable and are harvested. The average yields of these ponds is on the order of 500 pounds per acre per year, a reasonable but not outstanding figure for the production of high-quality animal protein. To promote greater yields, new techniques which proved effective in Taiwan have recently been implemented in other parts of Southeast Asia. Of particular importance is the practice of continuous stocking and harvesting; instead of stocking the pond once a year with fry, allowing them to grow into adults and harvesting them all together, a population consisting of several different-sized groups is maintained in the pond at all times, with the larger fish harvested almost continuously; in this way, the pond is kept at or very close to its optimum carrying capacity. Taiwanese methods of controlling predators and competitors for the food of the cultured fish as well as a type of pond construction which promotes more efficient harvesting have also been adopted. The result of these very simple improvements has been to increase yields from about 500 pounds to over 2,000 pounds per acre per year.

In summary, this form of aquaculture is simple, indeed primitive, in conception, yet its productivity compares very favorably to the rate of production per unit acre of land. Sea farming of this nature possesses other advantages as well. It presents more of the difficulties involved in introducing new products into an area for it supplies a product which is useful and already accepted in the country in which the organisms are grown. It is well suited for the underdeveloped parts of the world where vast acres of coastal wetlands exist. It can be developed with hand labor and very little capital investment and it requires only one man to supervise several hundred acres of ponds, except (when traditional methods are used) during the brief period of stocking at one time of year and harvesting at another. It can be undertaken on almost any scale; by employing almost identical techniques, a wealthy entrepreneur or government can operate thousands of acres of ponds or an individual can farm a single pound. Finally, it is an extremely profitable undertaking; people who have underwritten coastal aquaculture projects in the Philippines or Singapore or Indonesia are currently realizing a 20-30 per cent annual return on their investment.

To illustrate the advantages of this approach, one need only compare the difficulties involved in developing a commercial fishing industry in the Philippines with the success of aquatic farming in that country. Some years ago, the FAO set out to make fishing a major industry in the Philippines. The problems were formidable: a nonseagoing people had to be convinced of the value of the enterprise; fishermen had to be recruited from a reluctant native population or imported from other countries; a fleet of fishing vessels, freezer ships, and delivery vehicles had to be procured; and fishing ports, storage facilities, and roads had to be constructed. It was an extremely difficult task compared with the limited effort involved in establishing a number of aquacultural ventures, scattered throughout the country and operated by people who want and need this kind of farming and will consume its products.

When I was in the Philippines in 1967, the total annual yield of existing ponds farmed in the traditional manner was 63,000 tons or an average of 500 pounds per acre. However, as I indicated earlier, the introduction of improved techniques has raised current production to over a ton per acre. In addition, the government has identified about a million and a quarter acres of mangrove swamps that are available for the development of this type of pond culture, bringing the maximum theoretical yield of Philippine fish culture to

*The article entitled "World Food Situation: Pessimism Comes Back into Vogue" by Nicholas Wade (*Science*, August 17, 1973) contains an interesting analysis of the short- and long-term prospects for the world's food situation.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

approximately 1.7 million tons. Production at this level would be more than adequate to meet the protein requirements of the entire country. It is this kind of experience which underlines my belief that aquaculture is potentially both an attractive and valuable method of food production.

Using these figures, can we extrapolate the total theoretical yield if this form of aquaculture were supplied on a global scale? On the basis of my own calculations, I estimate that there are about one billion acres of coastal wetlands in the world. As a standard of comparison, some seven to eight billion acres of earth are now used for food production, with half of the area devoted to agriculture and half to grazing. If only one-tenth of the available wetlands, or 100 million acres, were set aside for aquacultural development, the potential yield, using improved methods of production, would be 100 million tons of fish per year—the equivalent of the potential yield from the world's commercial fisheries. This rate of productivity is particularly impressive given the fact that it can be achieved through a relatively simple process that requires no extraneous feeding and very little labor or capital investment. Moreover, while the potential yield from aquaculture is equal, in terms of gross tonnage, to the potential yield from commercial fishing, the former contains a far greater percentage of material that is directly beneficial to man. At least 50 per cent of the aquaculture yield is available for direct human consumption; if the remainder is recycled as fishmeal or fed to terrestrial animals, another 10 per cent can be realized. In the case of the commercial fish catch, only 17 million of the potential 100 million tons can be consumed by humans. Taken together, however, the commercial catch and the aquaculture products represent 77 million tons of food—enough to satisfy the protein requirement of a population estimated to be on the order of seven billion by the year 2000.

It should be emphasized that the production figures relating to aquaculture are based on the relatively simple technologies now in use. Theoretically, it is possible to realize even greater yields. For example, we know that the production of food in aquatic systems can be substantially increased if the production of the plant blooms which support the food organisms can be expanded through fertilization of the water. At the same time, however, the addition of fertilizer can pose a serious threat to the viability of farm ponds. If these systems become too heavily laden with organic material, they become unstable and their oxygen supply is seriously depleted. The central problem is that increased yields of organic matter require intensive fertilization of the water, yet fertilization eventually becomes a limiting factor in all kinds of food production, whether it be terrestrial or aquatic. One form of aquaculture that promises increased productivity without the detrimental effects associated with fertilizers was developed by the Chinese over a thousand years ago. The Chinese practice of polyculture entails the introduction into an aquatic system of a number of different species, each occupying a different ecological niche and consuming a different type of food. In the case of the Chinese carp, six varieties can be stocked in one pond; the grass carp which consumes the large emergent vegetation; two midwater dwellers, one of which prefers zooplankton, the other phytoplankton; and three bottom dwellers which feed on mollusks, worms, and the feces of the grass carp. The result is a highly efficient system of fish culture. On its own, the grass carp eats so much vegetation that its highly organic wastes could upset the balance of the pond; within the framework of polyculture, however, the bottom-feeding fishes derive some of their nourishment from the partially digested

plant remains in grass carp feces, thereby preventing the pond from becoming overladen with organic wastes and adding to the production of fish. The yields from this form of aquaculture are far greater than those obtained from the cultivation of a single species.

The importance of conserving and recycling nonrenewable nutrients has led not only to a recognition and appreciation of Chinese polyculture but also to the development of a highly advanced form of aquaculture designed to increase food production from the sea by recycling human wastes. For the past three years, the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution has been conducting laboratory experiments in which marine plankton algae, grown in diluted effluent from treated sewage and other compounds, are used to provide food for shellfish, principally oysters. A flowing system has been developed in which seawater, enriched with the effluent from a nearby secondary sewage treatment plant, is continuously pumped into a pond of algal culture as a comparable volume of culture is continuously removed. The single-celled algae in the pond feed on the "effluent fertilizer" and proliferate, turning the water muddy brown in color. This water is then circulated through runways where the oysters, if they are properly located and in the proper number, filter out the algae. In this way, the algae remove all the objectionable nutrients including ammonia, nitrate, and phosphate from the sewage effluent while the oysters, in turn, remove the algae from the water. However, since the oysters are not completely efficient machines, they return some of the nutrients to the water in the form of excreted wastes. To utilize these secondary waste products, we have added another component to the system which consists of tanks of seaweed that feed on the residual or regenerated nutrients. Sea lettuce is one of the varieties of seaweed which thrives in this environment and, in yet another extension of the system, is used as food for abalone.

In addition to the excreted, dissolved wastes removed by the seaweed, the oysters also produce a solid waste product which settles to the bottom of the tank and is eaten by sand worms. The sand worms, which are highly prized as bait—in fact, they are more expensive per pound than lobsters—are then circulated to a neighboring tank where they serve as food for flounder. The outcome of this continuous culture system is a primary crop of oysters and side-crops of seaweeds, worms, flounder, and abalone. In the end, the ultimate product which is discharged into the sea is as pure or purer than the ocean water itself.

In my view, this project is indicative of the future course of research in sea farming. By working with pollution, we have been able to achieve one of the highest rates of protein production in the world. Of course, a number of difficulties have arisen in the attempt to maximize the efficiency of the system. At the present time, the major challenge is to insure that no disease-carrying viruses are allowed to contaminate the oysters. Since the sewage is chlorinated before being pumped into the tanks, it is presumably free of bacteria. However, it is known that virus particles are not quantitatively removed or killed by conventional sewage treatment methods. A monitoring system which will concentrate viruses from large volumes of seawater has recently been devised as a first step in our study of the virus problem. It is our hope that, in collaboration with T. G. Metcalf of the Department of Microbiology, University of New Hampshire, and J. G. Trump of the High Voltage Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, we can develop a process that will destroy virus particles at the sewage treatment level, well before they enter the system.

May 31, 1974

Research on the combined sewage treatment-aquaculture project was begun on a scaled-down model designed and tested indoors. The model was later expanded in size and moved outside where it could be tested under natural conditions. To determine the reliability, productivity, and economics of the system, however, the level of experimentation must be increased to a much larger scale. Last fall, a new Environmental Systems Laboratory was completed to house pilot-scale studies related to the project. Initially, the Environmental Systems Laboratory will contain a 12,000-square-foot algae farm as well as shellfish and finfish culture tanks containing seawater from Vineyard Sound and treated effluent to cultivate the algae. The six algae ponds are 50 feet in diameter with three-foot depths; the shellfish growing units occupy a 3,000-square-foot area; and the piping system filters and heats up to 1,000 gallons of seawater per minute.

What does the project promise for the future? If implemented on a large scale, such a system would be capable of producing an annual crop of one million pounds of shellfish meat from a one-acre production facility and a fifty-acre algae farm using effluents from a community of 11,000 people. The potential yield of world-wide aquaculture, based on the simplest improvements, is already an impressive 100 million tons of food; by adopting advanced culture techniques such as that developed at Woods Hole, the yield could well be multiplied ten-fold within the next three decades.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE—
FIRST STEP TO SOCIALIZED
MEDICINE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many well-meaning people are starting to discuss health insurance in one form or another as a means of providing fair and equitable health care to all of the American people. Tragically, in the discussions of health insurance, little is said to remind the people that all of the pending Federal health insurance programs are directed toward placing private insurance plans under public or bureaucratic control. Nor is it mentioned that only some 11 percent of the American people today do not have private health insurance programs. Nor is it ever suggested that converting from a private program to a publicly controlled program will increase the cost and significantly downgrade the quality.

I would submit that none of the pending health insurance programs could possibly work to the advantage of the American people and are but a step toward socialized medicine. In fact, the labor bosses, so adamant in continued salary raises for their membership, continue to support a health security bill which would take over all existing health insurance programs, public and private, and provide "free" health care for everyone under a single federally run system to be paid by the taxpayers out of the Public Treasury.

The president of the American Medical Association, testifying in Washington last week, questioned whether the Amer-

ican public is as much interested in enactment of a national health insurance plan as the news media would have them believe.

The recent Harris poll shows inflation still ranking as first on the priority lists of concerns among the American people. The same survey ranked health care as 15th. Since any new Federal program must result in expanded spending which will only result in more inflation, our leaders who are demanding a federally controlled health program to meet the demands of the public seem to be only fooling themselves.

In discussing Federal control of health care, the politicians and the opinion-making machinery are using Americans' concept of our present private health care systems to make our people believe they have the same benefits under socialized medicine. They will not.

The advocates of "new medical care" are showing one thing and working toward another.

I believe my colleagues would find the following editorial from the local newspaper, which has never shown great concern over inflation, along with another related newsclipping, of interest: [From the Washington Post, May 24, 1974]

AMA PRESIDENT SAYS PUBLIC MAY NOT WANT

A HEALTH PLAN

The American Medical Association yesterday questioned whether the American public is much interested in enactment of a national health insurance plan.

AMA President Russell B. Roth of Erie, Pa., told the Senate Finance Committee that any such plan, including the one favored by his organization, is bound to push up health costs.

He said a recent Louis Harris survey showed that "concern for medical care rated 15th on the priority list, while inflation ranked first."

"That raises a final question," he said. "Does the public really, genuinely, want Congress to aggravate its principal concern— inflation—in order to treat the 15th ranking problem—health?"

However, Roth said that if Congress decides to move ahead on national health insurance, it should give close consideration to the AMA proposal called Medicredit.

The AMA plan would permit beneficiaries who pay part or all of their health insurance premiums to private companies to use tax credits to offset a part of their payments.

This mechanism would "minimize the number of dollars making a round trip to Washington, as tax to return as a shrunken benefit."

He said a proposal would be the least desirable because it would boost Social Security taxes and involve maximum government participation in the financing.

Meanwhile, before the House Ways and Means Committee, labor and insurance industry spokesmen continued their disagreement as to whether a national insurance plan should operate through the private insurance industry.

"We are strongly opposed to private insurance coverage and employer-employee contributions . . ." Dr. Lorin E. Kerr, director of occupational health for the United Mine Workers, said.

He said basic requirements for a health care plan include comprehensive benefits, universal coverage, financing by a progressive income tax surcharge and quality and cost controls.

But Frederick E. Rathgeber, vice president of the Prudential Insurance Co. and spokes-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

man for the Health Insurance Association of America and other groups, said a partial or total government takeover would be "inefficient, inflexible and an unnecessary use of taxes urgently needed to deal with other domestic needs."

He said the private insurance industry can demonstrate that it is efficient and that its profits have been extremely modest and used to expand and improve its services.

[From the Washington Post, May 26, 1974]

THE HEALTH INSURANCE DEBATE

The hearings on national health insurance that began last week in the Senate and last month in the House are not just for show and tell. Both of the committee chairmen involved, are personally sponsoring national health insurance bills. Each has made it clear that he wants to report out a bill in this session and has some hope it may pass. The earnest and often technical questions which committee members are throwing at witnesses reveal that the members are not grandstanding for the voters back home; they are seriously thinking through the difficult practical problems of setting up a national health insurance system.

Moreover, the parade of witnesses has shown clearly that the question being debated is not whether the United States should have national health insurance, but what kind it should have. Even the American Medical Association is no longer opposing national health insurance as such. It is pushing its own limited version called "Medicredit," under which the federal government would use the income tax to subsidize individual purchases of comprehensive health insurance.

It is, of course, always possible that the impeachment proceedings will pre-empt the time and energy of the Congress in a way that prevents enactment of health insurance legislation in this session of Congress. But other obstacles to passage also exist, and these strike us as being surmountable with a little good will and good sense. One is the fact that divisions still exist on several crucial features of a prospective national health insurance system. The other is the possibility that as the election nears some legislators may decide they have more to gain from voting for a lost cause than from making the compromises necessary to get a health insurance bill enacted.

The grounds for a compromise, however, are there. Fairly general agreement already exists that the bill ought to (1) replace Medicaid with comprehensive subsidized health insurance for low income people and (2) protect everyone against the "catastrophic" medical expenses of a serious illness or accident. The three bills under serious discussions accomplish these goals in different ways.

The Kennedy-Mills bill would provide comprehensive health insurance coverage for everybody under the Social Security system and finance it by increasing Social Security taxes. Only the poor would get free care, however; most people would have to pay a portion of their medical bills, but would be fully protected against expenditures exceeding \$1,000 a year per family. We believe this is basically a sound approach.

Administration proposal would provide similar benefits (with most families contributing to their bills up to a maximum of \$1,500 a year), but would pay for it differently. Employers would be required to buy insurance coverage from private insurance companies and to share the premiums with their employees. Only the needy would have their insurance subsidized out of general tax revenues. We are less enthusiastic about the administration approach, mainly because it sets up a private tax (the premium paid directly to the insurance company) and fails to provide adequate public controls on the insurance industry or the health providers.

The Long-Ribicoff bill, far less comprehensive than either of the other two, would provide only catastrophic protection against family expenditures exceeding \$2,000 a year and would set up a separate program for the poor. Except perhaps as an interim measure, the Long-Ribicoff approach strikes us as inadequate. It does nothing to help middle income people obtain comprehensive coverage of less extreme medical disasters, and its separate system for the poor perpetuates two-class medicine.

The President, in a radio address last Monday, reemphasized the importance he attaches to national health insurance and his willingness to work out a compromise with the Congress. We hope he is willing to move toward the Kennedy-Mills approach, rather than scaling down his own proposal in the direction of the Long-Ribicoff bill.

If a workable compromise is to be effected, one more voice must be raised in its favor: the voice of organized labor, which, for good reasons, carries great weight on Capitol Hill in discussions of health insurance. So far the major unions have rejected all three bills. They are holding out for a far more drastic "health security" bill that would replace all existing health insurance, public and private, with a single federally-run system and would provide free care for everyone.

We have doubts about the wisdom and workability of such a total transformation of the health financing system in one big leap. So does most of the Congress. Labor's leadership should stop painting its utopias with a broad brush and get into the practical realistic debate that is taking place on Capitol Hill right now. With union support, a compromise bill preserving the best features of the Kennedy-Mills approach would stand a good chance of passage.

DEAN RUSK AND THE OTEPKA CASE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of May 10 in an article on wiretapping and electronic surveillance quotes former Secretary of State Dean Rusk as stating that he recalls no "instance of wiretapping or other electronic surveillance directed toward any officer of the Department of State or any newsman for the purpose of discovering leaks." It was, of course, during his tenure that the most celebrated wiretap case of the 1960's, the Otto Otepka case, occurred. It will be remembered that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, in exhaustive hearings on State Department security and on the Otepka case, brought to public attention the tapping of Mr. Otepka's phone by State personnel, two of whom later "resigned" when the subcommittee revealed their perjurious testimony concerning their part in the tapping.

That Mr. Rusk knew and was involved in the case is a matter of public record. For instance, in his news conference of February 25, 1965, Mr. Rusk was questioned about the Otepka case by Clark Mollenhoff, the Des Moines Register investigative reporter and later counsel to President Nixon:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MOLLENHOFF. Well, do you condone the unauthorized wire taps or have you looked into this at all?

RUSK. As you know, sir, I have looked into this in great detail, but I am not going to get into this with you today.

On May 26, 1974, the same Mr. Mollenhoff reminded Mr. Rusk of the Otepka case in his syndicated column appearing in the Richmond Times-Dispatch. I insert at this point in the RECORD the Mollenhoff column and excerpts from two of Mr. Rusk's news conferences when he, as Secretary of State, was questioned, on both occasions by Mr. Mollenhoff on the use of unauthorized wiretaps employed against Mr. Otto Otepka, a State Department employee at that time:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, May 26, 1974]

RUSK "FORGOT" HIS OWN WIRETAPPING SCANDAL

(By Clark R. Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON.—Former Secretary of State Dean Rusk either has an exceedingly bad memory or is engaged in an intentional misrepresentation to the Congress on the question of electronic eavesdropping and wiretapping when he headed the State Department.

Rusk has testified to a Senate subcommittee that he knows of no eavesdropping or wiretapping of State Department employees during the Kennedy or Johnson administrations.

And, in a burst of self-righteousness totally out of character with his active role in the cover-up in a case involving security evaluator Otto Otepka, Rusk suggested that he would have quit as secretary had such taps been placed on his staff members without his knowledge.

"There would have been someone else in my office the next day," Rusk told the joint foreign relations and judiciary subcommittees. He said he had strong feeling against some of the tactics engaged in by the Nixon administration in recent years.

Rusk, now a teacher of international law at the University of Georgia, may have had no role in the decisions to "get Otepka" by burglarizing his office safes, putting a tap on his telephone and installing a "bug" in his office.

But thousands of pages of testimony before congressional committees on the infamous ordeal of Otepka demonstrate that the secretary of state knew of the controversy over the illegal wiretapping and night entry of Otepka's safe. Rusk also took an active part in covering up for the individuals engaged in the shameful efforts to frame Otepka, who was branded "an enemy" of the Kennedy administration.

What won Otepka a priority position on the Kennedy administration's enemy list was his truthful testimony before the Senate Internal Security Committee on certain laxities in the administration of the State Department employee security program.

Otepka, a long-time civil servant and expert security evaluator, gave his frank opinion on a Kennedy appointee and refused to change his report.

When Otepka was called before the Senate committee, his testimony was in direct contradiction of that of one of his superiors, John F. Reilly, then the deputy assistant secretary of state.

In proving that he was telling the truth and that Reilly's testimony was inaccurate, Otepka produced three documents from his files that conclusively corroborated his testimony.

According to unchallenged testimony before the Senate internal security subcom-

mittee, Reilly and two other State Department officials—Elmer Dewey Hill and David Bellisle—embarked on the "get Otepka" effort complete with burglary, eavesdropping, wiretapping, and personal surveillance. It was done with a fervor worthy of a Charles Colson, John Erlichman or H. R. Haldeman of the Nixon administration.

That subcommittee engaged in direct correspondence with Secretary Rusk on the eavesdropping and wiretapping after Reilly, Hill and Bellisle under oath made broad categorical denials of any knowledge of eavesdropping or wiretapping.

Rusk and the State Department legal office took part in approval of letters written by Reilly, Hill and Bellisle in which they admitted that they had tapped Otepka's telephone and bugged his office. But they insisted that their denials under oath were justified because "static" on the wire made the effort "ineffective."

Even this ludicrous explanation was false, for Hill later admitted that there were "a dozen" recordings made of Otepka's conversations, that he had told Reilly and Bellisle about these recordings and that they had in fact listened to them with comments indicating some of it would be helpful in the "get Otepka" effort.

Hill testified that on Reilly's instructions he gave the recordings to an unidentified man who met him in a State Department corridor. Reilly later testified that he had no recollection of any recordings, conversations with Hill or instructions to Hill.

This took place under Secretary of State Dean Rusk, whose response was to force the resignation of Hill, who played much the same role as John Wesley Dean in the current Watergate controversy.

Bellisle's conduct was condoned by the State Department where he remained and was promoted under the Rusk regime. Reilly was permitted to resign from the State Department with no derogatory report in his personnel record, and the Kennedy administration found a proper place for this wiretapping as a hearing examiner at the Federal Communications Commission.

Otepka has noted recently that in a June 1967 hearing, he was informed by Irving Jaffe, a Justice Department lawyer, that the taped conversations could not be produced because they had been destroyed.

The action has similarities to the Nixon administration's effort to install L. Patrick Gray as permanent director of the FBI after learning of his role in the illegal destruction of papers from the White House safe of convicted Watergate burglar E. Howard Hunt.

Repetition of the documented story of Rusk's responsibility in the Otepka matter isn't intended to minimize crimes of Nixon administration officials. Rather, it demonstrates that lack of integrity in high places is not a characteristic unique to this administration.

Incidentally, it also points up that important segments of the press and television were considerably less aggressive in dealing with such evidence of abuse of executive power when it was done by officials of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

TRANSCRIPT, SECRETARY RUSK'S NEWS CONFERENCE OF FEBRUARY 25, 1965

Q. Mr. Secretary, for a number of years—excuse me, Mr. Secretary.

A. Yes.

Q. I want to turn to an internal problem in the State Department. Mr. John Reilly, who took part in some unauthorized wire taps in the Otepka case here several years ago, gave some untruthful testimony under oath before a Committee of Congress on this, and now he has been hired by the FCC. I wonder if you could tell us if it is true that the State Department made no unfavorable

comment in his personnel file on either the unauthorized wire taps or the untruthful testimony under oath on a material matter?

A. I don't know what comments were made in his personnel file. I simply am uninformed on that point.

Q. Well, do you condone the unauthorized wire taps or have you looked into this at all?

A. As you know, sir, I have looked into this in great detail, but I am not going to get into this with you today.

Q. Well, Mr. Secretary, just a moment—

Q. I don't want to deal with the Otepka case.

A. Yes?

Q. Mr. Secretary, were we satisfied that all supplies and infiltration from the North had been stopped, would the United States be content to solve the indigenous aspects, the civil war aspects, by free elections under international supervision in South Viet-Nam?

A. Well, let's get to the first step first, and then if we get to that step, then we will have the luxury of indulging in the consideration of the second step.

Q. What are our policies with regard to the indigenous aspects of a civil war? Could you enlighten us on this?

A. Well, I think that the indigenous aspects of it could be brought to a conclusion very quickly, and that the South Vietnamese people could turn back to the problem of building their country and improving their constitutional system, elevating the economic standards of the country and get on with the . . .

Q. Mr. Secretary?

A. Sure.

Q. I did want to clear up two things here. You said you had looked into this matter and I wondered, did you know there were unauthorized wire taps and did you know there was untruthful testimony under oath? Those seem to be the pertinent points.

A. Well, I am aware of the circumstances involving both those points, but I won't make a characterization of either one of them at this point.

Q. Do you think it's all right? Did you approve it?

A. No. I am not making any comment about what I did or did not approve of about either one of those points.

TRANSCRIPT, SECRETARY RUSK'S NEWS CONFERENCE OF NOVEMBER 26, 1965

Q. Mr. Secretary—

A. Yes.

Q. On another question, could you tell us what high State Department official it is that has custody of these illegal and unauthorized wiretap recordings on the Otepka telephone? You have had an investigation for about a year and a half or so, and I thought you could pin that down for us.

A. No, I don't have the information, and I'm not sure that I would tell you if I had the information.

Q. Well, doesn't it seem rather important? You have testimony that one of your highest officials was given custody of these wiretap recordings, that were illegal and unauthorized and I would think that in your supervision of the Department that you would be interested in finding this out as soon as possible.

A. Well, when you talk about custody, if you are talking about in whose lockbox such things are, I don't know. If you are talking about custody, well, this would be the responsibility of Mr. Crockett.

Q. Well, do you know who obtained those recordings? Does Mr. Crockett have those recordings now?

A. I'm not going to get into that.

Q. Well, I don't know why not. This seems to be—

A. Because I'm just making a judgment that I'm not getting into it.

May 31, 1974

Q. Well, this deals with the administration of your department and the problem has been pending now for about two years, and I would think you—

A. You have asked your question and I have given the answer.

CARL BILLMAN, 1913-74

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, on January 26, 1974, Carl Billman, who was for over 26 years the executive secretary of the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa died.

As one of the members of the senate of Phi Beta Kappa, the governing board of that body, I came to know Carl Billman and to observe the dedication and ability he brought to his responsibility as chief executive officer of Phi Beta Kappa.

Mr. Speaker, I should like at this point in the RECORD to include a tribute to Mr. Billman that was prepared by Dr. Frederick Hard, professor of English literature at the University of California-Santa Cruz, and a senator emeritus of Phi Beta Kappa.

Dr. Hard's tribute to Carl Billman follows:

CARL BILLMAN, 1913-74

(By Frederick Hard)

Carl Billman, Executive Secretary of the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa for over twenty-six years, died on January 26 at his birthplace in Winchester, Massachusetts after a brief illness. He is survived by his mother, Mrs. Christopher Billman, 5 Lewis Road, Winchester, and by his brothers George and Russell. Private services were held in Winchester on January 30.

Born in 1913 he received his early education in Winchester schools. He was elected to Phi Beta Kappa at Harvard in 1935. There he earned both the B.A. and M.A. degrees in history, and taught that subject at Harvard and at St. Mark's school. In September 1946 he was engaged as Assistant Secretary of the United Chapters, and upon the resignation of Secretary George A. Works in April 1947 he was appointed Acting Secretary. He served in that capacity until the December 1947 meeting of the Senate, at which time he was elected to the Secretaryship.

Early in that period the headquarters of the Society were shifted to two different locations in New York City and to another temporary site at Williamsburg while plans were going slowly forward for a permanent location in Washington, D.C. Secretary Billman not only overcame the stresses and inconveniences of these dislocations of an operating base, but he also contributed significantly to the completion in 1955, of arrangements for establishing the new home at 1811 Q Street.

During his term of office the Society saw its greatest period of growth, both in numbers of chapters (from 141 to 214) and in total membership (from 119,000 to over 250,000). Yet organizational expansion was by no means the main focus of his interest. His chief concern was for the encouragement of higher standards of excellence for colleges and universities through the promotion of humanistic learning. Phi Beta Kappa fostered these purposes especially by several developments to which he gave much attention: the continuously successful publication of the *American Scholar*; the remarkably effective

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Visiting Scholar program; the establishment of the Phi Beta Kappa annual Book Awards; and the expanded activities of the Senate Committee on Qualifications. All of these developments depended largely upon capable and efficient staff coordination and cooperation. Mr. Billman's ability to command respect and loyalty from his office force was noteworthy but never ostentatious. The particularly complex duties of the Committee on Qualifications imposed heavy demands upon his time, talent, temperament, and experience; but he performed his tasks admirably, with skill, energy, tact, and gentle patience. Successive chairmen of that committee have frequently expressed their grateful approval of his expert and judicious assistance.

His friends were pleased and even this habitual modesty could not conceal his own surprise and pleasure at two events which recently gave recognition to the esteem in which he was held by his colleagues and associates. One of these was the conferring of the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws by Davidson College; the other, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his secretaryship, the presentation, on behalf of the Senate, of a gold watch and a ceremonial citation by President Park.

A valued member of his staff has lately said, "Those who had the good fortune to work with him knew how Mr. Billman matched a demanding standard of excellence with unusual consideration for others. We shall try to continue that tradition." A further testimony of this quality of considerate loyalty to the Society that he served so well is the fact that not long before the onset of his last illness, when arrangements were being made for his retirement annuity, he quietly named as one of his beneficiaries the Phi Beta Kappa Foundation. The loss of Carl Billman will be mourned wherever the influence of Phi Beta Kappa is felt. A memorial fund has been set up in his name. Contributions may be made to the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

WHY THE PRESIDENT SHOULD NOT RESIGN

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I have had many disagreements with the policies of this administration. Our differences are, I believe, fundamental. I have opposed the policies and the program of the President whenever I thought that his proposals were fiscally unsound and generally damaging to the country. Therefore, what I am about to say should not be interpreted as a blanket endorsement of Mr. Nixon, his programs, or his administration. The issue is much more fundamental than that. The question is whether by resigning under pressure from members of the Government, members of the press, and others, Mr. Nixon will be setting a precedent for future Presidents. The question is whether his resignation will merely whet Congress appetite for power.

There has been a great deal of controversy over executive privilege and the Presidency. It is not an impeachment inquiry that will damage the Presidency, although it may damage the President; it is the resignation of a President that may damage the Presidency. By capitulating to pressure for his resignation, Mr. Nixon

would go a long way toward transforming this country from a republic, whose Chief Executive Officer serves for a fixed term of years, to a democracy, whose leader serves at the pleasure of the people. By resigning rather than enduring impeachment, Mr. Nixon would be, in effect, changing this Government from one ruled by a written Constitution to one ruled by a popular will. Our Republic would not be changed into a parliamentary system—even a parliamentary system requires a vote of no confidence for the removal of a chief executive—it would be transformed into an ochlocracy: rule by the mob. The mob, of course, in this case is much more sophisticated than a street gang, yet it is nonetheless a mob.

I believe that Mr. Nixon's resignation at this time and in the present circumstances would gravely affect our form of government. I know that many of my colleagues in both Houses of this Congress have publicly urged the President to resign, some more thoughtfully and responsibly than others. Yet I believe that this course of action would be more damaging to the Presidency than an impeachment proceeding. By impeachment and conviction a President may be removed from office; by resignation under pressure, the Constitution is altered in effect, if not in substance. From that time forward the understanding will be that a President may serve a 4 year term, only if his popularity remains high in our national plebiscites, the polls.

If the President is to be removed from office, he ought to be removed by the constitutionally prescribed means; impeachment and conviction for treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors. He ought not to be removed by extraconstitutional means, such as a forced resignation. One's position on this matter is a good indication of how seriously one takes the Constitution as the law of the land. I have heard it argued that resignation is a constitutionally recognized action, and that, therefore, forcing the President to resign is constitutionally acceptable. The argument is fallacious. The Constitution obviously recognizes that a President might resign, and quite properly prescribes the procedure to be followed for filling the vacant office. But the fact is that there are many good reasons for a President to resign that do not fundamentally affect our form of government; however, resignation under pressure from Members of Congress, the news media and others is not one of those reasons for it is external to the President. A good reason for any President to resign might be mental or physical incapacity; a low showing in the polls is not a good reason for a Presidential resignation, for it is based upon factors which have nothing to do with whether a man is able or worthy of holding office.

To say then that resignation in this case would be acceptable because resignation is recognized in the Constitution is to ignore the difference between a resignation under public pressure and a resignation for internal reasons. If the President cannot perform his duties due to some incapacity of his then he ought

to resign. But he ought not to resign simply because the majority of the people think he ought to resign, for he holds office under the Constitution, not under the Gallup poll. Plebiscitary democracy is as great a threat to a free society as dictatorship. I urge the President to stay in office and await the outcome of the impeachment procedure, not for his own sake, but for the sake of our form of government.

MEDIA COVERAGE OF SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a most thoughtful editorial by Philip H. Abelson, editor of "Science" magazine, a weekly publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

The article to which I refer appears in the May 21, 1974, issue of this journal and follows:

MEDIA COVERAGE OF SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

(By Philip H. Abelson)

A cursory examination of news sources leads to the conclusion that citizens have a great number of opportunities to become well informed. They can view programs on the various television channels. Most radio stations give the news at least hourly—some continuously—and there are many talk shows. Newspapers and newsmagazines attempt to carry on their traditional function.

Yet a closer examination reveals that the news media are not effective in presenting balanced news in depth, but are to a degree contributing to a malfunctioning of society. They have participated in creating and exacerbating a series of crises by overconcentrating attention on particular topics. Typically, after a period of concentrated attention, the media suddenly drop one topic as they rush to indulge in overkill of the next one.

These tendencies were noted by Alan L. Otten in a recent column in the *Wall Street Journal* which began:

"One hallmark of contemporary America, it's frequently been noted, is the short lifespan of its crises.

"A problem emerges suddenly, builds swiftly to crisis proportions, briefly dominates public consciousness and concern, and then abruptly fades from view. Civil rights, urban decay, hunger, drugs, crime, campus unrest, medical care, the environment, energy—one succeeds another with blurring speed, almost as though some issue-of-the-year club were in charge."

A glance at Otten's list leaves one with the impression of a variable amount of residue from the periods of great mass media attention. Most of the topics listed are now practically dead as far as the media are concerned. True, there is a considerable residue from emphasis on the environment both in legislation and in public consciousness, although with sharply curtailed media coverage, the public concern and interest have lessened. After tremendous attention, news coverage of the energy crisis has almost disappeared, and there is little indication of substantive progress in meeting the issue. The basic problems remain, but the public is bored with the subject, and the net effect of the coverage is to make it more difficult for progress to be made in the future.

Another undesirable feature of the mas-

sive attention is its lack of quality. The bizarre and the spectacular news takes precedence over reports with balance and substance. We at *Science* frequently have opportunities to evaluate the performance of the media in unearthing the facts about a given situation, and more often than not we are disappointed. This is particularly true in those areas in which science and technology interact with public policy. These issues are usually complex and enduring and not well handled by slick or sensational journalism.

The current practices of the mass media point up the value of publications like *Science* that are designed to inform rather than to excite. Although our resources are comparatively modest, we feel no handicap in competing. On any topic we choose to cover, we can if we wish produce a more rounded, complete, balanced, and scholarly story. Usually we do not choose to compete on topics that are being well covered by others. We prefer to pinpoint issues before they are in vogue, and we are not averse to dealing with significant topics after others have dropped them, provided there is new and relevant information.

In our efforts to maintain quality, we are fortunate in having a readership that expects good performance. Our authors understand this and tend to behave accordingly. We are also fortunate in having an audience that values rigor and discussion in depth and is willing to contribute ideas, time, and money to the common objective.

WHEELING, W. VA., CUSTOMHOUSE

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1974

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, May 23, I was privileged to participate in the dedication of the Old Customhouse in Wheeling, W. Va., as an historical monument. The dedication remarks were made by Mr. Vernon D. Acree, U.S. Commissioner of Customs.

The significance of this occasion merits being recorded in the public record. Mr. Acree's remarks follow:

REMARKS BY U.S. COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, VERNON D. ACREE

Honored guests, Congressman Mollohan, Mr. Latimer, Mayor Haranzo, Mrs. Fluty, members of the board of directors of West Virginia Independence Hall Foundation:

I am delighted to be here today to participate with you in this celebration in connection with our Nation's Bicentennial.

During the past two years I've visited many old customhouses around the country. Some of them are even older than your magnificent building. But, unfortunately, most have been altered to provide modern conveniences. The glow of gas lights no longer warms marble walls as the architect intended.

And so it is a special pleasure to see this splendid building being carefully restored after decades of only minimal care. I sincerely congratulate the State of West Virginia and the directors of Independence Hall Foundation on this most impressive project.

I have heard an interesting story about your customhouse. Back during the Civil War some burglars tried to rob the government vault in this building. At the time the vault held over a million dollars. Now, as I understand it, this vault is in a corner between two walls of the customhouse. The burglars worked all night with crowbars and chisels to dig a hole through the customhouse walls. But between every layer of brick they

uncovered iron bars. It was nearly daybreak and the robbers could see and feel the money, but they couldn't pry apart the iron bars to get it out. With the approach of dawn they were forced to flee. Just one more hour and they could have walked off with a fortune.

For lack of an hour the burglars failed. Destiny and the dawn's early light were surely on the Government's side.

Destiny appears to have a history of siding with the Federal Government in this building. One hundred and thirteen years ago today, voters in this area sided with the Federal Government and changed the course of local history. On May 23, 1861, the people of the State of Virginia voted to secede from the Union. At the same time, the people of the northwestern counties voted against the proposal. Thus began the chain of events which produced the great State of West Virginia. And, as you all know, this customhouse was the scene of some of those momentous events.

One of your local newspapers in 1861 credited destiny with providing this building in time for the new State. "A fine State House," the press declared, "and just the place for the legislature to meet. The governor's room was almost made to order." And indeed I have to agree.

Today we are here to proclaim this distinguished old building "historic" as part of the Customs Service's contribution to America's Bicentennial Era. Since today marks a famous anniversary in West Virginia history, it might interest you to know that we in Customs also have an anniversary coming up. This year the Customs Service marks its 185th birthday as an agency established by George Washington and the First Congress of the United States. So today I want to speak briefly about the history of this small but vital agency which has had such an enormous impact on our country's growth and economic position in the world.

When the people of Boston tossed tea chests into the harbor 200 years ago they were rebelling against a tariff—a tariff which meant taxation without representation. But when our forefathers approved the Nation's Constitution, the same tool of oppression, tariffs, became the instrument for freedom and economic stability. For 70 years after 1789, Customs produced over 90 percent of all the Treasury's funds. These dollars made possible a period of unprecedented growth. They financed the opening of the west, beginning with construction of the National Road. Better known as the Cumberland Road, it reached your city of Wheeling in 1818. The Louisiana Territory, the Floridas, the Gadsden Purchase, and the Alaska Purchase were also financed largely by customs collections.

In 1835 Customs revenues even paid off the national debt! And during the 1850s a full Treasury, created largely by Customs revenues, enabled the Architect of the Treasury to build many handsome public buildings, including this customhouse.

So you see, not only destiny but also customs revenues worked together to provide your customhouse "just in time to serve as a State House and Governor's Office."

Today Customs no longer produces the greatest share of the Treasury's funds. Nevertheless, the Customs Service is still important to the Treasury Department and to the American people.

As in the past, we are still the first line of defense against contraband, such as narcotics and dangerous drugs. In addition, our mission has been broadened to include such modern responsibilities as environmental and consumer protection and cargo theft.

We now serve at 300 ports of entry throughout the country and maintain watch over 96,000 miles of land and sea borders. And we enforce over 200 laws for some 40 other Federal agencies.

Last year Customs officers inspected and

examined more people, vehicles, boats, cargo and mail from abroad than ever before in history. We collected more than \$4.2-billion in revenue on \$68-billion worth of imported merchandise on a budget of \$225-million.

We also cleared more people entering the country than the Nation's entire population—263 million persons.

While we processed this mountain of merchandise and mail and this sea of humanity, our enforcement mission also registered gains. We confiscated more than \$500-million in illicit drugs.

In their role as the "first line of defense" at our borders, Customs officers use the latest in enforcement technology: a nationwide computer-based look-out system, special sensors, patrol boats, light aircraft, helicopters, and special-purpose vehicles. Obviously, we have come a long way from that handful of revenue officers who manned the cutters to prevent smuggling in the 1790s.

Our Wheeling office was closed in 1913, but last year Charleston became the first Customs port of entry in West Virginia in 60 years. This reflects the economic growth of your State. Charleston is clearly emerging as a major regional transportation and distribution center, and we believe this new port is making a valuable contribution to the economic future of your State.

Last year exports of coal, agricultural products, and manufactured goods from your State were valued at \$824-million. Total imports came to \$463-million, so it looks like West Virginia is doing its part to improve the Nation's balance of payments!

Changing laws, changing patterns of trade and commerce, and changing methods of smuggling continue to challenge the Customs Service. And we continue to modify our activities to keep abreast of these changes.

But, at the same time, we seek to preserve those timeless qualities and traditions of our Service . . . just as you in West Virginia have sought to rescue and restore this beautiful monument to your State's history.

Today we commemorate this building—symbol of Federal authority at our borders and ports of entry for nearly two centuries. In so doing, we add the Treasury Department's salute to your proud heritage. We sincerely hope that this building will insure an opportunity for future generations to appreciate your State's history and also the contributions the Customs Service has made to our Nation.

On behalf of my associates in the United States Customs Service and the Department of the Treasury, I deeply appreciate the opportunity to be here today. Thank you.

A STATEMENT OF NATIONAL ISSUES AND NEEDS IN THE FIELD OF AGING

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Select Education Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Act, I found of particular interest a recent statement of "National Issues and Needs in the Field of Aging" that was prepared at the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center of the University of Southern California.

The statement will, I believe, be of interest to every Member of Congress in considering legislation that affects the older people of our country.

The statement follows:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A STATEMENT OF NATIONAL ISSUES AND NEEDS IN THE FIELD OF AGING, APRIL 1974

Why aging? Attempts to focus on growing old and being old seem inappropriate in this youth-oriented society. However, the hard facts and figures are that America is graying. Whereas in 1900 only 3% of the population of the United States was age 65 or older, today 21 million people or 10% of the total American population is over the age of 65. While the under 65 age group today is 2.5 times as large as it was in 1900, the over 65 age group in the United States has grown to be 6.5 times as large. Since we have yet to find the fountain of youth or the road to an unbroken, undebilitated immortality, the increasing demand is for society to confront the hard social realities and pressing issues of our aging society in a humanitarian way. Some of the specific problem areas creating needs for older people are:

MORE PEOPLE ARE REACHING OLD AGE TODAY

In 1900, an individual's life expectancy at birth was 47 years. Today at birth an individual's life expectancy is 70 years, or 23 years longer. In the U.S. today those who are 65 have a life expectancy of 15 years; men can expect to live another thirteen years while women can expect another sixteen years. Today we can look forward to a longer and healthier second half of life but also to one which is often unplanned, frustrated and lonely. A critical need is to help individuals plan for that free time in ways which enhance the later years.

RETIREMENT

The growing emphasis on early retirement results in more years of leisure time with less income to support these years. In the United States nearly one-sixth of the adult population is outside the labor force. Within a few years, it is possible that approximately one-fourth of the adult population over the age of 20 will be considered "nonproductive." Statistically, this means that some 25 million people will be without serious "work" or a significant role to occupy their time. Counselling programs, educational programs as well as retirement and social planning, are required to develop alternative life styles to replace the current work-oriented ethic.

INCOME

In 1971, the median income per year of families where the head of the household was over 65 was \$5,453 contrasted to \$10,976 when the family head was under 65. This means that older families live on about \$95 per week, or on about one half the income of younger families. The median yearly income for unrelated individuals living alone or with non-relatives over 65 was \$2,199 or about \$45 per week. About one quarter of the elderly live below the poverty level. Many do not become poor until they reach old age. The poverty of the elderly is accentuated by their fixed incomes in the present period of inflation and rising costs. The priority here is to assure older adults adequate and secure incomes and to provide them with the necessary information to optimally budget their available financial resources.

RECREATION: THE USE OF LEISURE TIME

On one occasion or another, all of us have cried out for free time, a day off, or an extended vacation. But, how would it be to have twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year of free time? That older adults find it difficult to use all this free time is reflected by the tremendous growth and interest in Senior Centers across the country. (In 1969 the National Directory of Senior Centers contained 1200 listings of Centers as contrasted with the 340 listed in the 1966 directory.) Leisure activities are expensive and generally geared to the whims of the young rather than to the interests, financial capabilities, and physical limita-

tions of older adults. What is needed is a more responsive and extensive plan for developing leisure time activities and facilities that are appropriate, meaningful, and stimulating for older people.

EDUCATION

Half of the U.S. elderly never completed elementary school. Some three million have had no schooling or less than five years. Approximately six percent are college graduates. It is often older adults who have the time, patience and interest for learning, rather than the young. The educational system is beginning to make opportunities for learning more accessible to the aged. At the University of Toulouse in France the Third Age College is devoted specifically to providing a stimulating learning environment for some 350 men and women who are over 65 years of age the U.S. has nothing quite like the Third Age College. However, an increasing number of programs for older citizens is being developed in the U.S. at universities, junior colleges, and recreation and senior centers. A number of universities, including Ohio State University and the University of Denver, recently offered courses free of charge to the elderly. The need is for extensive and sophisticated educational programs and opportunities for older adults. Eric Hoffer put it well when he said,

"The rising restlessness of the young will force us to reverse the accepted sequence of learning years followed by years of action. In the post-industrial society the first half of a person's life will be dedicated to strenuous, useful action, and the second half to book learning and reflection. Old age will be something to look forward to. It will be a time for leisurely study, for good conversation, for savoring and cultivating friendship; a time for the discovery of new interests, and for the transmutation of experience and knowledge into wisdom."

PHYSICAL HEALTH AND NUTRITION

Some 15.4 million persons over 65, or about eighty-six percent, have one or more chronic conditions. Chronic conditions increase with age, whereas acute conditions decrease. People over the age of 45 have over 45 days of disability per year and this restriction on activity increases with age. Men and women over the age of 45 have a greater prevalence and severity of dental problems than the average for all adults aged 18 to 79. The older person's reduced income makes it more difficult for him to pay for his health care needs. In 1970, per capita health care expenditures for older persons were 3½ times higher than for the under 65 population; \$791 as compared to \$226. Approximately ⅔ of the older person's medical expenditures are paid for by Medicare and Medicaid programs.

Nutritional inadequacies are a priority problem among older adults. The Agricultural Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture conducted a study on the nutritional diets of the elderly in New York City and found that less than one half of the households were providing diets containing sufficient nutrients and calories to insure well-being. It is significant that changes induced by poor nutrition are characteristic of those changes we associate with aging, i.e., loss of appetite, fatigue, irritability, anxiety, loss of recent memory, insomnia, distractability and mild delusional states.

In the areas of physical health and nutritional care there are inadequacies in the present programs relating to too few facilities, manpower shortages, lack of sufficient financing, lack of training programs for caretaking personnel, lack of educational programs for the public, and poor coordination of services and agencies involved with health programs for the older adult.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 31, 1974

MENTAL HEALTH

Emotional and psychological distress among older persons is the inevitable result of failing physical powers, increasing social isolation, loneliness, and the loss of well-established social and work roles. Although persons over 65 years constitute only 10 percent of the U.S. population, they represent more than 20 percent of admissions to mental hospitals and occupy approximately one third of all mental hospital beds. It is estimated that three million persons, or about 15 percent, over the age of 65 who are living in the community suffer from moderate to severe psychiatric impairment. Of these, two-thirds function with community or family support and one-third are as sick as the population in the mental hospitals.

Of the over 65 age group, 120,000 are in mental hospitals and 370,000 are in nursing homes with mental illness. By 1975, it is estimated that of the two million old people aged 65 and over who need psychiatric services, only 15 to 20 percent will receive the needed services. In most cases the psychiatric services rendered involve diagnosis, not treatment. Among the aged, and particularly those over age 75 years, physical and mental illnesses tend to go together. Eighty to 90 percent of geriatric mentally ill patients also have physical ailments severe enough to interfere with functioning.

There tends to be long-term institutionalization for mental illness when the individual is 65 years and older rather than short-term inpatient treatment followed by psychiatric outpatient treatment or counselling services. The over 65 form only two percent of the outpatient clinic population, 2.6 percent of the day-care population and 14 percent of the community health center population.

The critical need is for community mental health services, outpatient counselling clinics and senior centers to put older people in contact with activities, people, and support services. Better community-based and home care services promise to make mental health and an independent, self-sufficient life style realizable possibilities for increasing numbers of older persons.

HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION

Transportation and housing create interrelated problems for the older person. Reduced incomes and the need for accessibility to public transportation can dictate housing locations. Thirty-nine percent of the people who live in low income public housing projects are 65 or more years of age. Some of the projects have only older people living in them. Next to housing and medical expenses, transportation is the third largest income expense among the elderly. Nationally only 54 percent of the older population own and operate their own automobile compared to 83 percent of the general population. About one-third of the elderly poor have substantial transportation problems. These problems become especially critical in the large urban metropolitan areas having poor public transportation systems. The elderly find themselves concentrated in inner city ghettos, which boast both housing they can afford and generally easier access to public systems of transportation.

However, public transportation systems often ignore the routes to health facilities, shopping and community service centers, which are areas of importance to the elderly. Adequate planning of systems of transportation and site locations for housing, health, shopping, and community services facilities is essential to maintain contact between older persons and the community.

CRIME, PERSONAL SAFETY, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

The impact of crime on the aged is profound. Generally residing in urban areas, older persons are easy targets for pickpocket-

ing, assault, burglary and murder. They are favorite marks for many kinds of fraud, illegitimate schemes and misleading advertising. In a Kansas City study of crime and the aged, fully 75 percent of the victims of serious crimes had incomes less than \$3,000 yearly. To compound the problem, fear of crime can force an older person to retreat into his home, where he is isolated from friends, activities, and services. The Kansas City Study found that fifteen percent of the aged victims of crime experienced substantial withdrawal from society as a result of the assault. There is a crucial need to provide better consumer and police protection for senior citizens. Dissemination of crime prevention literature to the elderly is necessary via the media, magazines, radio, and television.

With older age comes an increased need for legal services. Older citizens may require legal information about their finances and about technicalities involved in the paper work for welfare, Medicare, Medicaid and Supplemental Security Income. Information is needed to protect their rights in the legal issues of age discrimination, pension plan rulings and early retirement plans. The aged must become informed and knowledgeable consumers and citizens so that their vulnerability is decreased and their personal rights and protection are firmly assured.

These are the priority needs and problems confronting our aging population. The programs dealing with the problems of the aging to date reveal that these problems cannot be solved independently from each other. No single approach can be fully responsive to meeting the needs of the elderly. What is needed is a coordinated, integrated and comprehensive approach which mobilizes the resources of a concerned society.

The leadership roles in such efforts originate in concerned universities that have a competent group of researchers, teachers, and professionals who need support to realize their potentials and commitments to the field. Selected universities need to be encouraged and financially supported to develop special programs in aging.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. VIOLA GOLDMAN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, the many friends and associates of Mrs. Viola Brereton Clark Goldman are honoring this outstanding educator for her many years of dedicated service to the community, State, and Nation.

It is through the selfless efforts of individuals, such as Mrs. Goldman, that our values, our ideals and our social fiber are transmitted from generation to generation, continuously seeking to improve our society through knowledge.

Born in Lawton, Okla., Mrs. Goldman was educated at the University of Oklahoma, and received her masters degree from the University of Southern California.

In 1946, she began teaching in Lynwood at Central Elementary School. Later, she taught at Washington Elementary, also in Lynwood.

Then, after 7 years of teaching experience, she was appointed principal of Lugo and Central Elementary Schools. Two years later, in 1955, Mrs. Goldman

became principal of Wilson Elementary School, where she was a leader in patriotic activities designed to instill pride and civic awareness in her pupils.

Following the annexation of Janie P. Abbott Elementary School from Compton in 1967, Mrs. Goldman was appointed principal of that school where she was recognized for her skills and for her devotion as the recipient of the George Washington Award, and the Principal School Award, both signal honors awarded for only the highest abilities.

During her outstanding career as an educator, she received the George Washington Honorary Medal four times; the Principal School Award—which, incidentally, is the highest award given—a total of three times; and she was the recipient of the Valley Forge Freedom Foundation Award.

In addition to Mrs. Goldman's duties at her schools, she is an active participant in community affairs. She is the President of the Lynwood Teachers Association, and a member of both the Soroptimist Club and the University Women's Club.

But, most importantly, Mrs. Goldman also found time to raise a stepson Bill Clark, who, along with his wife Lyn, have attained Ph. D. degrees.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the service of Mrs. Goldman and others like her, future generations will possess the historic significance of our country, the social context in which to frame ideas, and the civic awareness needed to improve the conditions which confront mankind.

I take great pride and pleasure in noting her achievements in the community, and I wish to join the many friends and associates of Mrs. Goldman in commanding this outstanding individual for her many years of selfless dedication to the betterment of our society.

THE HARD ROAD TO WORLD ORDER—IV

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in part IV of Prof. Richard Gardner's analysis of the need for, and the difficulties in the way of, achieving world cooperation, he points out some of the "structural" difficulties involved in creating an enforceable system of international rules. He also suggests some possible solutions.

The fourth part of Professor Gardner's article from the April issue of Foreign Affairs follows:

THE HARD ROAD TO WORLD ORDER

The need for multilateral agreement and management is, then, becoming steadily greater and more widely felt. But of course need alone is not enough. Most national leaders around the world do not have to be persuaded that it would be much better to approach key problems on a multilateral basis, usually a global one; the question that troubles them is whether international rules and organizations can be made to work. Unless some major structural weaknesses can be dealt with more effectively, even the ex-

isting responsibilities of existing international agencies will slowly wither away, and new responsibilities, however badly needed, will simply not be given either to old or new agencies.

Since the structural problems are political in origin, to remedy them will require not just technical ingenuity but an act of political will on the part of key member-states. The deficiencies of international institutions that governments cite as reasons for bypassing them are of the governments' own making. Some acts of creative statesmanship are needed to break out of the vicious circle. To paraphrase a slogan of the peace movement: "All we are saying is, give the international organizations a chance."

The most obvious structural problem is in the decision-making process. How to equilibrate voting power, not just with national sovereignty but with responsibility for implementing decisions, is a riddle that continues to plague the international agencies. It is understandable that large and middle-sized powers will not grant significant authority to a General Assembly where countries representing less than ten percent of the population of the total membership and less than five percent of the budget can take decisions by a two-thirds majority. It is equally obvious that the "principle of unanimity" under which any one country can veto action is not a recipe for progress.

Fortunately, there are a number of methods that have been developed to assure that influence in decision-making bears a reasonable relationship to power in the real world and to the responsibility for implementing decisions. Weighted voting is the most obvious, but the assigning of differential voting rights is often non-negotiable. Other approaches deserve greater attention: "double majorities" (requiring a majority of all the members plus a majority of specially defined categories of members); "weighted representation" (delegating decision-making to a small committee in which the countries that are most important in the particular subject matter have more than their normal proportion of seats); "bicameralism" (in which decisions must first be adopted by a small committee with weighted representation and then by the membership as a whole); and "conciliation" (deferring a vote for a "cooling-off period" of further negotiations at the request of a specified minority of countries).

Obviously no one decision-making formula will be applicable across the board. Different structures are required for different functions—what is appropriate in a new oceans agency may not be appropriate in multilateral development assistance. Moreover, the decision-making reforms that are needed will not always adjust power in the same direction. The United States will justifiably seek "a GATT within the GATT" where decisions can be taken by the key trading nations on some special voting basis rather than on the one-nation one-vote formula among 86 contracting parties. At the same time, it can reasonably be asked to concede a greater voice in the IMF and World Bank to Japan and the Arab countries, whose voting power does not adequately reflect their financial power. To be sure, changes in outmoded or unreasonable decision-making arrangements may be opposed initially by the countries that presently have more than their fair share of influence. The challenge to multilateral diplomacy—and one that has not been seriously faced so far—is to persuade the countries that are overendowed with power in a particular institution that a fairer sharing is needed to save the institution from creeping irrelevance and make it more effective on matters of interest to them.

A related but separate structural problem is how to improve present arrangements for creating, adapting, interpreting and enforc-

ing international law—what some would call the "normative process." The development of new rules of law has become both more cumbersome and more politicized—we need only contrast the highly political 90-member preparatory committee for the current Law of the Sea negotiations with the small and expert International Law Commission that prepared the texts for the Law of the Sea conventions of 1958. While the membership explosion of the U.N. system makes it politically impossible to return completely to the old ways of doing things, the common interest of all countries in the orderly development of new rules of international law suggests that greater use of small and expert bodies should be made in the preparatory stage of law-making conferences.

Once the rules have been created, we need better arrangements for adapting them in the light of rapid and possibly unforeseen changes in political, economic or scientific circumstances. The traditional amendment process is as unsatisfactory a means for modernizing treaties on oil pollution from tankers as it is for modernizing the GATT provisions on nontariff barriers. A possible formula here is the delegation of power to small and expert groups to promulgate changes in the rules, subject to an "opting out" privilege for countries that do not wish to accept the changes. With respect to interpretation and application of the rules, we will need to have greater resort, in such diverse contexts as trade and environmental protection, to fact-finding, conciliation and arbitration by disinterested third parties. Finally, we will need to find better ways of enforcing the rules, as by multilateral action that denies benefits and applies punishments. As has been noted, where essential community interests are threatened, as for example in hijacking, marine pollution or the withholding of vital raw materials, action may need to be taken not only against those who ratify the rules and then break them but against those who refuse to accept the rules at all.

A third structural problem that must be mentioned is the crisis in morale and effectiveness that now afflicts the international civil service. Though a few international agencies may be exempt from this generalization, in most of them the concepts of independence and efficiency have been badly eroded by political pressures, particularly the excessive emphasis given to the concept of "equitable geographical distribution." If the vitality of the international agencies is to be assured, more must be done to apply standards of excellence in recruitment, promotion and selection out. Greater efforts should be made to fill senior positions with outstanding persons from the professional, scientific and business worlds, rather than predominantly, as is now the case, with persons on loan from member-governments. As with the other structural problems, what is required here is a change in national behavior resulting from a new perception by key governments of their enlightened self-interest.

A final structural problem is how to coordinate and rationalize the fragmented system of international agencies. Governments are encountering increasing difficulties in coping with the proliferating conference schedule and the bewildering variety of secretariats that deal with separate pieces of a total problem. The need here is not just to cut overlapping and wasteful activities, but to clarify responsibility for taking and implementing decisions. It involves both functional coordination (e.g., the respective responsibilities for balance of payments adjustment between IMF, GATT and OECD), and regional coordination (e.g., the division of functions on air pollution between the U.N. institutions and agencies like NATO, OECD, and the Council of Europe). Once again, the problem is fundamentally politi-

cal, since the proliferation is partly the result of "forum shopping" by governments which wish to promote a favorable outcome, and partly the result of the launching of special purpose programs (e.g., on population, environment, and narcotics) financed by voluntary contributions from governments which feel they cannot achieve their objectives within the U.N.'s central policy and budget process.

A generation ago the central problem was to create new institutions where none existed; today it is to get several hundred functional and regional commissions, boards, committees and secretariats to work together effectively. Perhaps the most difficult obstacle in the way of the objective is the projection into the international organizations of the fragmented system of "portfolio government" that still characterizes most of the major countries. Governments will have to do a better job of coordinating themselves if the functional approach is to produce a coherent system of international institutions. The special session of the General Assembly on economic issues now scheduled for 1975 provides a useful opportunity for governments to clarify their objectives and improve their internal processes for the achievement of this purpose.

CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS SALUTES OLDER AMERICANS MONTH, 1974

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 30, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to observe that we are concluding this week the month set aside each year by proclamation to honor older Americans. As chairman of the Select Education Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over the Older Americans Act, I am particularly pleased to comment on the steps that have been taken this year to repay the debt we all owe to those older citizens who have given so much to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this month of recognition and rededication may awaken in many people a renewed sense of what we all have to learn from our elders, each of us can recall the words of the White House Conference on Aging in 1971 that "something is wrong with any society in which every age level is not clearly of meaning and value to that society."

The conference was echoing, with that statement, some words from the Book of Job:

With the ancient is wisdom, and in length of days, understanding.

I believe that this month of recognition should also serve, Mr. Speaker, to remind us of the material situation of our Nation's older people. We must never forget what a distance we have yet to go in insuring economic justice for the elderly of America.

Consider that:

One quarter of the 20 million Americans aged 65 and over are living in poverty;

Another 5 million cannot afford the Bureau of Labor Statistics "Intermediate

Family Budget" which, itself, is an inadequate \$5,200 annually for two people;

Medicare covers only 42 percent of the hospitalization costs of Americans aged 65 and over;

Last year over 19,000 retiring employees lost the retirement benefits which had been guaranteed them because their pension funds were inadequately funded; and

Property taxes have increased 30 percent in the last 4 years, ravaging the budgets of elderly homeowners living on fixed incomes.

Mr. Speaker, these are facts we cannot ignore, and which we must remind ourselves to consider in our legislative efforts.

I believe, however, that we can this month take pride in some accomplishments by Congress which address the problems of the elderly, for the last two Congresses have compiled a more solid record of achievement on behalf of older Americans than any in recent memory.

In the last 5 years Congress has increased social security benefits by more than 60 percent, despite unremitting hostility by the Nixon administration to this basic effort toward economic sufficiency for retirees.

Significant pension reform legislation has been enacted by both the House and Senate and a conference committee is at

work perfecting a bill. I trust the result will begin the long overdue reform of private pension plans that too often leave retired workers with little or nothing to show for years of contribution.

With respect to the health care available to the Nation's elderly, Congress has before it several alternative plans, and hearings are going forward on them, with a view to reducing the burdens of illness on our population. As heavy users of health care, the elderly have a large stake in the results of these deliberations, and for their sake alone it is high time that the Nation moved toward a more comprehensive insurance coverage or other means of assuring access to quality health care.

In the past year, the Select Education Subcommittee, which I have the honor to chair, produced a bill to extend the Older Americans Act. After a presidential veto of an earlier bill, Congress passed and the President signed legislation under which funds are provided to States and localities for a comprehensive, coordinated service system for the elderly.

The law assigns new duties and responsibilities to the States to plan programs for the elderly in their jurisdiction. Under the measure, new "area agencies" are being created in subregions of each State to serve as focal points for coordinating all existing services to older Americans.

Also as part of the Older Americans Act, we have seen the development this past year of a nutrition program for the elderly, which this spring made possible the serving of an average of 200,000 people per week a hot meal each day, and provided social, educational, and recreational programs for senior citizens.

I am pleased to have been one of the House sponsors of the legislation to extend this program for 3 more years, which passed recently by an overwhelming vote of 380 to 6.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I note that owing to the work of this Congress, we may yet see a coordinated attack on some of the scientific mysteries of aging, through a new National Institute of Aging passed by both Houses of Congress and awaiting Presidential action at this moment. We need to know all we can about the process of aging in all its dimensions, if we are to legislate wisely on this important subject.

Thus it should be clear, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress has taken seriously its responsibilities with respect to the needs of the older American.

But we still have much to do. Mr. Speaker, in order to make real for all our Nation's older citizens the rich promise of American life. I trust that although Older Americans Month, May, 1974, comes to a close, we shall not cease our efforts on behalf of the older people of our country.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 3, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Now, O God, strengthen Thou my hands.—Nehemiah 6: 9.

Eternal God, whose life is love and whose love is life, on this new day we lift to Thee the cup of our free hearts praying that Thou wilt fill it with the wisdom, the power, and the peace of Thy gracious spirit.

Be Thou our guide as we endeavor to lead our Nation along the paths of truth and honor that together we may dwell on the high plane of clean moral living.

During these difficult days enable us to have the vision and the valor to do all we can to bring about the reign of law and love, of truth and righteousness, that our Nation may now and ever be a blessing to all mankind.

To this end, O God, strengthen Thou our hands and our hearts.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

THE SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without

amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 11223. An act to authorize amendment of contracts relating to the exchange of certain vessels for conversion and operation in unsubsidized service between the west coast of the United States and the territory of Guam; and

H.R. 12925. An act to amend the act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1974 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13998) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1752. An act prescribing the objectives and functions of the National Commission on Productivity and Work Quality.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8215. An act to provide for the suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes until the close of June 30, 1976;

H.R. 11546. An act to authorize the establishment of the Big Thicket National Preserve in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12471. An act to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, known as the Freedom of Information Act.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11385) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise the programs of health services research and to extend the program of assistance for medical libraries," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. PELL, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. BEALL, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. STAFFORD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2661. An act to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 so as to authorize the development of indoor recreation facilities in certain areas;

S. 3301. An act to amend the act of October 27, 1972 (Public Law 92-578); and

S. 3433. An act to further the purposes of the Wilderness Act by designating certain acquired lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, to provide for study of certain additional lands for such inclusion, and for other purposes.

CONSENT CALENDAR

THE SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the bill on the Consent Calendar.