

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FINANCIAL IRRESPONSIBILITY
GRANDCHILDREN'S LEGACY

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, Congressman SAM STEIGER of Arizona wrote an interesting and enlightening article which appeared in the Arizona Weekly Gazette on April 16, 1974.

Congressman STEIGER correctly described the financial status of the Government as "precarious" and warned that sooner or later the Government will have to learn that you cannot spend what you do not have.

I commend Congressman STEIGER for his article. I note that he quotes with approval Senator BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona on the subject of the Federal budget, and I want to add that Senator PAUL FANNIN, also of Arizona and my colleague on the Senate Finance Committee, also has long opposed irresponsible Federal spending.

These representatives of the State of Arizona are rendering splendid service in the effort to bring Federal spending under control.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Congressman STEIGER's article, "Financial Irresponsibility Grandchildren's Legacy," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCIAL IRRESPONSIBILITY GRANDCHILDREN'S
LEGACY

(By Sam Steiger)

Yesterday at midnight—the 15th of April—when all of us pay or have paid our income taxes presents as good a time as ever to reflect on the precarious financial status of the federal government, recipient of all those hard-earned dollars.

The federal government has yet to accept the simple standard that all of the rest of us are forced to live by: You simply cannot spend what you don't have.

The budget submitted to Congress is a colossal example of just that: Not only "overspend" as an answer to all ills, but "spend more than you've got." Compounding the problem is the bureaucratic answer: "print more money."

The 304 billion dollar budget is not only the biggest in the history of this country, but the 30 billion dollar increase over last year reflects the biggest increase in peacetime history.

While I'm certainly appalled at the size of the figure, I'm even more shocked by some of the things the American taxpayers' money will be spent for.

Fortunately for the taxpayer, I'm not alone. Rep H. R. Gross (R-Iowa) has said, "But even a 10 billion dollar deficit means the nation is doomed to inflation." Sen. Harry Byrd, (Ind.-Va.) says, "I submit that federal spending is out of control," and Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.) submits, "I say to you very firmly that as a candidate and a senator I cannot live with the budget my president has submitted to Congress."

An enormous amount of this money will be pumped into federal programs allegedly in support of a number of worthy causes. The truth is only an infinitesimal amount of that money will ever reach the people it's supposed to help.

The vast majority will be tied up in the ever-growing bureaucratic structure and the red tape that goes with it, with the taxpayer carrying the crushing burden of waste in government.

We cannot continue to pay our bills with "printing press money" and we certainly cannot raise taxes the only other alternative to get out of the "federal waste maze."

The President apparently has relinquished all visible effort to hold the line on federal spending and social experimentation.

I, for one, will try with more determination than ever to advocate fiscal integrity, which means less taxes, less spending, continual reduction of the size of government, a balanced budget, and paying your own way.

Otherwise, the governmental financial folly of today will be a national debt carried by our grandchildren.

THE MAGNIFICENT MUTT

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, this past week, I received a copy of the Ladonia News. Featured prominently, was an article written by David Clark about "A Fixture in Ladonia." This particular fixture is a man by the name of Henry Herman "Mutt" Milford.

Now probably no one in either the House of the Senate has ever heard of Mutt Milford—with one notable exception—and most will have never heard of the city of Ladonia.

The one notable exception would be my colleague, Congressman DALE MILFORD, who will proudly point out that H. H. "Mutt" Milford is his uncle and that Ladonia is located 5 miles south of Bug Tussle—where my colleague was born.

Mr. Speaker, I know Mutt Milford. I first learned of him from another Fannin County, Tex., resident who used to "cuss" and discuss Mutt Milford. His name was Sam Rayburn.

Speaker Rayburn was a close personal friend of the Milford clan. His cussin' of "Big Mutt," as he called him, stemmed from affection and admiration—rather than from derision. His discussions reflected the characterizations of an individual that truly cared about his fellow-man.

David Clark's article about Mutt Milford, which I will enclose for the RECORD, characterizes the unassuming nature of the people of Fannin County. They work hard, they play hard and they offer their best without bragging or self-glorification. What these people consider to be a "Fixture in Ladonia," can well be a masterpiece in society when viewed in its true perspective.

People in Fannin County know and love "Big Mutt," because of his individual and unpublicized personal efforts to help his fellow man. He has a unique talent of being able to make every human being feel worthy and important.

Young children tag along behind him as if he were the Pied Piper of Hamelin. He makes them feel like adults. The older folks cluster around him like a magnet, because he makes them feel the freedom of children.

Even in the 83d year of this law officer's life, his telephone often rings at all hours of the day and night: A neighbor with a problem, a youngster in trouble, a criminal that wants a fair shake, a panhandler that wants a handout—all calls are answered.

Mutt Milford's greatest contribution to mankind probably consists of his sense of humor. He is a top-notch practical joker, usually using himself as the butt of the joke. His reflected philosophy has always been: "You can't cry if you are laughing."

My colleague, DALE MILFORD, relates to me a private joke that has been running between him and his uncle for over 20 years. Each Christmas, DALE would mail his uncle Mutt a greeting card simply addressed to: "The Ugliest Man in Texas." Ladonia, Tex. Big Mutt always got his card.

Recently, Congressman MILFORD attended a meeting in Moscow, Russia. While there, DALE mailed a card to his Uncle addressed to: "The Ugliest Man in the World." Ladonia, Tex. On the back side, the message simply said "Congratulations, you are now world famous." Big Mutt got his card.

Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues in the House and Senate, I am going to have to honestly admit that Mutt would have some rough going as a beauty contestant. However, he will stand tall in any lineup of first-class Americans and leading citizens of any community.

While it is true that Henry Herman "Mutt" Milford is a "Fixture in Ladonia," he is also a pillar in this Nation.

Mr. David Clark's article is as follows:

MUTT MILFORD—A FIXTURE IN LADONIA

(By David Clark)

Herman "Mutt Milford" is considered by many local citizens to be a fixture in Ladonia, a blend of the town's past and present.

Mutt, as he prefers to be called, is quite a contrast to most men his age. The 83-year-old constable can be seen making his rounds about town, while most of his friends have long since settled down to a daily routine of dominoes or "42".

Often making his rounds without a gun, Mutt said that a quick call on his radio can summon help from the Sheriff's Department in Bonham, if serious trouble develops. Mutt, who stands about 6'1", said that in his younger days he was 6'4" and weighed more than 200 pounds.

Elvin Fisk, a Ladonia resident, said that Mutt was "the stoutest man I ever saw. He could whip four or five men in friendly wrestling matches on a given Saturday night and I might have been one of them at one

time or another." Flisk said that Mutt's nickname came from his great size.

Having spent most of his life in Ladonia, Mutt has served as constable of Precinct 4 in Fannin County for 16 years, and claims that this will be his last term in office. Mutt explained that he was originally appointed to the post by the County Commissioners because he knew most of the people in the area and where they lived. He has been re-elected every since that appointment, but says that he is not quite as physically able to carry out his duties as he once was.

The constable said that he stood on the Ladonia square in 1905 and watched the burning of Happy Jack's gambling equipment. "I was just a boy of 14 then, and this town has seen some changes since those days. Happy Jack ran a bootleg joint and gambling hall, which was illegal, and some folks just got mad and burned his gear."

"I can remember back in the 1920s and 1930s when different gangs of outlaws passed through here pretty often, running from the law or looking for work. I believe Bonnie Parker and Clyde Barrow passed through Ladonia a few times, but I never tangled with them," Mutt said.

"All in all, Ladonia is a peaceful town, with good churches and friendly people," Mutt said. He added, however, that there is not much to offer young people, who graduate from high school and move to larger places in search of good jobs. "If you can find the right job, a small town is by far a city. You can see a special friendliness and a close-knit community," Mutt claimed.

Mutt said that he seldom arrests anyone, but sometimes gives traffic tickets and "generally keep an eye on things." Ladonia has no jail, and the only other law officer is the town's night watchman. Mutt said that there was not much difference in Ladonia's law enforcement problems since the town "went wet" about four years ago.

Glowing with family pride, Mutt explained that his son is a dentist in Honey Grove and that his nephew, Dale Milford, an ex-weatherman for WFAA-TV in Dallas, is a U.S. Congressman.

"I've got no regrets about my life, and I've enjoyed living in Ladonia," Mutt said. He said that over the years he has especially enjoyed his membership in the First Christian Church and the Ladonia Lions Club. "Sports has also been a favorite activity of mine. I coached and played catcher for a championship baseball team at Silver City during the 1930s. It wasn't professional but just for fun," Mutt added.

Listing other working experiences, Mutt said that he drove an oil truck out of Ladonia and Wolfe City, followed pipeline work, and farmed, and noted that he has watched Ladonia's population drop from about 3,500 in the 1940s to 870 now.

Mutt Milford is a part of Ladonia's history, a fixture of the town. He carries his 83 years of life on his shoulders, not as a burden, but seemingly as the shared experience of a long and meaningful life.

A SPENDTHRIFT NATION

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the May 13 edition of the Richmond News Leader included an excellent editorial sounding a warning about "the sad state of Federal finance, particularly the national debt."

The editorial rightly notes that during the last 20 years, the Federal budget

has shown only three surpluses. The rest of the time, we have had deficits—and the deficits have grown ever larger.

As the News Leader states, these continued deficits are responsible for a great deal of the inflation which erodes the value of every worker's paycheck.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, "A Spendthrift Nation," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SPENDTHRIFT NATION

Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., performs a vital public service in continuing to inform the public of the sad state of federal finance, particularly the national debt. The Senator's charts provide a clear picture of the runaway spending mentality that has dominated fiscal policies for the past generation.

In an updated chart that Senator Byrd provided for the *Congressional Record*, figures reveal vividly the whole sorry picture. In the 20 years since 1956, the federal budget has shown surpluses only three times—during the Eisenhower administration. Those surpluses weren't must to brag about—\$1.6 billion, \$1.7 billion, and \$800 million—but at least they were surpluses. After the late President John Kennedy came to office in 1961, the name of the game became deficit spending. Nothing changed during the administration of Lyndon Johnson, and President Nixon understates his annual deficits by disguising them as full employment surpluses.

President Johnson engaged the nation in a war he didn't want to pay for. Had he encouraged Congress to increase taxes to pay for the fighting in Vietnam, an unpopular war would have become more unpopular, especially among the middle class that supported it. In the final three years of the Johnson administration, \$48.9 billion was added to the national debt.

President Nixon did nothing to change the reliance on borrowing. In the years between 1970 and 1975, his budget deficits will add \$133.5 billion to the national debt, or more than half of the deficits accumulated in the past 20 years. Meanwhile, interest paid on the national debt has continued to soar. In 1956, only . . . went for this purpose; in fiscal 1975, \$29.1 billion is earmarked for interest. The amount of the interest alone would have sustained federal government operations for several years prior to World War II.

In the 20 years covered by Senator Byrd's chart, budget deficits total \$227.5 billion, and interest costs total \$296.4 billion. Unless Senator Byrd and others who share his beliefs about the necessity for balanced budgets can persuade Congress to put some reins on spending, the trend is likely to continue. In the past six years, revenues from individual income taxes have almost doubled, from \$69 billion in 1968 to \$129 billion in 1975. In the same period, corporate income taxes have increased, from \$29 billion to \$48 billion. But these rapid increases in revenues are never enough. The 1975 fiscal budget calls for deficit spending of \$17.9 billion.

The continued deficits are responsible for much of the spiraling inflation that continues to erode the value of the dollar. The taxpayer pays at least three times for inflationary deficits—once through inflation, then through taxes diverted to debt interest, and then through taxes levied on increases in his salary. The federal government is taxing the inflation it has helped to cause. Many taxpayers this spring found themselves in higher tax brackets that wiped out most of the salary gains they had made in the previous year.

No doubt, in the coming year, the ceiling on the national debt will increase also. It

now approaches the \$500 billion mark—half a trillion dollars. It may be an amorphous sum to taxpayers accustomed to dealing in mere dollars and cents, but it is a debt that is owned. It is a sad legacy to bequeath to coming generations, for it will have to be repaid. Someday.

VIEW OF VENEZUELA OIL PRICING

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the view that the U.S. Government must formulate a policy to deal with economically irresponsible price levels for foreign oil appears to be emerging, if slowly and belatedly, among energy officials, at least, though apparently not yet among State Department officials.

Respected Mutual Broadcasting network commentator Robert F. Hurligh reported signs of this growing awareness in a nationwide broadcast May 24, 1974, by quoting the view of Federal Energy Administrator John C. Sawhill. Mr. Hurligh further related this recognition to the amendment Mr. Rose of North Carolina, I, and others, will be offering to the U.S. Sugar Act to suspend a quota for Venezuela.

I include at this point in the RECORD the text of Mr. Hurligh's broadcast, followed by an expanded report of Mr. Sawhill's views carried in the Washington Post of the same date.

ROBERT F. HURLIGH SPEAKING FROM THE MUTUAL STUDIOS IN WASHINGTON

The head of the Federal Energy Office has told the top men of the larger oil companies that the Government may be involved in negotiating between the American oil companies and the oil producing countries of the world. The energy chief, John C. Sawhill, says that oil pricing and production negotiations with foreign governments are too important to leave up to the private American companies, and that the government must play a bigger role in these negotiations. Certainly, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Companies—the OPEC—has been able to establish the price of a barrel of oil at the well head, and make the world accept that price whether it appears fair or not. The increased cost of oil to the industrial nations of the world has played havoc with national budgets, has caused alarm in the emerging nations of Africa and is driving private companies to the wall, as in the case of the Consolidated Edison Company of New York which claims the higher cost of oil is to blame for its disastrous situation. While revenues in the oil producing nations have reached a point that these countries are having to search for areas to invest their skyrocketing revenues, the rest of the world searches for a means to bring the cost of oil down to a realistic level.

The use of government persuasion then, is worthy of discussion, and two members of Congress have presented an idea that may cause one of the oil producing nations to rethink its continuing agitation for increased prices of oil to the United States. Congressman Bill Gunter, Democrat of Florida, has sent a letter to the members of the House, advising them that he intends to offer an amendment to the United States Sugar Act to strike out or to suspend a sugar quota for Venezuela. Congressman Gunter and his col-

league Congressman Charles Rose, Democrat of North Carolina, are not at all pleased that Venezuela can press for higher prices for its oil, while taking advantages of trade agreements with the United States under the Sugar Act.

Once again, the American consumer is hit by the strategy of Venezuela and other oil producing companies—which Congressman Gunter calls “economic, political and moral blackmail.” And he quotes the celebrated economist Eliot Janeway “that the problem lies in America’s refusal to recognize that she is wasting her own resources internationally, instead of bargaining with them.” Along with her oil resources, Venezuela is a large sugar producing country—and the United States has usually given Venezuela a sizeable quota at an excellent price. Now, says Mr. Gunter and Mr. Rose, we propose to let the world understand that we intend to give ourselves the same fair shake at the bargaining table which they demand for themselves at our expense. So goes the world today.

FEDERAL ROLE URGED IN OIL IMPORT TALKS (By Tim O'Brien)

Federal energy chief John C. Sawhill said yesterday that oil pricing and production negotiations with foreign governments are “too important to leave up to” private American companies.

The U.S. government, he said, must play a bigger role in the crucial agreements with the Middle East oil-producing states.

Although Sawhill would not specify the nature or extent of any enlarged federal role, he said the government should at least establish a “framework” within which far-reaching pricing and production negotiations proceed.

He said the time may even have come for the United States to negotiate on a government-to-government basis with producing countries.

The new energy chief said he expects that, by the end of the year, a new federal policy will be enunciated to define the extent to which private American oil companies can make agreements with foreign governments.

Underscoring the point at an early-morning breakfast meeting with reporters, Sawhill said he has asked the heads of some American oil firms to avoid signing long-term contracts with foreign producing states. Long-term agreements, he said, would “lock us in” to buying high-priced foreign oil.

With Middle East crude still selling for more than \$11 a barrel, Sawhill said he would prefer that American companies sign short-term contracts, with a duration of perhaps six months.

Asked how the companies responded to his request, Sawhill said with a smile: “They said they’d think about it.”

Industry preference for long-term contracts may be tied to the substantial profits American companies reap from high-priced foreign crude. As the price of Middle East oil rose over the past several months, profits also jumped for American oil companies operating overseas.

Between January, 1973, and January, 1974, profit margins on a barrel of typical Saudi Arabian crude jumped from 79 cents to \$3.83 for the Arabian American Oil Co.—jointly owned by Exxon, Texaco, Standard of California and Mobil.

On the domestic energy front, Sawhill said he has called on the automobile industry to begin making cars that get better gasoline mileage. Although he said the request now stands on a voluntary basis, he added that “if it doesn’t work, we would have to go to compulsory standards.”

Meanwhile, Americans still seem to be practicing conservation, as gasoline consumption in a recent four-week period averaged slightly below the same period last year. Sawhill said much of the drop in demand can be attributed to higher prices.

According to the American Automobile Association, the price of both regular and premium gasoline has jumped an average of 8 cents since last January.

Sawhill said he has already scheduled a meeting with officials of Chrysler Corp. to discuss means to stimulate the production of more energy-efficient automobiles. Presently, he said, autos are averaging about 18.5 miles a gallon, and his goal is to increase that to 17 miles per gallon in 1980 and to 19 by 1985.

Achieving the goals, he said, would save about two million barrels of oil a day—equivalent of what the nation will get from the Alaska pipeline.

Sawhill further refined the definition of the administration’s “Project Independence,” saying it “does not mean zero imports” by 1980 but only that the United States must reduce its dependence on foreign energy sources so that any “future embargo is rendered ineffective.”

When it was suggested that “Project Independence” may be a misnomer, Sawhill said, “I didn’t invent the label.”

Presently, the FEA said, the nation imports about 38 per cent of its oil. If past trends continue, that percentage would jump to a full 50 per cent, but the administration’s objective is to bring it down to 20 per cent.

But for the time being, Sawhill said, the country will have to actually step up its oil imports, partly because nuclear development is not proceeding rapidly and because the FEA’s goal of increasing coal production by 10 per cent is not being achieved.

The Federal Energy Administration is in the process of developing a blueprint for “Project Independence” and Sawhill said he hopes to deliver it to the President by Nov. 1.

The push for new coal production ran into more trouble yesterday, as about 240 small Appalachian coal mines were cited for failures to install federally required safety equipment.

James M. Day, administrator of the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration, said the violators will be fined but that the dollar amounts have not yet been determined. The violations were found during government inspections of 540 mines in Kentucky, West Virginia, Alabama, Virginia and Pennsylvania.

Meanwhile, Rep. Dante Fascell (D-Fla.) released a Library of Congress study that, he said, showed U.S. oil imports actually rising “by a considerable amount” in the last quarter of 1973. Fascell said this indicates that the Arab embargo “did not have an immediate impact on U.S. imports.”

In addition, Fascell said the report shows that, whatever the reason for the delayed impact of the embargo, “the potential shortages were hastened by a sudden drop in the domestic production of oil in mid-November.”

Sawhill said new oil production in the United States is continuing to decline.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

HON. HAROLD V. FROELICH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, we all owe a great deal of thanks to our fellow Americans for their conscientious efforts to conserve energy during the past 7 months. This savings of scarce fuels played a major role in averting the drastic consequences originally predicted when the Arab embargo was imposed last fall.

The roots of our energy problems, however, go back much farther than October of 1973. For years, we have had abundant and relatively inexpensive sources of fuel, which have made the United States the greatest consumer of energy in the world and probably the greatest wastrel of energy, too. While the Arab embargo may rightfully be branded international blackmail, it has demonstrated somewhat painfully the delicate situation our country faces with respect to energy—and it has also demonstrated that significant savings can and must be made by all American consumers.

Recent reports that the Nation is returning to its former wasteful habits in using energy are quite disturbing. Certainly, Congress and the administration do not have an admirable track record on important energy legislation, but, perhaps, our largest failure has been the poor results in creating an “energy ethic” in this country. I strongly believe that we must continue to encourage conservation of these precious resources. As the following editorial from Appleton, Wis., Post-Crescent points out, “unless Americans learn to live with shortages so that real conservation of resources becomes almost second nature, we will be unpleasantly surprised once again.” I think that is something we should all remember.

The editorial follows:

ENERGY CRISIS FAR FROM OVER

In one of his speeches before a friendly audience President Nixon vowed to take action so that Americans would have self-sufficiency in energy by 1980.

“Political eyewash,” said Dr. Philip Abelson, editor of Science magazine. “My guess is that within two years we’ll be in worse trouble than at the time of the Arab oil embargo. And if we allow ourselves to drift deeper in dependency for Arab oil we’re going to have real, terrible financial problems.”

The majority of Americans felt at the time of the obvious gas pinch that the crisis was an artificial one. Either the oil companies were making huge profits—and their financial statements served to augment this suspicion—the Watergate plagued government had mismanaged things, or there was collusion. When the announcement came that the embargo was over, the long lines at service stations disappeared as if by magic long before any more Arab oil reached the United States. The oil crisis did build upon itself to some extent.

The former energy director to President Nixon, David Freeman, warns that the United States “is approaching a more perilous period than it has just been through.” We tend to forget that Americans continue to use proportionately a great deal more natural resources than our numbers justify. The highly publicized turning down of thermostats, slower highway speed regulations, and other voluntary moves to cut our energy uses helped. But to a considerable extent they are being forgotten. The winter is over, the gas stations are open, all the legislative hassles about snowmobiles, tourists and even enough gas and oil for farm vehicles have been largely dissipated.

But according to the experts, the problems are still with us and are likely to be well into the future. There is more research into other forms of energy such as solar and nuclear. But unless Americans learn to live with shortages so that real conservation of resources becomes almost second nature, we will be unpleasantly surprised once again. Even now we have become accustomed to the

higher prices we must pay for petroleum products and electricity. That indirect regulation will hold back some use of energy but probably not enough.

Former Energy Czar William Simon, a generally hard-nosed, tough-talking administrator, seems to be having his own political aspirations. We'll have enough, he says, if "the American people continue to abide by normal conservation practices and just be a little more thoughtful about the way we utilize energy."

According to the experts who have no political considerations to influence them, it's going to take a great deal more restraint than that.

HALL OF FAME DOES IT AGAIN

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to inform my colleagues that on May 11, 1974, our distinguished colleague, Representative LESTER L. WOLFF, of New York, was highly honored by the International Gaelic Hall of Fame. Mr. WOLFF was one of three people to receive recognition, which is given to outstanding individuals of Irish origin, and distinguished people of non-Irish origin who have demonstrated an especially strong interest in the affairs and people of Ireland. The two other honorees this year were the prominent Irishmen, Mr. Sean MacBride and Mr. A. M. Sullivan.

Congressman WOLFF's noteworthy efforts to obtain the release of the "Fort Worth Five," and to end the policy of internment without trial in Northern Ireland are merely two of the numerous activities he spearheaded which earned him the great honor of initiation into the Gaelic Hall of Fame. His work on behalf of the civil rights of all people who are victims of injustice and discrimination reinforces his standing as one of the leading spokesmen in the Congress for freedom and equality. Past award winners of this organization have included Mr. Paul O'Dwyer and Hon. PETER RODINO, making this group truly unique.

The Irish Echo recently published an excellent editorial on the awards dinner and the men who were honored, and I would like to insert the editorial in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

HALL OF FAME DOES IT AGAIN

The very idea of setting up an International Gaelic Hall of Fame causes a sharp intake of breath. How in the world could it be done?

Well, it has been done, and not alone that, it has proved itself by the very elusive virtue of consistency.

In November of 1972 when commenting on the initial selections to the Gaelic Hall of Fame—Paddy Doherty of Derry, Eoin McKiernan of Minnesota, Paul O'Dwyer of New York and Peter Rodino of New Jersey—we said the board of directors of the hall had set themselves a very high standard.

Last week they lived up to that standard by inducting Sean MacBride, A. M. Sullivan and Lester Wolf into the hall.

Mr. MacBride, currently an Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations and president of Amnesty International, has lived a

life of service to his fellowman as a lawyer, legislator, government minister, and international jurist.

Mr. Sullivan, a noted lecturer, essayist and writer, is one of America's finest poets. His ballads touch the heart of all who read them and make all aware of the great contributions of the Irish people to America and to the culture of the world.

Congressman Wolff, elected to the hall as a friend of the Irish as Congressman Rodino was two years ago, had a distinguished career as a broadcaster before becoming a Congressman in 1964. Since then he has served with distinction. He was in the forefront of the fight to release the Fort Worth Five and has been outspoken in his condemnations of the British policy of internment without trial in Northern Ireland.

Neill Sullivan, Bart Dougherty, Michael Delahunty and their colleagues in New Jersey who made the selections have scored again. The hall's induction ceremony at a luncheon in The Manor in West Orange was a credit to all involved.

We'll say it again. By their selections in 1972 and in 1974 the board of the International Gaelic Hall of Fame have set themselves a very high standard—one that we feel sure they will live up to.

EDITH GREEN STILL "MRS. EDUCATION"

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, many a thesaurus of complimentary terms has become dog-eared during the verbal gentility of House proceedings. One drawback to working within these mutual admiration surroundings is the difficult search for that less-hackneyed compliment which reflects the very highest and most sincere degree of admiration for another Member of Congress.

I hold such admiration for Congresswoman EDITH GREEN.

With thesaurus aside, I can tell you that she is a good person, a good friend, and an excellent legislator.

When EDITH GREEN returns to Oregon next year, the Congress is certain to miss her capabilities and the presence of her warm person. I am in the fortunate position of following her in retirement to our home State, and hope to continue to benefit by her association.

With these words, I would like to share with my colleagues the opinion of another fellow admirer which recently appeared in the Oregon newspapers. Mr. Jim Sullivan, executive director of the Oregon Independent Colleges Association, speaks for me and so many others with this brief comment on Mrs. GREEN's contribution to our Nation's education system:

ANOTHER VIEW—EDITH GREEN STILL "MRS. EDUCATION"
(By Jim Sullivan)

In the recent Oregonian profile of Representative Edith Green a non-admirer was quoted, "I should say at the outset that I dislike the woman intensely. In fact, I hate her. Anything I say is going to be colored by that." Let me be equally frank. I have worked with Mrs. Green over many years

and on many issues—and I love her. I am sure my feelings will also color what I say.

As Executive Director of the Oregon Independent Colleges Association since 1969 I have followed all federal higher education legislation; proposed and enacted. When the House took final action on the Higher Education Act of 1972 I spent two months in Washington, D.C. as a special assistant on the subcommittee on higher education. I believe I can speak with some authority from first hand experience both on higher education legislation and Mrs. Green.

Early in her congressional career Mrs. Green earned the title "Mrs. Education." After twenty productive years in Congress she may well have stepped on the toes of many politicians and bureaucrats, but among educators she is still "Mrs. Education."

There are many reasons for this. In the 1960s she was one who kept her head during the student riots. In contrast to what was said in the profile, Mrs. Green did not introduce a bill to cut off federal aid to colleges which failed to prevent disturbances; she knew such legislation would punish the institution rather than the rioters. Instead, her bill would have cut off federal funds to any student or faculty who were convicted of illegal action. That is quite an important difference.

The Higher Education Act of 1972 was one of Mrs. Green's main interests in recent years, but her role in this legislation needs to be clarified. The bill as she introduced it was the result of two years of open hearings where every higher education expert who wanted to be heard, was heard. The Green version of the bill was supported by every higher education association in the country.

The dispute over the bill centered on two issues. Mrs. Green wanted student financial aid more adequately funded so middle income students would receive aid but she wanted the programs administered as they had been with the funds going to the college of the student's choice so the college and the student could develop the best possible aid package. Her opponents wanted the funds channeled through a central federal agency. The final bill contained parts of both versions. It is worth noting, however, that the funds allocated under the Green version have all reached the needy students while the funds allocated under the centralized version are so tied up in federal red tape that \$45 million went unspent this year alone—in spite of the obvious need of hundreds of thousands of students.

The second issue concerned institutional aid. Mrs. Green proposed a simple formula that would allocate funds to public and independent institutions alike. Her opponents proposed a complicated formula tied to the assumption that the main purpose of higher education is to aid the poor. The latter version prevailed over Mrs. Green's objections. It has turned out to be so unworkable that not even its proponents have tried to implement it. We have only to look around Oregon to note the closure of Marylhurst, an outstanding independent institution, or the difficulties of such public institutions as Portland State, Southern Oregon College, or Eastern Oregon College, to recognize the impact the loss of these institutional aid funds has had on Oregon higher education.

None of this is to suggest that Mrs. Green is perfect or that those who have disagreed with her were always wrong. It is simply to remind people that Mrs. Green was voting for civil rights long before it became accepted; she was working for women's rights long before it became the "in" thing to do; and she has consistently felt that the taxpayers deserve the maximum return for their tax dollars. It is also to say that, as one who has worked closely with her, I have found Mrs. Green to be an honest, forthright, hard working, and knowledgeable public servant

and in today's Watergate world we will all miss such a voice in Washington, D.C.—not the least those of us in higher education.

JEWISH AND MINORITY ORGANIZATIONS JOIN IN CALL FOR HEW ACTION ON DEFUNIS ISSUES

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the issues surrounding the DeFunis case have been a matter of concern to me for some time. The case and its implications have engendered great comment among civil rights organizations and other organizations and interested parties. It is heartening to me to know that on May 17 the leaders of the three largest Jewish human rights organizations and three major civil rights organizations have jointly signed a letter calling on Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger to issue guidelines to clarify issues raised by the DeFunis case. The letter was released by Eleanor Holmes Norton, chairperson of the New York City Commission on Human Rights, who conferred with the leaders, she said, because of "concern voiced in some quarters about the impact of DeFunis on the civil rights coalition of the sixties." Signing the letter were: Benjamin R. Epstein, national director, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith; Bertram H. Gold, executive vice president, American Jewish Committee; Vernon Jordan, executive director, National Urban League; Naomi Levine, executive director, American Jewish Congress; Roy Wilkins, executive director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and Cesar Perales, executive director, Puerto Rican Legal Defense Fund.

The letter said that despite varying positions on the DeFunis case, the organizations wished to avoid polarization and were in agreement on the goal of "the elimination of all forms of discrimination and the establishment of affirmative actions that will provide equal opportunity within our constitutional framework." They asked Secretary Weinberger to direct the issuance of "non-discriminatory guidelines clarifying how educational institutions can best develop appropriate tools for special efforts to recruit persons from previously excluded groups."

Commissioner Norton said that the New York City Commission had undertaken this effort because virtually all the major Jewish and minority civil rights organizations are headquartered in New York and, like the commission, are concerned over the view that disagreement on specific issues threatens the civil rights coalition. She said that the commission had noted some areas of disagreement, but that they are "minor indeed, particularly when compared with the continuing large areas of mutual agreement and cooperation." She said

that strains in the coalition have been exaggerated and that this view was especially damaging "at a time when political and social problems threaten the gains made by the civil rights movement and when the need for the coalition that achieved these gains is greater than ever."

The full letter follows:

MAY 20, 1974.

Mr. CASPAR W. WEINBERGER,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WEINBERGER: While the undersigned organizations have taken varying positions on the DeFunis case, we have, over the years worked closely in support of civil rights and human freedom.

We all recognize that the process of creating affirmative action is not an exact science. It is only in the past few years that the nation has begun the development of procedures for dismantling discrimination.

All of us wish to avoid polarization. We agree that a primary goal for all of us is the elimination of all forms of discrimination and the establishment of affirmative actions and processes that will provide opportunity within our constitutional framework.

Since the issues raised by the DeFunis case remain, we believe that an early response from HEW within whose jurisdiction such matters lie is indicated. We are therefore requesting that you direct the issuance of non-discriminatory guidelines clarifying how educational institutions can best develop appropriate tools for special efforts to recruit persons from previously excluded groups.

Very truly yours,

Benjamin R. Epstein, National Director,
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai
Brith; Bertram H. Gold, Executive Vice
President, American Jewish Commit-
tee; Vernon Jordan, Executive Direc-
tor, National Urban League; Naomi
Levine, Executive Director, American
Jewish Congress; Cesar Perales, Execu-
tive Director, Puerto Rican Legal De-
fense and Educational Fund; Roy Wil-
kins, Executive Director, NAACP.

THE CASE FOR A FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION—NO. 39

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the role Government plays in our economic system has long been a subject of debate among scholars, economists and public officials, and is often raised in any discussion of the proposed Federal Oil and Gas Corporation.

Opponents of the Corporation contend that it would compromise the separation of government and business that is so cherished in the American system.

In truth however, the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation would not represent a step toward nationalization of industries. The Corporation would merely add a competitive element to the energy industry and provide the public with a standard with which to evaluate the profit figures released by the major oil companies.

Lee White, Chairman of the Energy Policy Task Force of the Consumer Federation of America, and an acknowledged expert in the energy field, has responded to charges that a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation would be the beginning of the nationalization of the energy industries in testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee.

His rebuttal follows.

Not only is it clear from the language of Senator Stevenson's proposal that this is not the case, it is my view and, so far as I know, the view of every other interested participant in energy policy debates that nationalization of the industry is not a desirable alternative. Certainly it is not a practical political reality. TVA was similarly hailed as the beginning of the end of the private electric utility industry in the 1930's and it, as well as the Bonneville Power Administration, has demonstrated that governmental activity in an energy field need not and has not had the effect of nationalization. Nationalization is an understandable concern of citizens in this country, and I assume that no such step would ever be taken without public awareness and, indeed, without public clamor for it. I do not detect that mood today nor do I foresee it for the future. I think it is a specious argument, and I hope that it will not be used to divert attention from serious discussion of the merits of the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation proposal.

11500 BANANAS ON PIKE'S PEAK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the backers of H.R. 11500 like to pretend it is not a bill to wipe out surface coal mining in the guise of regulating it. They say it would merely enact Pennsylvania's progressive surface mining law and allow use of the modified block-cut method of mining and reclamation.

But that is not what Pennsylvania authorities say. Walter N. Heine, associate deputy secretary for mines and land protection, Department of Environmental Resources, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, sent a letter a month ago to members of the House Interior Committee pointing out how H.R. 11500 would close down the operation of the Mears Coal Co. mine which the Interior Committee said was a model operation.

For example, Mr. Heine says the requirement to restore mined land to original contour is much too restrictive. The House bill forbids any reduction in the highwall by disturbing land above it. It is common practice in Pennsylvania to bevel the highwall to control settling and get a better bond between the highwall and the replaced materials.

H.R. 11500 is not a workable bill. It attempts to legislate in terms of absolutes. The result is that it is absolutely unworkable, like trying to grow bananas on Pike's Peak. It should be junked in favor of a bill that results in effective reclamation without cutting off our fuel supply.

OPEN MEETINGS AMENDMENT

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that a total of 47 Members of the House have now cosponsored an amendment proposed by my distinguished colleague, CLARENCE BROWN, of Ohio, and myself, that would make open committee meetings mandatory in the House except in a few narrowly defined instances.

That amendment will be offered whenever the Bolling reorganization plan reaches the floor.

I include at this point the text of a joint release issued last week by myself and Congressman BROWN announcing the cosponsorship of 43 Members. Since then, four additional colleagues have added their names—Mr. PEYSER, of New York, Mr. MCKINNEY, of Connecticut, Ms. BOGGS, of Louisiana, and Mr. MOSHER, of Ohio.

The text of the release follows:

OPEN MEETINGS AMENDMENT

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A wide cross-section of House Members have joined to support an amendment to make House committee and subcommittee meetings more accessible to the public and the news media, the two originators of the move announced today.

Reps. Clarence J. Brown (R-Ohio) and Bill Gunter (D-Fla.) said 43 Members of the House have now co-sponsored their "open committees" amendment, which would bar closed sessions by committees or subcommittees except in narrowly-defined instances involving national security or when open sessions would compromise the public interest or legal rights of individuals.

They will offer the amendment to a House reorganization plan drawn up by a special committee headed by Rep. Richard Bolling (D-Mo.) when the proposal goes to the House floor for action. The reorganization proposal is now tied up in a Democratic Caucus study committee.

"We are especially pleased by the wide cross-section of philosophical and bipartisan support for this needed rules change that would bring more of the public's business out from behind the locked doors on Capitol Hill," Brown and Gunter said in a joint statement.

"With support for our amendment that includes House Members from all segments of the political spectrum—liberal, moderate and conservative—it is apparent that there is a strong desire throughout the House for Congress to open up its most important working sessions to public scrutiny. We believe the desire exists because most Members of Congress are rightly concerned about the low esteem with which much of the public currently views Congress and that this is one improvement that should be made to regain public respect."

Brown and Gunter said many more Members of the House have indicated support of their amendment, but are waiting to see if the Bolling proposal can be broken loose from the Democratic Caucus study committee.

Brown-Gunter "open committee" amendment cosponsors listed below:

Clair W. Burgener, R-Calif., John N. Happy Camp, R-Okla., Caldwell Butler, R-Va., James C. Cleveland, R-N.H., Michael Harrington, D-Mass., Joe Moakley, D-Mass., George O'Brien,

R-Ill., Walter E. Powell, R-Ohio, Donald Riegle, Jr., D-Mich., Pat Schroeder, D-Colo., Alan Steelman, R-Texas, Charles Thone, R-Nebr., Lionel Van Deerlin, D-Calif., Gilbert Gude, R-Md., Angelo Roncallo, R-N.Y., and Marvin Esch, R-Mich.

Charles Wilson, D-Texas, Jerome R. Waldie, D-Calif., Pete du Pont, R-Del., David Towell, R-Nev., Tennyson Guyer, R-Ohio, Joel Pritchard, R-Wash., John M. Zwach, R-Minn., James Martin, R-N.C., Shirley Chisholm, D-N.Y., Harold Froehlich, R-Wis., Alphonzo Bell, R-Calif., Robert Tiernan, D-R.I., Herman Badillo, D-N.Y., Don Mitchell, R-N.Y., and Bob Lagomarsino, R-Calif.

Jack Kemp, R-N.Y., Ed Koch, D-N.Y., Bill Lehman, D-Fla., Pete Stark, D-Calif., Sam Young, R-Ill., Bill Frenzel, R-Minn., Ben Gilman, R-N.Y., William Roy, D-Kans., Robert Gialino, D-Conn., Ron Sarasin, R-Conn., and Lester Wolff, D-N.Y.

REPORT OF A STOCKHOLDER

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, Hubert F. Lee, editor of Dixie Business, and stockholder in the Retail Credit Co. of Atlanta, has sent me copy of his article entitled "Report of a Stockholder," I insert it in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

REPORT FROM A STOCKHOLDER

(By Hubert F. Lee)

Management and directors of Retail Credit Co., source of information for business decisions for 75 years, were applauded by stockholders on their outstanding job by the stockholders in Atlanta.

Retail Credit's policy of promoting from within has helped make it one of the finest companies in the world to work for.

I featured the late Guy Woolford in Dixie Business 40-odd years ago.

So it was like homecoming day at the stockholders annual meeting.

There were Guy Woolford, Jr. and his sister Miss Frances and scores of people who have made the company great.

"Our founders' goal was to help business serve consumers," W. Lee Burge, president, said.

"Today, this is our purpose more than ever."

Burge also announced that beginning June 1, "our normal disclosure procedure will allow consumers to read the reports we have submitted about them."

Previously, consumers have been entitled to oral disclosures of their reports, made in connection with applications for insurance, credit, employment and other consumer benefits.

"When a woman requests a separate credit file set up in her own name, we will be happy to honor her request," Burge announced.

To help a woman in her credit transactions, Burge added, the company is improving its systems so her financial record can be evaluated independent of credit grantors.

"We look forward to a higher revenues and higher earnings for 1974."

Walter C. Hill, Jr. with Eastern Airlines in Miami, son of a former president, along with George Craft, Trust Co. of Ga. and Allen Post, of Hansell, Post, Brandon & Dorsey were elected three year directors.

Re-elected were W. Lee Burge, president, Wilton Looney, pres., Genuine Parts Co., D.

E. Rutherford, president of Affiliated Credit Companies, F. J. Brutzman, executive vice president, K. E. Jenkins, Sr. V.P.-operations, Edward D. Smith, chairman First National and Corp. and of First National Bank.

President Burge invited stockholders to come an hour early and join me and your other company executives for coffee. Also, . . . to stay for lunch . . . following the meeting.

Cater and Guy Woolford set the pace of friendliness 75 years ago and it is still being carried on.

Six men, all civic leaders, in Atlanta have headed Retail Credit:

1913-1927 Cator Woolford
1927-1932 T. Guy Woolford
1932-1945 Walter C. Hill
1946-1955 James C. Malone
1956-1965 Preston C. Uphaw
1965 W. Lee Burge

For 75 years Retail Credit has been helping businessmen make decisions and take risks, and validated the qualifications of millions for credit, insurance and jobs. Mr. Burge pointed out in Intercom.

NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO CELEBRATES ITS THIRD ANNIVERSARY

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Ohio State Awards from the Institute for Education by Radio-Television Telecommunications Center at the Ohio State University are old and respected in the broadcasting industry, and this year National Public Radio led all the radio networks with three winning entries. On this occasion of National Public Radio's third anniversary, I believe it is in order to recognize the network's solid contribution to public radio stations across the Nation. Certainly the programming service it offers has raised the quality of public radio listening. Programs NPR makes available exclusively to its member stations and a host of programs available to all public radio stations from NPR have served as enriching supplements to public radio programming.

Public radio has long existed in the United States. For almost 50 years, we knew it as "educational" radio, and these noncommercial stations, most connected with universities and colleges, largely served the purpose of training future broadcasters and offering courses on the air. But gradually there were enough efforts toward expansion and community or alternative programming that educational stations became a vital, though small, part of American life. When Congress passed the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, it recognized the need for assistance to noncommercial radio along with television.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting funds National Public Radio to operate as a unifying system for noncommercial radio. All the stations remain noncommercial and alternative programming still exists, serving a smaller segment of our society, but meeting an important need. There are still those who jokingly

refer to public radio as the hidden medium and claim that radio's problem is its lack of visibility. If that is the case, I am proud to point to the Ohio State Awards as an example of deserved recognition.

The awards highlight some of the types of programming NPR offers its 164 member stations. Two documentaries received awards: "Northern Ireland: Voices from the Precipice" by Josh Darsa, examining onsite the conflict in Northern Ireland through the actual voices of the people who live there; and "Flight 401: The Night that Failed" by Jim Russell, a thorough and in-depth study of the fatal airline crash. Barbara Newman received her second Ohio State Award, this time a Special Award, for her series "Movers and Shakers," presenting profiles of power through lively and sensitive interviews with men and women in positions of power.

What this type of programming from NPR means to the people of Ohio is that it can be heard on any of 13 public radio stations in the state affiliated with NPR. And similar programming from NPR can be heard on any of the other 21 Ohio public radio stations outside the system. Indeed, public radio is alive and doing very well in Ohio, with the exception of WCSU(FM) in Wilberforce, recently hit by the tornado but making great efforts to get back on its feet. Ohio public stations receive a variety of programming for their network, but they also contribute programming to the network for national dissemination. This is the unique fact about the National Radio system: It is a two-way interconnection system throughout the United States.

In its beginning just over three years ago, the NPR founders wondered if the people in Ohio had anything to say to the people of Maine, California, or Florida. They decided "yes" and each day on the network's Peabody Award-winning show "All Things Considered" news and features from public stations all over the country are aired in an effort to bring people together with information. This same concept is expanded in "Options," as omnibus program fed three times a week with content as diversified as its sources. Ohio is also the home of two production centers, receiving extra grants from CPB for the production of specialized local programming: WGUC(FM) in Cincinnati is funded for music production and WOSU(AM/FM) in Columbus is a news and public affairs center. Their productions often find their way to the network for national distribution. Consequently, while NPR itself is an authorized production center for public radio, its programming distribution figures reveal that over one-half of the productions made available to public radio stations comes from sources other than NPR, usually other public stations.

I like the idea that someone in Arizona or Alaska or Puerto Rico knows and understands someone in Ohio a little better because a night's news from a local perspective came from Kent or Bowling Green. Or perhaps a speech given in Athens, a conference in Cleveland or a

concert from Oxford or Youngstown was shared nationwide.

This is public radio, doing what commercial networks understandably cannot do. I commend the numerous individual public radio stations across the country and National Public Radio for the service they are providing to these United States.

CAPTAIN'S CONCERN SAVES TAXPAYERS MILLIONS OF DOLLARS

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to relate an example of how time, initiative, and personal concern properly coordinated can save millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

Without any appropriate yardstick many times to determine whether cost overruns are due to legitimate, unforeseen causes or are simply the result of waste and inefficiency, we in the Congress reluctantly appropriate the necessary money to complete the project.

Most excessive costs are unnecessary and can be avoided if the right people simply do their job. Capt. David Cormany, stationed at McClellan Air Force Base in Sacramento, is one man who does his job well.

Recently, Captain Cormany saved the taxpayers \$9.5 million. Through his own initiative, he persuaded authorities at McClellan to delay their order from General Dynamics Corporation for 1,306 new wing tanks of the F-111. General Dynamics wanted \$14,080 for each tank; a total cost of \$18,388,480 for the American taxpayers.

For 15 months Captain Cormany worked on preparing a precise description of the tank for engineers and investigating to see whether interested manufacturers could in fact meet the contract. In the end, his efforts paid off in a big way.

The company who was finally awarded the contract, Royal Industries of Santa Ana, Calif., agreed to build the tanks for \$6,844 each; a total savings to the American public of \$9.5 million. Most interesting of all was that General Dynamics, the contractor who originally wanted to build the tanks for \$14,080 apiece, found that when faced with competition from other bidders they could manufacture the tanks for the lower price of \$10,000 each.

Fascinating, is it not, how a little bit of personal initiative and concern can make such a big difference. I think both the Pentagon as well as the Congress can learn a great deal from Captain Cormany's example.

The following article from the Sacramento Union spells out the story in Government efficiency and economy:

McCLELLAN CAPTAIN SAVES TAXPAYERS \$9.5 MILLION

(By Ed Mendel)

Capt. Dave Cormany saved the taxpayers \$9.5 million, so they gave him a plaque. He was, after all, just doing his job.

The time came for the Air Force to order

1,306 new wing tanks for the F111. The aircraft manufacturer, General Dynamics, wanted \$14,080 for each tank.

On his own initiative, Cormany persuaded the authorities at McClellan Air Force Base to put the order up for bids.

It took eight months of fulltime work to prepare the specifications. It took another seven months to investigate the bidders.

But the tanks finally were ordered at \$6,844 each. Cormany also had the satisfaction of seeing General Dynamics, when bids were called, offer to build the tanks for about \$10,000 each.

The tanks will be stored as war reserves. They were not used in Southeast Asia, where the common F111 payload was large (about 13½ tons) but the missions were short.

By mounting six of the 600-gallon tanks under the wings, the range of the F111 can be extended by 30 per cent. That, in other words, is enough to lift a full load about two miles off the ground.

"By the time an F111 with a maximum load gets off the ground and climbs to 10,000 feet," said Cormany, "it has burned 3,600 gallons of fuel. It's really pumping it through."

If the wings are pulled back for faster flight, he said, the two outside wing tanks automatically drop off. The other four pivot to keep pointing straight ahead.

To preserve its center of gravity, the aircraft, prompted by automatic sensors, may also shift the fuel between the three compartments in each wing tank—or between the wing tanks and the tanks inside the aircraft wings.

Like the wing that supports them, the tank is a kind of air-foll that provides lift in an air-stream. Made mainly of aluminum with a once-piece fiberglass tail, the tanks weigh about 550 pounds.

Before calling for bids, said Cormany, McClellan had to prepare a precise description of the tank. "Now that's what takes the time," he said. "That's the trick. When you go out on a contract, you have to tell a contractor everything."

After receiving five bids, the Air Force sent teams to the manufacturers to see if they could in fact meet the contract. "These were some of the most exhaustive pre-award surveys the government has done," Cormany said.

The contract was awarded to Royal Industries of Santa Ana. Two of the first tanks built by Royal are being tested now. If they pass, Cormany said, delivery may begin about Sept. 1, continuing through 1975.

For his work, Cormany has received the U.S. Air Force Resources Conservation Award. In his own way, he has also come to grips with the magnitude of his saving.

"I figured it up," he said. "I saved my tax dollars for the next 476 years."

SUPPORT OF ASHLEY AMENDMENT

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, commitments in my congressional district precluded my attendance in the House on May 30, 1974. Had I been present and voting, I would have cast my vote in support of the Ashley amendment to H.R. 10265, a bill authorizing an audit of the Federal Reserve System by the General Accounting Office. I believe that this amendment recognized the need for congressional oversight of the adminis-

tration of the Federal Reserve Board and the manner in which its operating funds are spent. At the same time, it insures that the independence of the Federal Reserve System is maintained by prohibiting policy audits which would most probably lead to the System's involvement in passing political pressures.

I am very pleased that the House adopted this constructive amendment.

WOMEN IN SPORTS—PART IV

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today we submit the last in a series of four articles on women in sports. These articles have covered the background of inequality in athletics, legal remedies, and the financial situation, and today's exposes the foolish stereotypes women often face if they excel in sports. A final thanks is due both the authors and the Washington Post for setting forth so completely the facts of discrimination in this area that is central to our lives.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 15, 1974]

AN "UNFEMININE" STIGMA

(By Nancy Scannell and Bart Barnes)

Excellence in sport has been regarded as an exclusively masculine virtue through nearly all of recorded time.

From the beginning of the Olympic Games in 776 B.C. women were not allowed on the playing fields even as spectators (with the exception of the priestesses of the earth-mother Demeter, hallowers of the grounds).

So important were those contests to the Greeks that winners became national heroes, demigods whose praises were sung by musicians and immortalized by poets. Their splendid grace and form are known to us because they were rendered in marble by the greatest sculptors of the time.

The American sports ethic descends directly from that Greek tradition. While our sports are somewhat less savage—the loser of an Olympic wrestling match usually was maimed and often was killed—they are nearly as sexist.

For the most part American women, from girlhood on, have been discouraged if not barred outright from participation in the major sports. If they persist in developing their athletic abilities they commonly are stigmatized as "unfeminine" and "overly aggressive." In a word, mannish.

If and when a story about a woman athlete appears on an American sports page it is as likely to dwell upon her looks as on the quality of her performance.

A recent Associated Press dispatch about tennis player Chris Evert described her game as being "as fresh as her mint-green dress." One can be certain no such simile would occur to a writer seeking to illuminate the ability of her fiancé Jimmy Connors, also a noted player.

It is an innocuous example of the difficulty sportswriters—virtually all of whom are men—have in writing straightforwardly about women athletes. Their accounts tend either to patronize or to ridicule.

They simply reflect the prevailing attitudes of our culture, which tends to view athletic competition not so much as games as a dramatic version of the ultimate struggle.

"Losing is like death," was the way Redskins' football coach George Allen once put it. He was in tune with the times, old and new.

The Olympics began as a spin-off of combat drill. Skills, strength and endurance needed in war were developed in such contests as javelin throwing, long-distance running and weight lifting.

The warlike origins of many sports is evident from the terminology used in the sports pages. In The Washington Post on the weekend after Thanksgiving last year, for example, North Carolina State "methodically crushed" Wake Forest, Brown "shellacked" Columbia, Maryland "flattened" Tulane and the Capital Bullets "took the Knicks apart."

The Western view of athletics as a vital ingredient in building character and manliness was epitomized by the remark of the Duke of Wellington that "The Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton," and in the tradition of muscular Christianity espoused by New England schoolmaster Endicott Peabody.

Women now are challenging the idea that the benefits of athletic competition lie chiefly in the development of such virtues as manliness.

"What athletics can do for a man, it can do for a woman," says Lee Morrison, president of the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women and women's athletic director at Madison College in Harrisonburg, Va.

"It can give her the opportunity to cope with success and failure. It can give her the opportunity to enhance her own self-concept, to know more about what she's like as a person."

The presidential Citizens Advisory Council on the Status of Women found that in the United States athletics is "the area where discrimination (against women) is most pervasive and most readily apparent."

In a 1973 study the council said, "Short-changing of girls in physical education and sports deprives them of the opportunity to establish lifetime habits of exercise which lead to a high level of continuing good health in adult life."

"The opportunity for achievement in sports, scholarships and other recognition of ability in sports and for developing a competitive spirit within a framework of team cooperation should be available to girls."

Currently in the final stages of drafting at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is a set of guidelines barring discrimination on the basis of sex in athletics. The guidelines based on the education amendments of 1972, would deny federal funds to any institution, organization or school system that discriminates against women in sports in the availability of scholarships and coaching or use of facilities and equipment. Federal funds are vital to nearly every American school, public or private.

To many educators and advocates of upgrading athletics for women, the guidelines are seen as the beginning of a trend that will dramatically alter the structure of sports in America.

At its lowest level, the growing assertiveness of women in sports touches the raw nerve of sexual identity and challenges age-old stereotypes of femininity and masculinity.

Diana Okon, named best girl athlete last year at Fairfax County's Madison High, said she was teased about the title so much that she wasn't sure she wanted the honor at all.

"The boys said, 'Show me your muscle. Why don't you try to pick me up?' When I won the award. They think you're a tomboy . . . You can't really feel that proud of something people are always cutting down. You almost wish you weren't getting it."

Pat Hines of Potomac, Md., a swimmer on an athletic scholarship at the University of Miami in Florida, said her mother, like the mothers of many of her teammates, had

qualms about her swimming in serious competition.

"Make sure the people know you're feminine," Pat recalls her mother saying.

"I think," the young swimmer added, "all women are afraid their daughters are going to be accused of being something less than a woman . . . (with people) saying she's more like a man."

Over the years the attitude that sports was inappropriate for women has been reinforced by a body of medical opinion, much of it now discredited or challenged.

Testifying in a New Jersey lawsuit on the admission of girls to competition in Little League baseball, league vice president Creighton J. Hale argued that baseball competition would be unsafe for girls.

He based his opinion on, among other things, a study of cadavers of elderly male and female Japanese, which showed that the bones of the females broke more easily than those of the males. From this, Hale concluded that girls between the ages of 8 and 12 would have bones which were more susceptible to fracture than those of boys.

Hale's testimony was disputed by Dr. Joseph Torg, a specialist in pediatric orthopedics and an assistant professor of orthopedic surgery at Temple University. Attempting to extrapolate from data concerning dead bones of adults to conclusions regarding bones of living children, Dr. Torg testified, was the equivalent of trying "to extrapolate a study done on oranges to canteloupes."

Dr. Torg also disputed what Hale had contended was a "substantial body of medical opinion" to the effect that a blow to the female breast—like being hit with a base ball—could cause cancer.

Olympic skier Suzy Chaffee said she had been discouraged from competition at Denver University by the head ski coach who told her "it was bad for the ovaries."

Chaffee chose to ignore that advice and pursued her interest in skiing independently. In 1968, she was chosen captain of the U.S. Women's Olympic ski team.

"There seems to be no reason to restrict the physical activity of women because of the reproductive organs and no need for concern about the later effects of sports competition on pregnancy, labor and later health," said Dr. Thomas E. Shaffer of Columbus, Ohio, a nationally recognized authority on the medical aspects of competitive sports.

Gradually that view is gaining acceptance. Already, at a very small but growing number of colleges, women athletes are pursuing the same rigorous training programs as the men—and, in fact, are being recruited and offered athletic scholarships.

It is the issue of athletic scholarships for women, perhaps more than anything else, that has sparked controversy. It has also proved to be deeply divisive among groups and individuals concerned with upgrading women's roles in sports.

Those opposing scholarships see recruiting and excessive pressures to produce a winning team as inevitable horrors resulting from scholarships.

Those supporting scholarships contend that if they are available for men, basic fairness dictates they be available for women, too.

Phyllis Bailey, women's athletic director at Ohio State, says she basically is not opposed to scholarships for women " . . . if the talent is good enough. Just because a woman's talent happens to be in sports skills, people shouldn't say, 'Too bad for you, sister.'"

"We're very concerned. We want our program to be educationally sound. We don't want to get into buying talent," says Della Durant, director of women's athletics at Penn State University.

"We don't want to get into boxing or a girl into participation on a team for a given

length of time. If she comes to this university and sees the many advantages and activities she could participate in, we don't want her to feel she has to participate on a team."

Florida's University of Miami is one school where athletic scholarships are available for women.

Doug Hartman, who coaches the women's swimming team there, has seven swimmers on scholarship for the first time this year.

"The best ones work out with the men," Hartman said. "They go 10,000 yards a day for three hours a day five days a week and then they go out there on Saturday and Sunday afternoons. We offer a kid a chance at swimming and swimming nationally." Hartman's team is ranked No. 2 in the nation.

Olympic swimmer Jenny Bartz is one of the athletes on scholarship at Miami.

"Sure there's pressure with scholarships. Pressure to swim and swim well because of what they're giving you," she said.

At Miami, athletic scholarships for women cover tuition only, \$2,500. Over four years, that does not begin to approach the costs of recruiting and supporting a male athlete at any of the big-name sports schools. That can run as high as \$30,000, according to Marjorie Blaufarb of the American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

One reason for the disparity is economics. At the big-name institutions, men's sports are a way of raising money and keeping the alumni happy (and contributing), plus building a national reputation through media exposure. To a lesser extent, men's sports at the college level are frequently a training ground for the pros, where the real money is.

Social attitudes may be changing, but women's sports have not yet reached the point where they can command the media attention and raise the money that men's sports draw.

Just this month, UCLA basketball superstar Bill Walton signed a five-year contract estimated at several million dollars with the Portland Trail Blazers. By contrast, tennis player Billie Jean King became the first woman athlete to break the \$100,000 mark in 1971. Last year, Margaret Court surged ahead with winnings of \$180,000, the highest ever.

In professional golf, the top-ranking men players usually can expect winnings of more than \$100,000 a year. For women, the top figure is about \$40,000, although last month's Dinah Shore Winner's Circle tournament, the highest-paying women's golf tourney ever, may change the women's average. Winner Jo Ann Prentice's earnings in that contest were \$32,000 of the total purse of \$200,000.

Both the Dinah Shore tournament and the tennis matches of Billie Jean King have received nationwide television exposure, an indication at least that women are getting a foot in the media door.

They made progress, too, at the 1972 Munich Olympics, where women's sports events received extensive television coverage. Donna de Varona, a gold medal double winner in swimming in the 1964 Olympics, became the first woman to do live television commentary on the Games.

There were other improvements, too, said Fairfax County's Melissa Belote, who brought home three gold medals from Munich. "The girls on the team actually had a better deal than the boys," said the Lee High School junior. "We had only one girl to a room and each of us had our own portable kitchen, which didn't happen for the boys."

Belote's description of the treatment of women athletes in 1972 contrasts with de Varona's remembrances of 1964, when the women were treated more like second-class citizens.

De Varona recalled that the women had inferior lodging and ate their meals at caf-

fee shops and hamburger stands while the men stayed at plush hotels and ate steak.

It's unclear precisely where the movement for women's athletics will lead but most predictions are that, over the years, the effects will be profound.

The emergence of the female athlete is a challenge to deeply imbedded values and traditions. It appears certain that some will erode under the pressure.

One possible casualty may be the "win-at-all-costs" mentality that dominates many men's sports. Large-scale participation by women may have the effect of humanizing sports, particularly at the big-time college level.

As things stand now, the pressures to win are intense. "We are at the mercy of winning and losing," said University of Maryland athletic director Jim Kehoe, explaining that he has to compete for the spectator dollar with the Redskins, the Bullets, the Baltimore Orioles and any other sports team or event in the area.

Making a crucial basket against North Carolina or beating Alabama in football will be reflected in cash flow at the gate and in television and radio income, Kehoe said.

So heavy are the pressures at Maryland and elsewhere that many athletes simply give up their scholarship and quit college.

A survey by The Washington Post last fall showed that of 27 athletes recruited on football scholarships in the fall of 1969 only 17 were still at Maryland four years later.

"They promised such a good education when I was being recruited," said Sam Martin, who gave up his scholarship and left in the summer of 1971. They said the emphasis was on studies first and then football.

"But the first day we arrived at school we had a meeting and it was all turned around. He (former coach Roy Lester) said family was first, football second and studies were the least important."

In a research paper on the origin of the "winning is the only thing" mentality of football in particular, Penn State sociologist Allen Sach traced it to the last quarter of the 19th century. This was a period in American history when the "robber barons" were building the giant corporations that dominate the business world.

"For individuals amassing great fortunes in the cutthroat competition of the latter 19th century, sport probably reflected the same acquisitive values that permeated the rest of their lives," Sach said. "Survival of the fittest, fierce competition and an intense desire to win at any cost became the major themes of their work as well as their play."

"The whole system needs to be reevaluated," said Dorothy V. Harris, director of Women in Sport at Penn State's Sport Research Institute.

"It should be our job to see that all human beings who desire to participate in sports have an avenue to pursue it . . . I'm just as concerned about the boy who gets cut from the system as the girls who have almost no opportunity."

"The thing that prostitutes sports is, all the educational values get traded off for the business values and that goes right to collegiate sports and the NCAA," Harris continued. "They're big business so you can't argue educational values because you've already sold, traded them off for business values . . . Those rich old men, buying and selling and wheeling and dealing and they don't care what happens to the individual."

The most significant change to come from the athletic revolution, however, may be one of attitudes. Many women's groups see a parallel in what's going on in sports now with the civil rights movement over the past 20 years.

The Title 9 law barring sex discrimination is word-for-word the law barring discrimination on the basis of race, with the word "sex" substituted for "race." (Title 9, how-

ever, applies only to educational institutions.)

It is also worth noting that in the civil rights movement, athletics has been and remains one of the areas where there has been the greatest progress and acceptance for blacks.

Just as the civil rights movement brought dramatic changes in the way blacks perceived themselves and society, many women feel similar results may evolve from the upgrading of women's sports.

"There are few countries where we have encouraged our girls to be as sedentary as we have in the United States," said Phyllis Z. Boring, a Rutgers University professor and a member of the New Jersey Women's Equity Action League. "I don't see where it becomes unfeminine to stay in decent condition."

What Boring and others are looking for is a general social attitude that it is more—not less—feminine for a woman to develop her skills, in sports and everything else, to their fullest potential.

Gradually, grudgingly, that view is becoming accepted.

THE WILLIAMSVILLE PARENTS' TEACHERS' PROGRAM FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN: A MODEL FOR AMERICAN VOLUNTARISM

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a volunteer program sponsored by the Williamsville PTA Council Special Education Committee and directed by Mrs. Frances C. Dando to teach handicapped children to swim.

The children are taught by teenagers who volunteer their time to teach basic skills of swimming. The swim program has been so successful that there is a waiting list of children who wish to participate.

All too often such effective community action programs are ignored. It is my belief that now is the time to give them the recognition they are due. For all involved, it is a truly rewarding experience. The children learn not only to swim, but also to have confidence in themselves. For the volunteers, it is a valuable teaching experience and a more essential lesson in caring for the less fortunate in our society. Under the exemplary direction of Mrs. Dando, both the children and the volunteers experience all this and have fun at the same time. It is through these programs that the youth of our Nation can learn self-initiative and responsible citizenship plus help point the way to one of the real strengths of the American spirit—voluntarism. I support their efforts and hope other communities will follow their lead.

The Sunday, May 26 edition of the Buffalo Courier-Express carried a fascinating article written by Louise Leiker which gives us an inside look at what the swim program means to both the teenagers and the handicapped. The article follows:

TEENS TEACH THE HANDICAPPED

(By Louise Leiker)

Sleeping in on Saturday morning has been sworn off by scores of Williamsville teens

who prefer swimming pool shivers to snug covers when it comes to teaching 150 handicapped children how to swim.

As the children—some retarded, others with varying learning-perceptual disabilities or physical impediments—learn to float, kick and bob, they're simultaneously opening doors to richer experience. And the youthful volunteers themselves, now halfway through the eight week swim program sponsored by the Williamsville PTA Council Special Education Committee are acquiring a greater understanding of the handicapped.

"We felt the need to help these special children find an area which would help them get into the mainstream of life—and swimming seemed like a good place to start," Mrs. Frances C. Dando, director of the swim program said.

Mrs. Dando, a pert mother of five with cropped blonde hair and limpid hazel eyes, has a retarded 12-year-old daughter who sharpened her swimming skills in the programs experimental run last year.

"We also would like to prepare these children to take the regular summer neighborhood swim classes, she said. "Not only are they learning a skill, the children are also training to enter a heterogeneous society. We see swimming as the great equalizer where handicapped youngsters can mingle with normal children and where normal children can see that the handicapped are not to be feared, but to be loved.

The results of the swim classes have been dramatic. Many handicapped children have gone on to earn the Red Cross beginning swimming certification through the one-to-one or two-to-one instruction. Others have learned enough skills to enter regular swim classes. But, it is the seemingly "small" accomplishment that Mrs. Dando is most proud of.

"One of the most memorable instances was when we couldn't get one scared little boy out of the locker room," she recalled. "He became interested in the volunteer's water-resistant watch worn in the water. So tile-by-tile we edged the boy by the pool and got him into the water by putting the watch around his ankle."

Some of the 125 volunteers are adults and parents of the children. Parents, where possible, are not allowed to observe the swim classes until open house two weeks before the program ends.

"Since we want to use swimming as a common ground between normal children and the handicapped, we try to help the children attain as much independence as possible," Mrs. Dando said. "We ask the parents to drop the kids off at the locker room, where they, for example, learn how to find and use their lockers. Of course, some will not be able to do this.

"But on the whole everyone is given the opportunity to learn, to go away from the program with a greater feeling of confidence and self-esteem."

The program, which now has a waiting list, is open to the handicapped aged 5 to 20, living in Akron, Alden, Amherst, Cheektowaga, Clarence, Depew, Grand Island, Hamburg, Kenmore, Lancaster, Sloan, West Seneca and Williamsville school districts. It is funded through the Amherst Youth Board and the Village of Williamsville, and takes place in these Williamsville school pools: Casey Middle School, in Casey Rd., Heim Middle School in Heim Rd., and Mill Middle School in Mill Rd.

Although not all volunteers have Red Cross lifesaving certification, there are certified life guards and water safety instructors coordinating the program at each pool.

"Sometimes it seems as though the volunteers may be learning more than the children themselves," Mrs. Dando said. "They appear to come to a better understanding of these special children after working with them for awhile.

"One boy told me he had become more

patient and more tolerant of others after the program. Even those children taking part in the swim program who are not retarded learn more about this type of handicap."

The young volunteers themselves agree that they've received much for their efforts and that their Saturday mornings are well spent.

"I've learned to practice a lot of patience," Eileen M. Tiebor, 15, a freshman at Williamsville North High School, said. "You can't force these kids to swim. We do one thing at a time. Even if the kid I'm working with learns to kick, or uses his arms or tries to float, we both feel a sense of accomplishment. And the time spent is really no big sacrifice, I enjoy the work."

Her classmate, Deborah Siracuse, 14, added:

"Some kids were told by their parents and friends not to volunteer for the program because the children would attack them or it would be a waste of time trying to teach them something. As the weeks go by, the ignorance of those statements becomes clearer. "Sometimes success is just getting a kid to put his face underwater. But, through those small miracles, we both get more confident and more is learned."

Another Williamsville North freshman, Joseph H. Streiff, 15, became involved in the program after he realized that "so many people have helped me I thought it was time to help others."

"Swimming is something that definitely should be taught to the handicapped," he said. "It's another accomplishment they can achieve and it's something they can do well."

The swim program is only one of several projects carried out by the Williamsville PTA Council Special Education Committee of which Mrs. Dando is chairman.

The committee is dedicated to insuring that special education students receive all educational advantages due to them under state law. It formed last February when parents expressed concern over the negative connotations the word "retarded" carries and over incidences where retarded youngsters were called derogatory names.

"Perhaps the hardest thing a retarded youth has to bear is the stigma society places on his condition," Mrs. Dando maintained. "By taking retarded children out of homogeneous environments, we hope to break these stereotyped images. We also hope that other communities will initiate swim programs like ours."

SUGAR ACT FULL OF IMPONDERABLES, LIMIT ACT TO 2 YEARS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we have been aware of the dramatic increases in the price of sugar during recent months. There is great controversy surrounding the proposed amendments, the Sugar Act, which are scheduled to be before us on Wednesday, June 5, 1974.

It is clear that there are more imponderables confronting sugar today than ever before. The world market is more chaotic than at any time in its history. Many voices are being heard attempting to pull and haul the United States in various directions concerning the Sugar Act. In view of the extreme uncertainties involved and the overriding importance of insuring that the American consumer receives an assured supply of sugar at the most reasonable

possible price it seems to me that tying ourselves to a 5-year act is the wrong solution at this time.

I believe that the correct course—the course best designed to protect the public interest and particularly our consumers—is to enact legislation with a 2-year tenure. This then would enable us to re-examine the act and its impact upon the consumer in a couple of years, and make such adjustments as appear necessary.

To this end it is my intention to introduce an amendment to H.R. 14747 substituting a 2-year duration for the 5 years contained in the bill as reported out by the committee.

A copy of the amendment follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 14747, AS REPORTED

OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Page 22, line 7, strike out "1979," and insert in lieu thereof "1976."

Page 22, line 9, strike out "1979" and insert in lieu thereof "1976".

HOW MUCH INFLATION? HOW SERIOUS A RECESSION?

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, an article by Hobart Rowan, "How Much Inflation? How Serious a Recession?" appeared in the May 5 Washington Post. In that article, Mr. Rowan takes on the President's recent economic message to Congress, and rather effectively challenges its credibility.

It seems to me that Mr. Rowan's article not only poses the central questions raised by the message, but also highlights the challenge it poses Congress. Are we going to sit back and listen to pretty words, or are we going to assume a role of leadership and do something to solve the very real economic problems afflicting the people of this Nation.

It is my belief that we must resolve ourselves to address those problems.

I insert Mr. Rowan's article in the RECORD at this time, for the information of my colleagues in this context.

The text follows:

HOW MUCH INFLATION? HOW SERIOUS A RECESSION?

President Nixon, according to John Kenneth Galbraith, noted Harvard economist, "is in more trouble for failed economics than failed burglars." In an interview with Parade Magazine, Galbraith said that "no administration can survive" when the inflation rate hits 11.5 per cent, as it did in the first quarter.

Judging by the new White House cover-up of the real problems of the economy, Galbraith may be right.

In a radio address last Saturday, President Nixon assured the nation there are "encouraging signs today that the worst is behind us."

He went on to point out that the chief causes of inflation last year were food and energy prices, over which the administration had little control, and that these price increases had diminished and should cease further. Thus, "the storms are abating," the President said.

The only problem with this analysis is that, at best, it is simplistic and, at worst,

dead wrong. The pattern of inflation in 1974 is different from the inflation in 1973, and as Cost of Living Council Chairman John T. Dunlop has indicated, might be more serious.

Just a day after the President delivered his soothing words on Saturday, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur F. Burns told a college commencement that "the gravity of our current inflationary problem can hardly be overestimated." Using grim words very carefully, Burns said that the very future of the nation could be "in jeopardy" if the inflation rate did not recede. And he offered little hope of lower prices.

"The President is right and Burns is wrong," Ron Ziegler told UPI. Ziegler may later have to make the statement inoperative.

The root of the inflation problem that President Nixon failed to mention is that there are counter forces at work this year which more than make up the reduced pressure from oil and food prices (which of course are still very high).

"We are seeing in 1974 the consequences of the 1973 inflation," Dunlop told an audience of business writers a few weeks ago. "The 1973 costs are now going through the (economic) system, into steel, paper, utilities, transportation."

Beyond that, Dunlop pointed out, with the end of wage-price controls, business is not only free to raise profit margins—but many companies have raised prices in anticipation of further higher costs. Moreover, wages—freed of government restraint—will also tend to push prices higher.

Thus, argues Dunlop—and he has made the same presentation in the White House—we are confronted with a "bedrock" inflation in items that make up 69 percent of the Consumer Price Index.

The stage is potentially being set, as Federal Reserve Board Governor Andrew F. Brimmer pointed out over the weekend, for a "cost-push phase of a renewed wage-price spiral similar to that in 1969 and 1970."

So our economic problems are far from being behind us: they lie ahead, and are likely to become more pressing before easing up.

"If 1973's inflation was made abroad (in fuel and other commodities) then 1974 inflation will be made at home," Dunlop says, "and no one thinks that this bedrock inflation is reversible because it is being built into wage rates and profit margins."

Recently, administration and private economists who had expected inflation to turn down this year and be less than 6 per cent during the fourth quarter have come to the conclusion we will be lucky if the rate then is no more than 7½ to 8 per cent. That is also the rate predicted by Treasury Secretary William Simon in an interview with the Washington Post, a forecast that would have been unthinkable a few weeks ago.

Paul H. Earl, an economist with Data Resources, Inc., estimates that the CPI, which swelled to 12.2 per cent in the first quarter, will still be rising at a 9.6 per cent rate in the fourth quarter.

Earl takes into account the end of price controls, especially in health care, construction, auto and processed food industries; continued supply shortages for critical materials like scrap metals, paper and copper; large increases in price of electricity and steel; and higher wage rates. All this outweighs the moderation expectable in petroleum and food prices, as well as the weakening of some spot commodity prices.

Nixon administration economists have consistently underestimated the strength of inflationary pressures in the economy. They misjudged the strength of the world-wide commodities boom when they junked Phase II of the wage-price effort in January, 1973—yet complain there was little they could have done to head off that part of the inflation.

Now, President Nixon talks in syrupy style of "further improvements in the economy"

for the rest of the year. The real question is how far inflation will go, and how serious a recession the Federal Reserve Board will be forced to put the nation through in an effort to bring down prices.

WOMEN IN SPORTS

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the recruiting of college athletes, the selection of sports, and the call for affirmative action for women's athletics are discussed in the following excerpt from the Project on the Status and Education of Women's article, "What Constitutes Equality for Women in Sports?":

WOMEN IN SPORTS

The practices surrounding recruiting male college athletes have periodically erupted in scandal over the years. There is increasing concern over recruitment practices at present because, according to the *New York Times* (March 10, 1974), they are becoming more like a "frenzied slave market" as more and more athletic departments run in the red. Because of the cost and the pressure, forty-one colleges have dropped football in the past ten years.

The issue of sex discrimination does not rest on whether or not recruiting is desirable. It rests on equality. For example, if an institution feels that recruiting student athletes is not desirable, it may wish either to use the pressure for equity to de-emphasize recruiting for males, or to begin recruiting female athletes with the same intensity that they have been recruiting males.

MEDIA COVERAGE OF SPORTS

In some stadiums, women are not allowed in the press box, with the result that they cannot adequately cover games.

Women at a prestigious western university protested so-called "honey shots" of women spectators at sports events. The women said that they neither wanted nor needed "the defense of their physical attractiveness by (the) sports information director of the media."

Women at a number of institutions have raised the issue that women's athletics have not received sufficient coverage in university publications (press releases, bulletins, newspapers, etc.) or that the public information office of the institution provides services for men's, but not women's athletics. It seems clear that such university-sponsored or funded publications or services are bound by the university's obligation not to discriminate on the basis of sex.

THE SELECTION OF SPORTS AND LEVELS OF COMPETITION

A large midwestern university spent over \$2,600,000 on its men's intercollegiate athletic program. There was no comparable program for women's intercollegiate athletics. In fact, no university money whatsoever was officially spent on women's intercollegiate athletics.

At a formerly all-female college, men compete in five sports (with an annual budget of \$4,750), while women have three sports (with a \$2,060 budget).

A competitive athletic program of ten includes sports at the varsity, junior varsity, freshman and occasionally the intramural or club level. The level of competition offered is expected to vary according to the skill level of the participants and opportunities for competition. However, because fewer women generally participate in competitive

sports, their opportunity for competition at various levels is limited. As part of an "affirmative action" or "remedial action" program concerning women's athletics, an institution might both encourage its own women students to participate in athletics and encourage other institutions to develop competitive sports programs for women, so that the women at a given institution would have greater options for competition.

Some people are recommending that institutions conduct periodic student surveys to determine the sports in which members of each sex would desire to compete, the appropriate levels of competition, and whether teams should be single sex or mixed. They argue that these assessments would provide institutions with guidance concerning the most appropriate way to expand opportunities as women become more involved in competitive athletics. They further argue that these surveys should be conducted yearly (perhaps using data processing cards at registration) so that the athletic opportunities for women students are responsive to changing interest patterns. Opponents of this plan, however, say that such a survey would be difficult and expensive to administer and that it poses a governance problem. They also fear that they would be forced to change the athletic opportunities available for men if male students were similarly allowed to play a major role in determining what athletic opportunities were available to them.

THE CALL FOR AFFIRMATIVE ACTION FOR WOMEN'S ATHLETICS

Women's groups are saying that institutions should take affirmative action to overcome the effects of past discrimination in competitive athletics. Already there have been a number of changes in the athletic opportunities available to women in educational institutions. Several states have passed state laws to open up athletic opportunities to women. Others have expanded the opportunities available to women in response to pressure and complaints from civil rights groups and women's groups. In addition, a growing number of institutions are conducting studies to determine the adequacy of the athletic opportunities that are available to women.

Women's groups argue that it is not enough simply to expand the athletic opportunities for women somewhat. They are urging institutions to take affirmative steps to encourage women to avail themselves of the available opportunities for competitive athletics. They stress that institutions should use their facilities and services to the fullest to assure substantial participation by women in competitive athletics.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1974

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add these few words of tribute to one of the most remarkable men of our times, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, who honored us with a brief audience last week.

It was both an honor, and a humbling experience, to be ushered into the presence of this man whose name is symbolic of the fight for freedom throughout the world. His lonely vigil on behalf of all free men has been an emotional experience for Catholic and non-Catholic alike.

An editorial in the most recent edition

of the Catholic Standard, archdiocesan newspaper in the Nation's Capital, best expresses our thoughts on the Cardinal's visit to America:

His personal visit is a reminder that men of principle can prevail against even the most insidious forms of evil. His presence repudiates those who reject the innate dignity of man and man's right to profess and live his belief in God as well as his right to be free. Few men in history have paid the price of imprisonment in terms of years as has Cardinal Mindszenty. Yet he has not lost heart, nor has he failed to stand firm for his faith and the principles in which he believes.

... In a world in which we observe the actions of so many faithless men, Cardinal Mindszenty stands out as a man of faith. A strong-willed man who shares the human failings of the rest of us, he has risen to great heights in his search for perfection. We can all take strength and confidence from what he is and what he has accomplished."

Indeed, the Cardinal's life should bring home to us the realization that freedom understands no limitations of territory or denomination.

PAYROLL BITE ACCEPTANCE IS "WEARING THIN"

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come again for me to remind the Members of the U.S. Congress about the regressive social security tax being levied upon the American working men and women of this Nation. This regressive tax is causing domestic business untold hardship and is resulting in our working people paying more in social security taxes than they are in income taxes.

I have filed legislation with more than 130 Members of Congress as cosponsors providing for a reduction of this exorbitant tax from 5.85 percent on the employer and employee to 3.9 percent on both, with the remainder of the money to come from general revenues.

The social security trust fund is now carrying many of the burdens formerly paid for by local, county, State, and Federal Government. This is grossly unfair. This burden should be shared in a more equitable way.

The Washington Star-News, in a series of articles, has explored this problem in depth. I am submitting for the RECORD today, the first in the series of articles, entitled "Payroll Bite Acceptance Is Wearing Thin," by Duncan Spencer. I hope my colleagues read this article carefully. Perhaps, then, they will understand what I am trying to accomplish.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Star-News, May 30, 1974]

PAYROLL BITE ACCEPTANCE IS "WEARING THIN"
(By Duncan Spencer)

It was when Dick Rung, a 26-year-old architectural assistant, was filling out his income tax form 1040 two months ago that he noticed it. He was paying almost as much Social Security as income tax.

It was a reflection that perhaps crossed

millions of harried minded this year as payroll taxes for the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA) reached an historic high. Rung met his calculations resentfully.

"Before that," he said recently, "I paid no attention to Social Security at all. It's just something you accept."

But for him as for many other workers across the country, the attitude of acceptance of Social Security's bite each week is now wearing thin. This year, for the first time, over half of the country's taxpayers paid more for these "retirement benefits" than for income tax.

"Social security is a deception," Rung asserted. He sat in his cool white drafting room at Harry Weese Associates in downtown Washington where he earns \$12,000 a year as assistant to a project architect working on Metro.

"There are only two types of people who really benefit from Social Security—the people who got in early and the bureaucracy. You're told you're paying money into an account that's for your own retirement, when in fact, I'm paying for my parents' retirement, and I'll have to depend on a generation yet to come."

Rung's jaundiced view may be inaccurate, at least in part, but his attitude is widespread and growing. It seems that the tax levied in the name of "contributions" to Social Security has crossed a real pain threshold for young workers.

Is Social Security a good investment? Rung thinks not, and there are calculations that would seem to bear him out. Most people have not thought at all about the question. What will they get from the system over their working lives and after retirement?

Social Security officials answer these questions by pointing out there is no private insurance plan on the market that offers a combination of old-age pension, disability insurance, health insurance after retirement, benefits to widows and dependent children.

Created during the Depression's widespread poverty and unemployment, Social Security was not envisioned as an investment program but rather as a system of limited benefits to protect the nation's elderly from problems against which they were essentially defenseless.

Some 10 million people in the United States today are estimated to live on Social Security benefits alone. The average monthly payment is only \$183 a month.

The officials also argue that the strength of the system is what Rung dislikes most about it—that it is compulsory, and it is based on an unwritten pact between one generation and the next, with the older generation retiring on part of the income of the younger.

The Social Security Administration bases its predictions for the future on two key assumptions—that wages will outstrip inflation by a small percentage, and that the system itself will remain in the same basic form. Both of these assumptions are subject to challenge. But even under the predictions SSA confidently expects, the system is now uneven and seems likely to become considerably more uneven.

For example, a 22-year-old making the U.S. median wage (\$7,681), perhaps a laborer, paid \$449 in payroll tax this year. When he retires in 2017, his monthly benefit will be about \$2,400 in almost unrecognizably inflated dollars. In constant dollars, about \$295. If he's married, the benefit will be 50 percent more.

A 22-year-old making maximum taxable earnings (\$13,200) will get a monthly benefit of about \$3,000 a month—in constant dollars, about \$376.

A low-wage 22-year-old now making \$3,200 a year will get about \$1,600 a month in 2017, a sum equal to about \$197 in today's dollars.

A 40-year-old making median earnings will retire in 1999 at \$939 a month, worth about \$277 in 1974 dollars.

A 49-year-old making maximum taxable earnings will retire in 1990 at \$748 a month, the equivalent of \$343 in today's dollars.

A man retiring this year at maximum taxable earnings gets a benefit of \$304, while a poorer man, also 65, who is only a minimum wage earner (\$3,200), will get \$157 a month.

These examples show that it's a great advantage to be married; that benefits have only a slight relationship to the amount paid in; and that, in general, the future benefits for middle-income workers in constant dollars are going to decline in most cases not increase.

There is considerable variation in the benefits paid under the system. People who pay the same amount of payroll tax may get different benefits, depending on whether they are married or not or on the year in which they retire. People who pay in different amounts of payroll tax may end up getting the same amount of benefits.

The system has been weighted throughout its history to benefit the low-wage earner, yet there are those who argue that the poor and unskilled start work younger, and die sooner, and thus get less out of the system.

"You need the money now, not when you're older," grumbled Rung. Retirement is not something he often contemplates. "I'll work until I drop," he said.

Rung's personal financial picture is bright. He earns much more than \$7,681—the amount on which the average American worker pays Social Security taxes.

And his wife pulls in another \$9,200 as a librarian.

The couple, with no children and no debts, lives in Arlington in a \$220-a-month apartment. Their principal possessions are a \$2,000 stereo set and \$2,000 worth of records, some furniture and a bicycle. They have no car. "It's a matter of economics," he says. They spend about \$30 per month on a big dinner in town, and they spent \$1,700 on a European vacation last year.

Ironically, the reason the Rungs live this way is because of their fears of the future, related in an oblique way to Social Security.

Rung tries to put 20 percent of his take-home salary into common stocks, in spite of the fact that in the last two years he has been losing ground steadily. The fact is, he simply doesn't have any faith that Social Security will be able to provide for his own retirement, he sees savings being constantly eroded by inflation, and the stock market seems to him the last reasonable hedge.

He may be right. The changes that are coming to the U.S. population due to zero population growth will not greatly affect Rung. He will have passed out of the earnings picture to join the huge group of "baby boom" retirees in time. But inflation, according to the conservative estimates of Social Security actuaries, will just about decimate the U.S. dollar.

Inflation has been going on for a long time, but now, for the first time, the Social Security system is actually pegged to it.

Rung's present wages of \$12,000 are close to the present Social Security wage base of \$13,200—the amount on which FICA tax is based. As a college graduate with high chances for advancement in his profession, he is likely to earn more than the base for the rest of his career.

But counting on inflation of 3 percent a year (the current rate is 8 percent) and an annual 5 percent rise in wages (below the Cost of Living Council's 5.5 percent guideline), Rung's base wage on which Social Security tax would be computed in his last working year—2012, when he will be 64—would be \$84,600.

The \$84,000, of course, could be mere play money compared to today's currency. It's exactly the old \$13,200 blown up by steady inflation. But the percentage of Social Security tax will march steadily upward, too. By 2013 the payroll tax, SSA estimates, will

have risen to the region of 7 percent—and that is a real percentage, not an inflated one.

What do the system's current assumptions mean for the Rungs? Assuming they both retire in 2013, he at age 65 and she at 62, they will have put about \$111,000 into the system, according to calculations by SSA's acting chief beneficiary Francisco Bayo.

But this is by no means the true value of their compulsory "contribution" to the system, Bayo concedes.

At a moderate compound interest rate of 6.35 percent, which Bayo named as a reasonable figure, their "contribution" is actually \$319,000—the amount their payroll taxes would have earned if invested outside the system.

And the "contribution" should be doubled, since the Rungs' respective employers have paid equal amounts to Social Security over the years. So the total they "gave" to the kitty is really \$638,000 plus the sum paid over the years toward Medicare. This would add about 15 percent to the total, but Social Security can't estimate a dollar sum accurately because medical costs are expected to rise abruptly. The approximate total contribution grows to \$731,400.

After Rung retires, he still gets no benefit out of his contribution to the system. Since the money is gone—paid out to others—it has earned no interest.

That represents what Social Security experts concede is a loss to him of 6.35 percent a year during his retirement years—in other words, the interest income he would have continued to receive in retirement if he had had the money to invest when he was working.

Here's how it works out in Rung's case: He is expected to live 13 years after retiring, according to mortality tables supplied by SSA. During that time, he and his wife will receive benefits of \$50,400 per year, or \$4,200 per month.

Over the 13 years, he and she will be paid \$655,200 in benefits. But from that, there should be subtracted the 6.35 percent loss or discount. The sum left to the Rungs is \$613,495—their return on a lifetime FICA "contribution" of \$731,400.

One of the most persistent criticisms of Social Security now is that it moves across every layer of society with its flat tax of 5.85 percent on the first \$13,200 of wages. For the Rungs, it means they are paying about 10 percent of their joint wages, since neither yet earns up to the maximum base.

Most economists put the tax burden on young couples much higher—part of it, they argue, is hidden, because the employer also pays 5.85 percent towards the employee's Social Security.

"The employer couldn't care less," said Prof. Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago, one of the loudest critics of the Social Security system. "The employer's portion of Social Security is wage cost just as wages are." He calls the Social Security Administration's policy of calling the payroll tax a "contribution" and counting only the employee part of the tax burden "absolutely disgraceful and misleading."

Taking into account the employer's tax payment, too, it works out to about 20 percent of the Rung's wages. In their earning lifetime, it will rise to over 30 percent.

In 1972, the Brookings Institution published a study of the payroll tax—before the accelerating factors of fast-paced inflation and declining population were as clearly visible and before the biggest-in-history 20 percent hike in benefits was in force.

"Most taxpayers complain about the income tax, but their wrath is blunted by the general belief that it is a fair tax overall despite some inequities," write Brookings senior fellow John A. Brittain. "There is little visible wrath against the payroll tax because most of those who pay it do not realize how

heavy and inequitable its burden actually is."

The study pointed out that the payroll tax is negligible on high incomes, that persons with income only from stocks and bonds are not taxed at all.

Clearly, however, the emphasis in the public's mind on Social Security has not been on its long-range or future problems. Rather, it has been on how good the system is.

One of the apparent reasons Social Security has had such an affirmative look about it is that Congress has never bothered to spell out specific goals or definitions so that potential problems might become more visible.

James Cardwell, the current chief of Social Security, would like Congress to do some long-term planning. But few observers expect it to do so.

And young workers also seem unlikely to do much toward planning about retirement, either. Rung, with his stocks, is an exception. A way around the system does not seem a major worry for most.

AMERICANISM—OUR PRIVILEGE AND OUR STRENGTH

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Legion Auxiliary, department of Wisconsin, sponsors an essay contest on Americanism for students in the State. I am pleased and proud that the winning essay in the grades seven to nine competition was written by a student in the Sixth District, Meghan McDonald of Winneconne Middle School.

Meghan wrote a most thought-provoking piece on the subject, "Americanism—Our Privilege and Our Strength." All too often, Americans tend to take for granted the freedom we enjoy here in the United States. But, as Meghan says, "Freedom is not 'free' at all. It must be worked for. It is a privilege, not a right."

I commend to your attention this very fine essay:

AMERICANISM—OUR PRIVILEGE AND OUR STRENGTH

For nearly five thousand years men have lived and died taking advantage of their fellowmen. During some periods in history men made a little more progress when they worked together to help each other. When the early cave man joined into simple tribes or clans, they were able to protect themselves, as well as, provide for a happier way of living and sharing. Our great nation was born two hundred years ago by the strength, determination, and willpower of fearless Americans willing to work together and die for the greatest gift of life—Freedom.

When we celebrate the Bi-Centennial in 1976, every living American ought to review the history, struggle, and responsibility of freedom. Americanism is the trademark of a great, free nation. Our willingness to accept and cherish the values of freedom are challenged today by persons who would destroy all we live for. Let's substitute corruption, greed, fraud, hate, and distrust for the American Values of:

Respect for all individuals; Trust; Cooperation; Faith and religion of one's choice; Responsible citizenship; Liberty under law; and Freedoms guaranteed under the constitution.

In our democracy, governed by a free people, you and I have a voice in the building or destroying of the values of Americanism. What will be your choice?

My voice and strength will always be expressed in an effort to build an even greater America. I hope to do my share throughout my lifetime to see the ideals of Americanism spread for the good throughout the world and even accompany men and women as they inhabit the universe.

Privileges build strength. And it takes strength to fight to preserve the privileges we treasure. In a free Nation we receive a great many privileges but we must struggle daily to be worthy of these gifts. We must work hard to keep our freedom. To take this Heritage for granted will be the first step toward losing it. Freedom is not "free" at all. It must be worked for! It is a privilege not a right!

To uphold the standard of Americanism before the world, we must first be worthy Americans. To be a good American is the most important job that will ever confront you in this land of Freedom and Opportunity. Are you willing to do your part in the making, the struggling, the fighting, and the sharing to keep the great ideal of freedom for the next two hundred generations and more? I am!

A HERO FOR OUR TIMES

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, Pope Paul VI removed Josef Cardinal Mindszenty from the jurisdiction he had nominally retained in Vienna, and from his honorary function as his nation's Roman Catholic primate.

The papal decision on formal retirement for the 81-year-old cardinal was, many believed, aimed at improving church-state relations in Hungary.

Cardinal Mindszenty, many seem already to have forgotten, was tried for antistate activities by the Hungarian Government in 1949 and spent more than 22 years in imprisonment and in asylum in the U.S. Mission in Budapest.

At an earlier time, Cardinal Mindszenty opposed to barbarism of the Nazis as they marched across Europe and was imprisoned by the Germans and their Hungarian supporters for his refusal to coexist with Nazism.

Both the Nazis and the Communists found in Cardinal Mindszenty a man whose Christian belief caused him to rebel against all tyranny and all those who would degrade man and enslave him.

For many years Communist officials in Hungary have told the Vatican publicly and privately that Cardinal Mindszenty must resign or be removed as primate before the church could expect to fill all vacancies, or hold religious classes in schools.

Cardinal Mindszenty's removal from his position has been especially tormenting to him since his removal came as the day approached for the announcement of the 25th anniversary, February 8, when he was sentenced to life imprison-

ment on trumped-up charges by a Hungarian Communist court.

Hundreds of telegrams and phone calls came to the cardinal at his residence in Vienna from eminent Catholics and non-Catholics from throughout the world.

Shortly after the Vatican announcement, Lajos Lederer of the London Observer spoke with Cardinal Mindszenty. He reports:

The spirit of the Cardinal—despite eight years in Stalinist prisons and 15 years in self-imposed exile in the U.S. Embassy in Budapest—is unbent. He has taken off his gloves and he is determined to spend the rest of his years battling against misguided concessions to Communist rulers from whatever quarter they come . . . Mindszenty is convinced that the political advisers to the Pope have no inkling of the suffering of Catholics in Eastern Europe.

Mr. Lederer also reported that the cardinal was "very grieved and angered about reports that secret negotiations concerning the return of St. Stephen's 1,000-year-old crown—the symbol of Hungarian monarchy—have been resumed in Washington. The crown, which was brought to the West by Hungarian Nazis in 1945 and captured in Bavaria by U.S. troops, is being kept in custody for a 'freely elected Hungarian government' in Fort Knox." It has been suggested that President Nixon, to pave the way for his visit to Moscow, is considering a new request by the Hungarian Communist leaders to return the crown.

Cardinal Mindszenty made it clear that the previous bargain between the Hungarian regime and the Holy See which forced him to leave Hungary just over 2 years ago, under conditions of which he disapproved, has not been carried out. He declares that Hungary's Catholic Church is still not free. The decision to appoint church functionaries still rests with the Communist regime, and the guarantee of freedom of religious teachings and of conscience is not a reality.

When he suffered in Hungary for his belief in God and in the church, many thought him a saint. Now, in an era of good feeling with the Communists, he is an anachronism and many in the church are visibly uncomfortable with him.

Unfortunately, the Communists have not changed. Their brutality and inhumanity are on display for the world to see. The Communists are fighting as hard as before and we should all be thankful that Josef Cardinal Mindszenty stands firm and strong, a monument to man's folly and a point to which men may return with pride when once again our sanity is restored.

During his recent trip to this country, Cardinal Mindszenty said with regard to the policy of détente that—

I have no hope that any concessions can be had in return (for Western concessions) from the atheist and inhumane governments.

Cardinal Mindszenty is a hero in this age when heroes are all too rare. I take great pleasure in joining my colleagues at this time to pay tribute to him.

NATO TO AID WHITE AFRICA

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues the following information concerning:

Allegations that NATO members have engaged in secret contingency planning for the defense of southern Africa.

My telegram to the Defense Department requesting its response to these allegations as made in Tad Szulc's column in the Washington Post.

The Department's resulting denial of such charges, and, finally, press clippings indicating that NATO officials have actually admitted the allegations are true.

The information follows:

[From the New York Post, May 10, 1974]

NATO To Aid WHITE AFRICA?

(By Michael J. Berlin)

American and NATO military officials are actively engaged in secret contingency planning that could turn into a commitment to defend the white minority regimes of southern Africa against both internal and external threats, according to a report prepared for the UN's decolonization committee by three American academics.

On the official level, the commitment has reached a point where the NATO defense ministers in a communique—issued last June in Brussels, but still classified as secret—authorized the Supreme Allied Commander in the Atlantic region (SACLANT) to plan for contingencies "outside the NATO area."

NOT ENOUGH FORCES

SACLANT, headed by American Admiral Ralph W. Cousins and based in Norfolk, Va., has already begun gathering information on bases that might be required in the southern African area, the needed reconnaissance and communications facilities shipping lanes, traffic density and the "oceanographic situation."

So far, The Post learned from an informant, SACLANT has reached the conclusion that NATO itself does not have sufficient forces to deal with that area. And the corollary to this is that a defense arrangement involving the white minority regimes of southern Africa, South Africa in particular, is required.

Ostensibly, the NATO purpose is to protect the shipping route between the Persian Gulf and Europe, used to transport much of the West's oil, from a potential Soviet-naval threat.

This route, a SACLANT spokesman admitted to The Post in a telephone interview from Norfolk, is an "area of concern" for NATO. But the spokesman insisted that NATO activities remain "bound" to its authorized area—north of the Tropic of Cancer—and he added that "SACLANT has no plans for the air and naval defense of South Africa."

Technically, of course, the denial is accurate. The plans SACLANT is formulating officially involve not the defense of South Africa, but the sea route around its Cape of Good Hope.

But the report prepared for the UN committee says that defense of the sea route would be impossible without "active cooperation, at several levels, with the defense forces of Portugal and South Africa."

The UN report, prepared by Sean Gervasi, a fulltime UN consultant, with the collaboration of Prof. L. W. Bowman of the University

of Connecticut and Prof. Ellen Frey-Wouters of CUNY, goes on to make the argument that although the importance of the sea lanes around southern Africa is real "the threat to the Cape route is minimal."

The report says that the real motivation of the NATO planners was hinted at in the NATO Assembly action that set the SACLANT contingency planning in motion—to "relieve the pressure on . . ."

The authors of the UN report quote an unnamed NATO official, who was involved in the action that set SACLANT in motion, as saying that the contingency planning was designed to make it possible "to go to the aid of our potential allies in southern Africa if the need should arise."

The debate over protection of sea routes, the UN report says, is a "smokescreen" designed to hide from the public of the Western nations and evolving alliance designed to sustain the rule of a South African government that practices the racist system of apartheid, repugnant to majority public opinion in most NATO nations.

Several Western nations, the U.S. included, have moved quietly and individually in the last few years to bolster the military capacities of the southern African white regimes against internal pressures from "liberation movements," which the West has seen as extensions of Soviet and Chinese influence. The UN report details the flow of American (as well as British and French) military items to the Portuguese colonies, including large quantities of the defoliants the U.S. used with such devastating effect in South Vietnam. *

EXCHANGE DATA

The Post learned that the U.S. and South Africa have already begun informally, through the U.S. Naval Attache there, to exchange intelligence information on Soviet ship movements in the Indian Ocean area.

All this stemmed from a National Security Council decision, coordinated with NATO early in 1970, to bolster positions against Soviet influence all along the shores of the Indian Ocean.

But the current contingency planning undertaken by SACLANT could lead far beyond that—by building an infrastructure of military relationships and a rationale to expand them into direct U.S. military involvement.

The recent Portuguese coup, which leaves the future of the Portuguese territories of Angola and Mozambique—buffers between South Africa and black Africa—very much in doubt, has spotlighted the inherent long-term instability of what had been termed the "white redoubt" of southern Africa.

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1974]

A "NEW BEGINNING" FOR PORTUGAL

(By Tad Szulc)

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

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

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

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

African colonies—General Antonio de Spínola, the Junta chief, has set in motion new and contradictory forces that still leave much of the future in doubt.

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

But this is where the similarities end.

De Gaulle's basic problem was to win at home (and among Algeria's French *colons*) the acceptance of the inevitability of a peace settlement largely on the Algerians' terms. To be sure, he had to endure for awhile the menace of military counter-coups and the terrorism of the OAS (Secret Army Organization). But he was spared the trauma of transforming a nation from a primitive dictatorship into a reasonably functioning democracy when hatreds and frustrations bottled up for nearly a half-century were surging to the fore. This, of course, is General Spínola's primary task.

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

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

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

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

In a bilateral arrangement, France has

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TELEGRAM OF MAY 6, 1974, FROM CONGRESSMAN CHARLES C. DIGGS, TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Request information that Admiral Bierman, Commandant, South Africa Defense Forces is scheduled to visit us on or about May 5, and that South Africa Foreign Minister was scheduled to visit us on or about May 10. Stop. If confirmed, request complete information re: initiator of invitation nature of visit. List of USG officials and others to be seen any functions or examination of facilities being arranged by USG or private related operations based on government contracts or research. Stop. Further request complete information about any so-called national security discussions between USG and SAG growing out of Portuguese coup, prospective opening of Suez Canal, Diago Garcia installation, and on related matters. Stop.

Request information re any dispute at any level of USG re granting of visas to aforementioned, and why operation if any was over ruled.

Finalist comprehensive comments on Tad Szulc column, editorial May 2, Washington Post, re alleged secret US plan for air and naval defense of South Africa.

I am considering hearing on this subject if disclosure of appropriate information is not forthcoming expeditiously.

MAY 14, 1974, RESPONSE BY DEFENSE DEPARTMENT TO TELEGRAM OF MAY 6, 1974, BY CONGRESSMAN CHARLES C. DIGGS CONCERNING ALLEGATIONS IN TAD SZULC EDITORIAL IN MAY 2, 1974, WASHINGTON POST

There is no truth to the allegation that there was a high level (NSC) decision in 1969 to . . . "preserve a balance in Southern Africa . . ."

Comment on other specific allegations are as follows:

A. Allegation in tenth paragraph of Tad Szulc article:

Part one.—As long as a year ago, when it became obvious that the rebels were gaining in strength in Mozambique, the U.S. and NATO began to draw up secret contingency plans for air and naval defense of South Africa.

Answer: This is not true. The U.S. fully supports the UN arms resolution against the Republic of South Africa, and it supports neither side in the disputes between Portugal and the African nationalist movements in its territories.

Part two.—In June 1973, NATO's defense planning committee (DPC) instructed SACLANT (Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic) Headquarters in Norfolk, Virginia, to draw up plans for an allied air-naval task force to stand ready to assist South Africa, should the need arise.

Answer: This is not true. There have been no NATO instructions, by the DPC or other NATO authority, to SACLANT or any other NATO command, for any such planning calling for assistance to the Republic of South Africa or any other country in Southern Africa.

B. Allegations in eleventh paragraph of Tad Szulc article:

Part one.—Following a December 1969 (U.S.) National Security Council decision to preserve a quote balance unquote in Southern Africa, the U.S.

Allegation a. Has been quietly selling Portugal quote non-lethal unquote military end-items such as jeeps, radio systems and spotter planes as well as defoliants.

Answer: The USG has not provided or sold defoliants that are applicable for military uses to Portugal. Portugal itself manufactures a wide range of herbicides, including those useable as defoliants.

The USG neither provides nor sells any military equipment to Portugal for deployment or use in Africa. The selective U.S. training and equipment provided or sold to Portugal is strictly for Portugal's NATO responsibilities, and by agreement are precluded from African use. This has been maintained.

Allegation b. It has trained Portuguese officers in counterinsurgency at the jungle warfare army school at Ft. Gulick in the Panama Canal Zone.

Answer: This is not true. There has never been any training of Portuguese military or other personnel at the army jungle warfare school at Fort Gulick, Panama Canal Zone.

Allegation c. And helped in training Portuguese pilots at bases in West Germany.

Answer: Limited U.S. pilot training for Portugal is restricted to support of its NATO missions. It is primarily for technical upgrading of pilot proficiency for the NATO missions and is accomplished wherever the U.S. or other NATO expertise is available in the NATO area.

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1974]
NATO LEAK SHOWS PLAN TO PROTECT SOUTH AFRICA

The Nato command in the southern Atlantic (Saclant) received authorization in October 1972 to draft a study of possible operations in the southern African area. The fact

was confirmed by a Nato spokesman in Brussels after the leak of a draft working paper to the United Nations decolonization committee.

The initiative for SACLANT's authorization, according to the draft report, came after pressure from a British contingent.

The report claims that the authorization to SACLANT was given under "smoke screen" motives for protecting the tanker transport routes around the Cape of Good Hope from possible Soviet naval interference. It was, the draft report claimed, an excuse to draw up plans for the protection of the white minority regimes in South Africa in order to secure supplies of minerals, in particular heavy metals, from those areas for Nato member countries.

The draft working report has been drawn up by an American Oxford graduate and former lecturer, Mr. Sean Gervasi, an economist, who is now working as an adviser for the Tanzanian Government. He was assisted by two American professors. The United Nations secretariat have hastened to point out that the draft report was not exactly what the United Nations commission for decolonization had commissioned from Mr. Gervasi.

[From the Manchester Guardian, May 20, 1974]

NATO ROW OVER CAPE DEFENCES

(By Patrick Keatley)

Four NATO Governments—Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Canada—are unhappy about the confidential instruction issued at a ministerial meeting in Brussels in June last year which has led to the preparation of a secret contingency plan for air and naval defences of the sea routes around the southern tip of Africa. The row has come to light as a result of the activities of a Dutch parliamentary committee which has been investigating NATO policies with a view to recommending cuts in defence expenditure.

There was no comment from the Foreign Office last night and in Washington the Defence Department has flatly denied that a contingency plan exists.

However detailed evidence has been compiled in a 275-page report prepared for a UN committee by the American authority on southern African affairs, Dr. Sean Gervasi, who formerly taught at Oxford. He was in Holland last week.

The gist of this study is that the Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic, Admiral Ralph Cousins of the US Navy, was asked to implement the directive, and that he has ordered his staff to prepare plans on how the NATO forces could protect the sea lanes around the Cape of Good Hope in an emergency.

[From the Sunday Times (London) May 19, 1974]

NATO'S SECRET PLAN FOR CAPE

(By Peter Watson)

Secret plans for the air and naval defence of sea routes around southern Africa have been drawn up by the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. The Supreme Allied Commander in the Atlantic, US Admiral Ralph W. Cousins, has made the contingency plans at his headquarters in Norfolk, Virginia, on instructions from a classified communique issued by a ministerial meeting of Nato's defence committee held in Brussels last June.

The plans are the first official sign that Nato may be willing to extend its activities beyond the Tropic of Cancer.

The plans, according to the ministerial communique, are to counter the "Soviet maritime threat," particularly to the West's oil from the Persian Gulf. They are supposed to exist on paper only and refer to such things as traffic density in the sea lanes around the Cape, reconnaissance capabilities from local airports, communications facilities in the area and oceanographic details.

Joint manoeuvres are ruled out and no non-Nato governments are to be consulted. "No action is to be implied by the drawing up of the plans," according to the communique.

These moves are disclosed in an as yet unpublished report by an American consultant to the UN Special Committee on Decolonisation. The consultant, Sean Gervasi, an American political economist who has taught at Oxford and the London School of Economics, was commissioned by Salim Saleem, the Tanzanian Ambassador to the UN and chairman of the UN Special Committee in August, to produce a report on Portugal, the Western powers and Southern Africa.

The report was completed in March and Mr. Saleem said in New York yesterday that the report is now being considered by the special committee. They might present it to the full UN Assembly. He said he felt that "some" of the report would have to be published.

However, says Mr. Gervasi in his report, other Nato studies in connection with the plans show that defence of the Cape sea routes is "impossible without the active co-operation at several levels, with the defence forces of Portugal and South Africa."

He says South Africa has the only detailed maps for 3,500 miles of coastline in the area and has been making these available to NATO via the Simonstown agreement with Britain. (The agreement was unilaterally extended by South Africa last week, more bases being made available to Britain.)

South Africa, the US and Britain have been co-ordinating communications equipment in the past few months. The US and South Africa have already begun to exchange information on Soviet ship movements in the Indian Ocean.

Inevitably, says Mr. Gervasi, innovations like the cooperation over counter-insurgency training with the Portuguese raises the question as to whether one of the contingency plans included in Nato's researches is an internal situation threatening to the right regimes in the area.

Last week, the British Foreign Office offered "no comment" on the plans. The Pentagon denied their existence.

A spokesman for Admiral Cousins admitted that the Cape routes were "an area of concern" for Nato but insisted that Nato activities remain bound to the authorised area, north of the Tropic of Cancer.

But Mr. Harry de Vreiss, official spokesman of the Nato in Brussels, conceded that most of Mr. Gervasi's disclosures are correct. When asked why the plans were kept secret, he replied: "It was seen as an internal military affair which should not give rise to misunderstanding."

However, he contributed to that misunderstanding when he added that the conditions under which the Nato forces would be mobilised included not just "war," but "crisis" as well. He would not elaborate on what "crisis" meant.

[From the London Observer, May 19, 1974]

NATO PLANS TO PROTECT AFRICAN CAPE ROUTE

(By Andrew Wilson and Sue Masterman; The Hague, 18 May)

The head of the NATO Press service admitted to THE OBSERVER in a telephone call from Brussels yesterday that the NATO Supreme Commander, Atlantic, Admiral Ralph Cousins, had received secret authorization to study possible operations in the Southern African area.

The allegation that SACLANT had been given a secret directive to conduct contingency planning in the area was made in a United Nations commissioned report leaked earlier in the week to Parliamentary circles here. The report says the study is intended to prepare the way for the setting up of a "counter-intervention" force in the area

with South African co-operation; but NATO vigorously denies this.

According to the NATO Press chief, authorisation for the study by SACLANT was given in October 1972, because of concern at the possibility that the Soviet Union could interfere with oil supplies for Europe and America round the Cape.

Asked why the existence of the directive had been kept secret, he said: "It is a purely military matter, and thus one we do not normally talk about."

The United Nations report—commissioned for the General Assembly's decolonisation committee, and, until its adoption, still technically a "draft"—has already increased the threat of a crisis in the Dutch Coalition Cabinet, where Socialist members are committed to making defence cuts.

The report was written by three American professors: Sean Gervasi, an economist formerly at Oxford; Lawrence Bowman, of Connecticut University; and Ellen Frey-Wouters, of the City University of New York. It says the directive to SACLANT came as a triumph for a largely British pressure group that had been working on behalf of the white regimes in Southern Africa since the 1960s; and that one of the principal figures was the former Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Mr. Geoffrey Rippon.

"From 1970 the British Government began to press its allies for an extension of NATO. Members of the Government were aware of the opposition to the idea among their allies. They therefore proceeded to press for various *ad hoc* arrangements. In this, they seem to have had some support from the Nixon Administration. "In the spring of 1972, the supporters of defence co-operation with the white regimes scored their first important success. The Military Committee of the North Atlantic Assembly appointed a sub-committee to examine the "Soviet maritime threat."

The report says the purpose of establishing the committee was to bring the "threat" to the Cape route into the open; and the appointment as its *rapporteur* of the right-wing British MP Mr. Patrick Wall was part of an attempt to commit NATO to the policies recommended by Mr. Rippon.

It says that in a draft working paper in June 1972 raising the question of 'NATO being outflanked to the south,' Mr. Wall was making a barely-veiled argument for a naval alliance with South Africa. "It bears repeating that this could not have been accidental. One can only deduce that the results which Mr. Wall produced were those which were intended by those, who secured his appointment."

According to the report, the draft working paper prepared by Mr. Wall's sub-committee had to be toned down, for political reasons, by the NATO Assembly's Military Committee.

After the committee approved the report the discussion continued in the full Assembly in Bonn, with the result that the Assembly approved 'Recommendation 22.' This urged the North Atlantic Council to give SACLANT authority to plan for the protection of the Cape routes.

The UN report says the recommendations caused considerable disquiet in a number of European countries.

It goes on: "Western Governments have been very sensitive about this and have gone out of their way to deny that anything has actually happened."

"It is now clear that this is not true. The 1972 deliberations of the Assembly . . . were the prelude to an official decision to move towards defence planning with the white regimes. The decision was taken at a Ministerial session in Brussels when the Defence Planning Committee of NATO issued a classified communique in response to Recommendation 22. The communique gave SACLANT authority to plan for contingencies "outside the NATO area."

THE DEMOCRATS SCORN CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we will never have any transcripts or tapes of the secret Democratic Caucus which by secret vote derailed the Bolling committee's proposals for congressional reform. The participants in that secret vote, however, should have no illusion that the people do not know what those at the meeting were attempting to hide. As the following articles from the Hartford Courant and the San Diego Union testify, the country understands perfectly that Democratic Congressmen proved more sensitive to the egos of powerful committee chairmen, to their own narrowly conceived personal interest and to special interest lobbyists than they did to the urgent need for rational reform of House procedures and committee jurisdictions. In the light of such a performance by the Democratic majority, it is no wonder that, as Benjamin Shore in the San Diego Union points out, "public opinion polls for the last several years have indicated declining public confidence in the ability of the Congress to solve major problems."

The articles follow:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, May 17, 1974]

THE DEMOCRATS SCORN CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The Democratic majority in Congress has just given voters a powerful reason to "turn the rascals out."

In this instance the "rascals" are not Richard Nixon or the "reactionary" Republicans; the rascals are the reactionary Democrats—enough of them to block the first significant congressional reform in a generation.

They don't want reform if they can help it; they don't want to get a more efficient, competent Congress capable of transacting the public business better than it has in the past if the needed changes are going to upset even a little bit the power base from which the omnipotent Democratic committee chairmen have long operated. They talk virtuously about how Congress must reclaim the power which it has squandered so rashly but act pettily and petulantly when it comes to doing it if doing it distributes some of their power elsewhere in Congress.

This, it seems to me, is the only candid judgment which can be pronounced on the decision of the Democratic Caucus in the House of Representatives, binding on the party, neatly tucking under the rug the whole package of congressional reforms painstakingly prepared by a bipartisan select committee headed by Rep. Richard Bolling (D-Mo.)

This crass stonewalling of congressional reform—needed by Congress, needed by the country—can be justified on no grounds and explained on only one ground: the willingness of powerful Democratic committee chairmen to put their personal political interest ahead of the national interest.

The purpose of the Bolling committee proposals is to enable Congress to do its job of governing more effectively.

They would equalize the work of major

standing committees so that the work could go forward more expeditiously.

They would consolidate major policy areas. Example: Congressional responsibility for the environment is now scattered over 17 different committees and subcommittees.

They would abolish proxy voting by which committee chairmen further aggrandize their power.

The changes would vastly reduce wasteful overlapping, make the work of Congress more coherent and increase its ability to oversee the executive branch.

When the Democratic Party caucus was voting 111 to 93 to suffocate these proposals, the chairmen of most of the major committees were shouldering them down. Their theme was: Reform, yes; but not us.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, May 11, 1974]

CONGRESS REFORM IS GOP ISSUE

(By Benjamin Shore)

WASHINGTON.—Congressional Republicans think they now may have a decent campaign issue to use against their Democratic colleagues, many of whom are counting on Watergate to slow down their GOP opposition.

The issue is reform of the Congress, which is solidly under Democratic control. Public opinion polls for the last several years have indicated declining public confidence in the ability of the Congress to solve major problems.

However, given a chance last Thursday to endorse the first modernization since 1946, House Democrats by a secret vote of 111 to 95, decided to shelve the reform proposals which a special committee had been working on for more than a year.

The vote was taken in a closed-door caucus of the Democrats. Republicans, who generally favored the proposals never had a chance to vote on them in an open House session.

Although the Republicans would have preferred to see a streamlining of House procedures and a restructuring of committee jurisdictions, they at least came out with a potential campaign issue.

DEMOCRATS LOOK INSENSITIVE

The Democrats come out looking insensitive to public opinion and blind to the weaknesses in the House machinery which they control.

Furthermore, House Speaker Carl Albert, D-Okla., who a year ago had created the special committee headed by long-time reformer Rep. Richard Bolling, D-Mo., emerges as a leader without majority support. Even though the vote was relatively close, it is viewed as diminishing his power.

Bolling's proposals, carefully drafted after a year of study and open hearings, would have focused primarily on the House committees, abolishing a few, creating a few new ones, but mostly redistributing legislative responsibilities to equalize the work load and thus speed up legislative response to major national issues.

However, many powerful senior congressmen and outside special interests were opposed to changing the status quo.

"The name of the game is power," commented Rep. Thomas P. O'Neill, D-Mass., the majority leader, "and the boys don't want to give it up."

One of the "boys" is Rep. Wilbur Mills, D-Ark., powerful chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, which writes all legislation dealing with taxation. Bolling's committee thought Ways and Means should give up its jurisdiction over international trade, Medicare and revenue sharing. Mills made sure every Democrat in the House knew of his strong opposition.

PLAN FOR SPLIT OPPOSED

The reformers thought the liberal-dominated Education and Labor Committee should be split into two committees. The liberals opposed that suggestion, and they were joined by special interest groups, such as the AFL-CIO, which over the years have built up effective lines of communication with the committee to help shape legislation.

Under the Bolling committee's proposal to reorganize into 15 major committees, each congressman would have been limited to membership on just one. This would have forced 108 congressmen, including 65 Democrats, to give up present committee assignments.

COMPETITION IN THE ENERGY INDUSTRIES

HON. RICHARD W. MALLARY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. MALLARY. Mr. Speaker, the United States has relied heavily on oil for the production of energy. With decreasing oil supplies, and increasing oil prices, many people have been looking to alternative sources of energy. Most promising sources have appeared to be coal and nuclear power, for which our technology is relatively advanced, and of which we have a large potential supply.

In order to understand the problems posed by coal and nuclear power, Congressmen FISH, FRELINGHUYSEN, HORTON, WHITEHURST, and I have studied competition in the coal and nuclear energy industries, giving special attention to acquisitions by oil companies in these industries.

I include the following:

COMPETITION IN THE COAL INDUSTRY

In 1962, the coal industry consisted of a large number of independent producers:

The fifteen largest firms accounted for less than 41% of U.S. production;

Coal companies owned by large industrial firms controlled less than 10% of U.S. production; and

Only one oil and natural gas company owned a coal-producing subsidiary.

By 1969, production had become increasingly concentrated in the hands of a small number of coal companies owned by large industrial firms, especially oil and gas companies:

The fifteen largest firms accounted for over 53% of production;

Coal companies owned by large industrial firms contributed over 43% of production;

Five oil and gas companies controlled 23% of production; and

Oil companies leased or acquired over 30% of proven domestic coal reserves.

Journalistic commentary and Congressional testimony have warned that the acquisition of coal companies by large oil firms and the trend toward increasing concentration may be undermining the industry's competitive structure. It is alleged that these mergers tend to reduce competition between oil and coal in the electrical utilities and industrial boiler fuel markets. In the future, they argue, oil company control of coal reserves and production may nullify potential competition between synthetic fuels made from coal and increasingly scarce and costly natural gas and petroleum.

Some observers, including the United Mine Workers Journal, offer even more damning

allegations. They pointedly suggest that the coal acquisitions by big oil are part of a general strategy which seeks to constrict supply in all branches of the energy industry, to damage vulnerable, non-integrated competitors, and to create artificially high prices.

Indeed, shortages of deliverable coal and price increases have coincided with the recent wave of acquisitions and the trend toward increased concentration. During the 18 months before December, 1970, the average price of coal jumped 60% despite a 5% increase in production. Coal users, especially small electric utilities, reported difficulties in obtaining coal even from contracted suppliers. Coal companies pressed consumers to renegotiate their contracts, forcing them to accept long term contracts and higher prices. At the same time, utilities reported a decrease in the number of bids on new contracts. It was not uncommon for consumers who previously received as many as five bids from coal suppliers to receive as few as one.

Such circumstantial evidence has led some observers to hypothesize that large coal firms, which are not only large producers but also brokers for sales of smaller producers, are using their market power to curtail deliveries and increase prices. Furthermore, this hypothesis suggests that large coal producers and holders of substantial reserves, especially integrated oil companies, are increasing their market power by sitting on vast low-sulfur reserves and tying up existing production in long term contracts. These restrictions on access to raw materials and markets erect barriers to entry and discourage potential competition.

Carl Bagge, President of the National Coal Association, has vigorously rebutted these charges. He argues that, shortages and price increases are the result of government regulations, increased costs, labor problems, uncertainty regarding demand, and legitimate market forces rather than unethical practices.

Strict pollution standards and competition from nuclear energy seemed to presage a decreasing demand for coal, Bagge states, and production was planned accordingly. In fact, demand for coal in the urban northeast did drop as utilities and manufacturers switched to cleaner fuels such as imported residual oil. However, the more general energy shortage has created a nationwide demand for coal which more than offsets these changeovers. Furthermore, nuclear energy is now generating only one-third as much electricity as the AEC had forecast in the mid-1960's. At the same time, new health and safety regulations have added significantly to the cost of deep mining, although Congressional testimony by Dr. Bruce Netschert of National Economics Research Associates indicates that the coal companies' public estimates of these costs are inflated and that, in any case, these costs cannot adequately account for recent price hikes. The big producers' ratio of net income to sales for 1970, the year of the largest price increases, was up 50% or more. A seven-week miners' strike curtailed 1971 production and put additional upward pressure on coal prices.

In short, Bagge's scenario depicts increased prices as the natural and inevitable result of unpredicted increases in demand, unexpected supply problems, and cost increases.

Furthermore, the coal industry argues that the invasion of the oil companies has a coincidental and not a causal relationship to these price and supply problems. Oil companies defend their investment in coal reserves and production as an important future source of raw materials for their oil and gas marketing operations. As natural gas and petroleum become increasingly scarce, coal-based synthetic fuels may supplement or replace conventional sources of energy. Hence,

coal acquisitions can be seen as legitimate investments and not necessarily as efforts to constrict supply throughout the energy industry.

In fact, far from curtailing production, oil-owned coal companies are expanding their capacity faster than independents. Occidental's Island Creek company accounts for 12.5% of new capacity in the coal industry; Conoco's Consolidation Coal, 6.8%; Gulf's Pittsburgh and Midway, 2.3%. Overall growth for the four principal oil-owned coal firms is 6.2% annually, compared to 2.6% for the whole industry.

It is argued that the "deep pocket" of the parent company is a great benefit in financing large expansion projects. However, these benefits can be obtained by merging coal companies with large industrials which do not have other energy holdings. For example, Kennecott Copper's newly acquired Peabody Coal Company has been able to finance a large expansion program which accounts for 29.5% of new U.S. capacity. Ironically, most coal expansion is financed not by the parent company's retained earnings but instead by debentures against future profits from long-term contracts. This, in turn, is used as an argument to justify the coal companies' reluctance to sell on the more competitive spot and short-term markets.

Both expanded production and research and development on gasification, liquefaction, and stack scrubbing require large financial resources. The parent company's "deep pocket" would seem to be a virtual necessity for a coal company facing the prospects of huge capital outlays for R and D in light of the distant returns on investment. MIT's Raymond Baddour argues that gasification R and D would be economically unattractive even for the most financially secure investors without the government's participation as a co-contractor. Not surprisingly, independent coal firms have shown no initiative toward gasification R and D, whereas Conoco's Consolidation Coal is financing one of the most promising gasification projects.

In conclusion, it seems clear that the tendency toward increasing concentration in the coal industry has created a situation in which individual firms can exercise considerable control over price and supply, especially in regional markets which may be dominated by a few firms. In 1955 the four largest firms controlled 17.8% of the national market; in 1970 they controlled 30.7%. Although this level of concentration is less than that of the petroleum, natural gas, or nuclear energy industries, it has been sufficient to foster anti-competitive practices such as alleged bidding agreements, pressure for long-term contracts, and contract-breaking and "renegotiation".

These alleged abuses seem to exist independently of acquisitions by oil companies. Independent coal companies seem no less prone to indulge in these practices than oil-owned firms.

With respect to the concentration ratio of the energy industry as a whole, the production of the four largest firms represents 19.0% of the total; the eight largest produce 31.6%. If all oil companies were to immediately divest themselves of their coal and uranium holdings, those figures would be 18.7% and 30.1% respectively. Perhaps with these statistics in mind, the Justice Department decided not to challenge the oil-coal mergers on anti-trust grounds, finding the two industries "not in significant competition" despite the utilities' high degree of convertibility between coal and oil. Furthermore, as presently interpreted, the anti-trust acts cannot be used to prosecute on the grounds that excessive concentration of reserve holdings may limit future competition. Even if it were legally feasible, it remains unclear whether anti-trust actions against coal-owning companies would be beneficial. It

seems plausible that abuses within the coal industry would continue despite divestiture, while oil-owned coal firms seem to represent a potential leading force for expansion and R and D in the coal industry.

In devising effective public policy regarding competition in the coal industry, the important question to ask seems to be: what kind of competitive structure will be most likely to yield (1) sufficient long-run supply, (2) rapid development of new coal processing techniques which would overcome environmental limitations of its use, and (3) reasonable price levels?

In light of these criteria, remedies for allegedly artificial short-run shortages and artificially high prices should be compatible with long-run expansion and rapid research and development. Ironically, the demise of the independent coal company and the demise of the spot and short-term markets are, at the same time, anti-competitive trends as well as developments which allegedly facilitate the financing of expanded production. Insofar as this is true, some hard trade-offs will have to be faced.

A special study by the Vanderbilt Law Review of the possibility of anti-trust actions against coal-holding oil firms somewhat reluctantly concludes that "competition alone will not assure the country of an adequate fuel supply."

COMPETITION IN THE NUCLEAR ENERGY INDUSTRY

In his 1973 energy message President Nixon predicted that nuclear energy will generate one-fourth of America's electricity by 1985 and over half by the year 2000.

The nuclear energy industry must meet several challenges if it is to supply these greatly-expanded nuclear power needs at an acceptable price:

Expanded exploration for and development of uranium resources, including technical breakthroughs which would make the extraction of low grade ore economically feasible;

Successful demonstration and, by the 1990's, commercial production of a fast breeder reactor, a development which would yield a thirty-fold increase in the use of nuclear fuel's energy potential;

Advances in cooling system technology which would minimize the effects of thermal pollution and permit the construction of nuclear plants in areas where large amounts of cooling water are not available; and

Expanded fuel-processing facilities and development of more economical uranium enrichment techniques.

These challenges of technical developments and industry expansion would be formidable even in an industry whose vigorously competitive structure provided incentives for full production, maximum efficiency, and constant innovation as a means to maintain or expand the firm's share of a profitable market. In the nuclear energy industry, however, potential threats to vigorous competition may diminish these natural free-market incentives.

The principal threats to competition stem from (1) excessive concentration in the nuclear equipment industry, (2) excessive concentration in the nuclear fuel processing industry, (3) substantial participation of major oil firms in the nuclear industry, especially in mining, milling, and reserve holdings, and (4) an increasing trend toward vertical integration in both the fuel and the equipment sectors.

At present, two firms convert U_3O_8 to UF_6 gas; the AEC holds a monopoly over the enrichment stage, four firms fabricate nuclear fuel from enriched uranium; three firms reprocess fuel; four supply almost all reactor steam supply systems; two supply turbine generators. Economies of scale and the present low-volume market make these levels of

concentration inevitable in most segments of the industry. High capital costs, complex technology, cyclical buying, and the credibility problem faced by new entrants in a high risk business create additional barriers to entry that seem unavoidable. The AEC itself has exacerbated this situation by its long-standing policy of awarding its R and D contracts to the most experienced and technically competent firms, thereby further concentrating expertise while passing up the chance to encourage new competition.

Perhaps an increase in sales volume and the stabilization of industry technology will encourage new entries. Ironically, oil companies are the most likely candidates for new entrants into the fuel processing and equipment supply sectors—a mixed blessing from the standpoint of free and vigorous competition in the energy industry as a whole.

Arthur D. Little's still-current 1968 study of the nuclear energy industry suggests that concentration ratios alone are not adequate indicators of the state of competition in the nuclear industry. Industry performance and firm behavior should be the ultimate criteria for evaluating the extent of competition.

The Little study's estimates indicate that profits in most sectors of the nuclear energy industry seem to be high but not excessive in light of the considerable risks. In fact, the two firms which control all conversion of U_2O_8 to UF₆ realized only between 7 and 10% return on investment.

Business Week reports vigorous competition for increased shares of the potentially lucrative reactor market. Although Westinghouse and GE account for almost 80% of steam supply system sales, potentially huge profits have evoked intense competition between these two firms for the breeder reactor demonstration contract. Both have shown interest in cost-cutting innovations such as plant standardization, an indication that traditional competitive incentives seem to be operating despite the oligopolistic industry structure.

In justifying a recent \$60 million investment in nuclear operations, a Westinghouse official explained, "Between now and the year 2000, the potential return to Westinghouse, just assuming it maintains its present share (38%) of the nuclear reactor market, could be \$300 billion. Facing a future of rapid industry expansion, these firms may assume that corporate interests will best be served by increasing or maintaining the firm's market share in expectation of future profits rather than by using monopoly power to press for supernormal profits now. If this is indeed their assessment, it dovetails well with the public's interest in expanded production and low prices. However, these calculations of corporate interests—and the corporations' benign intentions—may change as the industry matures and market shares become settled.

Even at present there is evidence of some abuse of market power. For example, GE and Westinghouse try to tie turbine purchases to steam supply system purchases. In this way, they use monopoly power in one sector to increase their market share in an unrelated sector.

The Little study equivocates in its assessment of the effects of high concentration. It points out that "the modern corporation must possess at least some degree of control over its respective markets before it will undertake the risky innovational activities that account for the strikingly high rate of industrial progress in the United States. Another study is cited which links moderately high concentration to high rates of innovation. Such considerations may be especially important for the nuclear energy industry, whose prices and supply levels will be determined as much or more by technological advances than by the state of competition.

At the same time, the Little study does not deny the potential ill effects of excessive concentration. However, it argues that anti-trust

actions would be a disruptive and counter-productive means to forestall anti-competitive developments. Instead the study suggests that the AEC can use its considerable influence to control industry behavior. Tools available to the AEC include R and D and demonstration project contracts, contracts to operate government owned facilities, government procurement and stockpiling, import/export controls, and plant licensing. In more recent Congressional testimony, the AEC's James Ramey reiterated his preference for these tools, coupled with industry-AEC consultation, as a means to promote competition rather than anti-trust measures.

The uranium mining and milling sector is not so concentrated as the fuel-cycle and nuclear equipment sectors. The four largest firms account for 53% of domestic U_2O_8 production; the eight largest contribute 76%.

Despite these comparatively tolerable concentration ratios, oil company acquisitions of uranium reserves and mining and milling companies has prompted concern regarding the potential of these firms to restrict production in order to maintain artificially high energy prices. The AEC estimates that uranium production must expand from 8,300 tons of U_2O_8 in 1973 to 58,800 tons by 1985 to meet projected demand. Presently, exploration and discovery rates are lagging because demand has fallen below predicted levels. Prices are low and inventories are full, so there is little incentive to increase the rate of exploration. As demand rapidly increases, however, price increases should encourage rapid expansion of exploration, discovery, and production.

By the year 2000, it will be necessary to expand estimated reserves six fold in order to fill projected demand with ore which can be extracted and milled at \$8 per pound. Such a rapid rate of expansion would tax even an industry which was responding freely to market incentives. Some observers suggest that the oil companies might not respond to increased demand; instead they may seek to withhold production in order to protect the prices of oil, natural gas, and coal products.

Oil firms control 45% of domestic uranium reserves. Seven companies, three of them major oil firms, control 70% of low cost reserves. Juxtaposing this market power against a six fold increase in demand, it seems possible that the oil firms would be in a position to cause serious shortages.

However, former AEC head Clarence Larson cautions about overestimating the power of any group of companies to curtail production. "With both worldwide and local competition, I can't visualize . . . that a few companies could completely dominate the uranium supplies," he told a House subcommittee. "There is a very extensive world exploration and supply of uranium. Larson said that the AEC could permit gradual import increases in order to supplement domestic production if necessary.

The intentions of the oil companies are not clear. Most speculation regarding the ill effects of the entry of oil firms relates to potential abuses, not present behavior. The present buyers' market offers no opportunity for raising prices by restricting supply. When demand increases, however, those observers who allege that the major oil firms manufactured the current oil shortage foresee a possible recapitulation of that strategy in the uranium industry.

On the other hand, the acquisition of nuclear energy interests by oil firms can be seen as a legitimate entry into a profitable, expanding industry. (Oil firms are logical entrants at the exploration and mining stage because of their geological expertise.) In the long run, fuel production may be viewed as more profitable than restricted production at high prices, especially if non-oil uranium firms followed a vigorous full-production policy.

The increasing trend toward vertical inte-

gration in the nuclear energy industry represents still another threat to free competition. Firms with mining and milling interests are acquiring positions in fuel processing. Furthermore, many of these firms are oil companies, e.g., Kerr-McGee, Getty, Gulf, and ARCO.

Steam supply system producers, GE and Westinghouse, are also integrating backwards into components, fuel fabrication, and reprocessing. To cite one example of the anti-competitive effects of such vertical integration, the decision by GE and Westinghouse to begin in-house production of zirconium tubing is jeopardizing the existence of the two independent firms which had supplied GE and Westinghouse as well as the remaining 20% of the reactor market. If the independents are pushed from the market, the GE and Westinghouse may control the zirconium tubing supply of companies which bid against them for reactor contracts.

To summarize, threats to competition in the nuclear energy industry, stemming from acquisitions by big oil, from excessive concentration, or from vertical integration are primarily potential threats. Despite high concentration ratios throughout the industry, it is difficult to discover specific present abuses. Firm behavior during the nuclear industry's "take-off" period has not been markedly anti-competitive despite the potential market power of some firms.

As the industry matures, however, competitive strategies may change. Fortunately, the AEC's special position with respect to the nuclear energy industry holds out the hope of using its formal and informal powers to promote competition without resorting to the blunt instrument of anti-trust action.

GIANT HELICOPTER FAILS TEST

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Army's controversial giant helicopter—the HLH—has suffered three major test failures in the last 2 months.

These three failures involving the huge helicopter's transmission and engines are new and startling evidence that the HLH program is headed for big costly problems.

I am publicly urging Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger to personally review the program and believe he should cancel the HLH.

As many of my colleagues may know the Navy is already procuring a similar helicopter that can lift very heavy items such as trucks and the building of the HLH is a foolish and unnecessary duplication.

In 1971, the Congress ordered the Pentagon to build one helicopter instead of two for lifting heavy equipment but the military decided to totally ignore the congressional directive.

The Pentagon has requested \$57.7 million in next year's budget to continue the HLH program and provide for the building of second test prototype model of the plane. Thankfully the Senate Armed Services Committee cut the Army's request by \$21.2 million eliminating the second prototype and \$7.2 million for additional test which are make-work for the prime contractor—Boeing Aircraft.

I have also learned that problems in the testing program will result in a 5-month delay in its completion.

It is also important to note, Mr. Speaker, that Boeing has used \$5.5 million of its \$6.2 million contingency funds caused by the test program failures.

I hope that Mr. Schlesinger will stop this foolishness before the taxpayers are asked to foot the bill for huge cost overruns on this ill-conceived monstrosity.

COMMUTER RAIL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, recently I conducted a survey of the residents of three counties of Virginia's eighth Congressional District in an effort to determine the interest in a commuter rail proposal which is currently pending before the Prince William County Board of Supervisors.

The proposal calls for the Southern Railway and the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad to run daily commuter trains from Manassas and Quantico into Alexandria, Crystal City and L'Enfant Plaza in Washington. The trains would make passenger stops in Woodbridge, Clifton, Manassas Park, Burke and Springfield.

The survey results indicate that more than 6,000 residents of Fairfax, Prince William and Stafford Counties would use commuter rail service if it was available to and from the Washington area on a daily basis. Most of the 3,453 households responding to the mailed questionnaire indicated the interest of more than one rider; 1,197 persons were interested in using the commuter rail service on a daily basis, 1,788 frequently and 3,697 infrequently; 621 persons responding to the questionnaire said they would never use the service if it were available. The most significant ridership interest came from the Woodbridge and Springfield areas, which, I feel, reflects on the large number of Federal employees residing in those areas.

I believe the results of this survey more than justify the continued efforts on the part of concerned citizens and responsible public officials toward obtaining commuter rail services for the residents of the three counties. In my view, the next step is for representatives of Prince William County to present the survey figures to Federal and State officials and to file a formal application for financial assistance with the Department of Transportation.

For my part, I intend to do everything within my power to assist the county in its efforts to get a Department of Transportation capital improvements grant for the proposed project. It has been estimated the commuter rail service would need Federal funds in the neighborhood of \$700,000 to make the necessary capital improvements before the service could begin operation.

Following are the survey results in detail:

COMMUTER RAIL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

	Daily	Frequently	Infrequently
Woodbridge to L'Enfant.....	239	318	618
Woodbridge to Crystal City.....	101	78	140
Woodbridge to Alexandria.....	67	124	188
Manassas to L'Enfant.....	129	333	823
Manassas to Crystal City.....	33	76	86
Manassas to Alexandria.....	34	78	110
Clifton to L'Enfant.....	28	57	75
Clifton to Crystal City.....	13	17	17
Clifton to Alexandria.....	0	5	23
Quantico to L'Enfant.....	21	70	122
Quantico to Crystal City.....	7	11	25
Quantico to Alexandria.....	14	21	43
Manassas Park to L'Enfant.....	32	92	89
Manassas Park to Crystal City.....	11	9	27
Manassas Park to Alexandria.....	5	19	25
Burke to L'Enfant.....	113	90	213
Burke to Crystal City.....	55	54	65
Burke to Alexandria.....	3	40	58
Springfield to L'Enfant.....	212	236	706
Springfield to Crystal City.....	66	69	151
Springfield to Alexandria.....	12	51	93
Total riders.....	1,195	1,788	3,697

Note: Number of never rides, 621; number of questionnaires returned, 3,453.

STATEMENT BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2 ON MILITARY PERSONNEL

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

MILITARY PERSONNEL

(Statement by Honorable ANTONIO B. WON PAT, Territory of Guam, before Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Armed Services Committee, May 30, 1974)

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am happy to give my support to legislation which would permit the admission of women to our military academies.

In this day of expanding women's rights, the female members of our society are gradually assuming many duties formerly performed by men, and have proven themselves to be capable and efficient. In all strata of our society and all sectors of our economy, women are filling many positions which have traditionally been the domain of the male sex. Among the areas into which their talents now lead them is the military establishment of our country.

During the past several wars in which the United States was involved, women were a welcome resource to take over many functions so that men could be freed for combat duty. The first women to serve in the military were nurses serving under civilian contract during the Spanish-American War. The first women in the military, other than in the health field, were clerks who served in the Navy during the First World War. Of course, once the war was over, women could no longer be recruited, and the Navy became again an all-male preserve.

The beginning of the Second World War again brought about the need for women in the military services. Congress passed legislation creating the WAC (Women's Army Corps) and the WAVES (Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Services). During the war, women proved they could play an important role within the military. As opportunities grew, the number of jobs which women performed increased. By the end of the war, over 265,000 military women had served their country.

It has been said that history repeats itself. In the past, women have been consistently accepted in the military forces only as a last resort. Today, because of the difficulty the Armed Forces are having in filling their quotas for an all-volunteer establishment, it is the women who are filling the ranks of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. Not only are women true volunteers, but they must meet higher standards for admission than men. They must be high school graduates or have an equivalent education, and are accepted from only three out of four mental groups.

Previously, women in the military worked in two main occupation groups: administration, about 67 percent; and health, about 22 percent. Today, the range of occupations open to women is rapidly expanding, and it is likely that, as a result, more and more women will want to enlist. Women are now doing things such as repairing Air Force planes, operating radios on board ship, taking parachute training, and keep track of foreign satellites.

The number of women in the military services today is 35 percent more than three years ago, and is expected to double by 1978. By Fiscal Year 1975, there are expected to be close to 100,000 women in the Armed Services.

Since women are entering all branches of the military services, and serving with distinction and honor, I feel it is only fitting that they be admitted to the service academies. They have proven that they can perform military duties as well as men, and, in line with our national policy of providing equal opportunities for everyone, they should be permitted to further their careers by obtaining a special education. If they can perform well in the lower echelons, there is no reason why they cannot do well as officers in the highest ranks.

I am proud to say that I have two daughters in the military services. They are both officers and nurses, one in the Air Force and one in the Army. They enjoy their work, and I believe they are doing a good job.

Passage of the important legislation under discussion today will lead to more opportunities for them and all American women.

THE PEOPLE SPEAK ON ABORTION LAWS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, several years ago I initiated a "home phone poll" to encourage residents of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania to voice their opinions on matters involving the Federal Government. They have responded admirably.

Our latest poll concerned the liberalization of abortion laws and I believe my colleagues will be interested in the results: 1,219—47 percent—opposed any further easing of abortion laws; 1,130—43 percent—favored liberalization and 263—10 percent—had no opinion on the issue.

Participation in the "home phone poll" is strictly voluntary and over the years the people who have taken part in it have provided me with a valuable insight into the feelings of my district on issues such as foreign aid, school busing, prayer in public schools, wage and price controls and national priority programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to represent the people of the 20th District in the Congress of the United States. They have demonstrated time again their love and concern for our Nation and a willingness to take an active part in its Government.

THE GOVERNMENT IS A LOUSY BUSINESSMAN

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, many people believe the solution to almost every social problem is the establishment of a government program.

A careful examination of the costs of delivering services to the public by means of Government programs should be conducted.

I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the Winona Daily News dated May 19, which notes the increase in governmental expenditures and compares the cost of first-class postage with telephone service. It also compares the postal deficit with the taxes paid by the Bell Telephone Co.

I would urge my colleagues to study this editorial and keep it in mind when new Federal programs are proposed.

The editorial follows:

THE GOVERNMENT IS A LOUSY BUSINESSMAN

When the economy's in trouble, for one reason or another, we're always turning to the federal government to solve the problem. What did certain members of Congress say when the gasoline and fuel oil crisis hit last winter? Nationalize the oil industry, that's what.

Just how efficient is government? Here the expert comment of David L. Babson, the Boston economist, extracted from an article in Better Investing, publication of the National Association of Investment Clubs:

The extent to which government's share of the economy has mushroomed over the years is shown below:

Federal, State and local government activity

	Employment (millions)	Percent of total employment	Expenditures (billions)	Percent of total economy
1973....	13.7	16.2	\$407	31.6
1967....	11.4	15.3	243	30.6
1963....	9.2	13.6	167	28.3
1955....	6.9	11.1	98	24.5
1947....	5.5	9.6	42	18.3
1940....	4.2	8.8	18	18.4
1929....	3.1	6.4	10	9.8

The public share of employment has been rising almost as fast since 1947 as it did during New Deal days. Now 16.2 percent of all workers (one out of six) are now on public payrolls compared with 6.4 percent (one out of 16) in 1929.

The public sector now accounts for nearly one-third of total economic activity against less than one-tenth in 1929.

In the past four years, total federal expenditures have jumped \$78 billion, or nearly two-fifths. The entire rise has been for non-defense activities.

Moreover, Washington is constantly pressing, or being urged, into new fields.

A question that puzzles us is why anyone

should think that such spheres of activity can be conducted more effectively under public than private management.

A good illustration of the striking differences in public vs. private management is afforded the two giants of the communications field—the U.S. Postal Service and the Bell Telephone System. The trend in postal rates:

1ST CLASS POSTAGE RATES, 1-OUNCE LETTER

[In cents.]

	Regular mail	Air mail
1974.....	10	13
1971.....	8	11
1968.....	6	10
1963.....	5	8
1958.....	4	7
1957.....	3	6
1947.....	3	5
1933.....	3	6
1932.....	2	5

In recent years, various public officials have criticized the "inflationary" pricing policies of private business. Yet in 10 years the post office has hiked its rates 65 percent to 100 percent.

Now let's see how prices of the privately operated telephone system have fared. The rates for three-minute toll calls between Boston and other major cities:

Year	Station-to-station toll rates ¹ from Boston to—					
	New York		Chicago		San Francisco	
	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night
1974.....	\$0.80	\$0.55	\$1.15	\$0.65	\$1.45	\$0.85
1967.....	.75	.55	1.40	.70	1.75	1.00
1963.....	.75	.55	1.50	1.20	2.25	1.75
1955.....	.75	.55	1.60	1.30	2.50	2.00
1947.....	.57	.45	1.65	1.25	2.50	2.00
1939.....	.80	.50	2.50	1.50	6.75	4.50
1932.....	1.00	.60	3.25	1.75	9.50	5.75
Percent decline, 1932-74.....	-20	-8	-65	-63	-85	-85

¹ Excludes Federal excise taxes.

While toll charges have declined substantially, the cost of local telephone service has been up. But the rise since 1932 has been less than half that of the consumer price index and only one-quarter as much as the increase in postal charges for regular mail.

Consumers have fared much better with the privately operated organization than with the publicly run one. This is largely a reflection of increased efficiency or "productivity." Despite some improvement in recent years, the public operation again makes an unfavorable comparison. Over 43 years the postal service has increased the number of pieces of mail handled per employee by 56 percent, but the Bell System takes care of 2.7 times as many conversations per worker as it did then.

Now what effect have these two systems had upon us as taxpayers? The following table shows the postal deficit and the taxes paid by the Bell Telephone Companies, both annually and on a cumulative basis:

[In millions of dollars]

	Deficit of Post Office Dept.		Taxes paid by Bell Cos.	
	Annual	Cumulative from 1932	Annual	Cumulative from 1932
1973.....	1,390	22,703	4,350	54,454
1966.....	943	12,843	2,718	30,045
1963.....	819	10,454	2,246	22,301
1961.....	826	8,860	1,972	17,952
1958.....	891	6,832	1,483	12,442
1950.....	545	2,233	499	4,472
1940.....	41	687	185	1,090
1935.....	66	428	94	352

Public operation makes a strikingly poor showing here. We now contribute \$1.4 billion a year to make up the postal deficit, or 20 times as much as when the letter rate was only 2 cents.

While the post office has drained off \$23 billion from tax revenues since 1932, the Bell companies have paid \$54 billion in taxes. And does not include the federal excise taxes paid by Bell customers—\$18 billion in 20 years.

Moreover, the Bell companies have millions of stockholders. In the past two decades, these disbursements have created \$4 billion of federal income taxes to help finance the postal deficit.

If the government ever gets into the oil business and runs it like the post office, today's gasoline prices will be remembered as wistfully as the 10 percent income tax and the 2-cent stamp.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHILE AND BRAZIL

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD an article by Anthony Lewis entitled "The Meaning of Torture" and an article by Marvine Howe concerning political prisoners in Brazil. Both appear in the May 30th issue of the New York Times.

Mr. Lewis describes the tragic situation in Chile. Torture has become a pervasive practice of the Government to suppress dissent and punish those who supported the Allende government. Lewis notes that the United States has strongly supported the military government, offered no asylum to Chilean refugees, and said nothing about the murder and savagery which has been practiced.

I share Mr. Lewis' disquiet about our Government's silence and apparent indifference about torture and repression in Chile. The Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements and Inter-American Affairs will be holding a hearing on June 11th to ask the Department of State a broad range of questions concerning U.S. policy toward Chile. We shall be asking the Department, for instance, how it views the relationship between respect for human rights in Chile and the level of U.S. assistance. In fiscal year 1975 the administration is requesting \$85 million in bilateral U.S. economic assistance, military assistance, and credit sales. Of that amount, military assistance is \$800,000 and military credit sales \$20,500,000. In fiscal 1973 Chile received only \$3,800,000 in economic assistance; \$800,000 in military assistance; and \$12,400,000 in military credit sales. Thus, economic assistance will have increased 16 times over these 2 years and military assistance and sales will have increased by more than 50 percent. These figures suggest the extent to which human rights factors are taken into account by the Department in deciding upon the level of U.S. assistance.

The United Nations Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council have been making modest

but serious efforts to bring the force of international public opinion to bear on the situation in Chile. The Commission recently adopted a resolution urging the Government to have greater respect for human rights. The lack of vigor and concern on the part of the United States regarding the UN effort was reflected in a vote taken by the Social Committee of the Economic and Social Council just a few weeks ago. The resolution was a similarly modest resolution urging the Government of Chile to respect human rights. The vote on the resolution was 41 in favor, none against with 2 abstentions. Chile and the United States abstained.

In the plenary session of ECOSOC the resolution was adopted by consensus. The Department explains that the abstention was due to the fact that the U.S. delegation had not expected a vote on the resolution, but rather that it would be adopted by consensus. However, since the question had been discussed for about 2 weeks prior to the vote, the U.S. delegation had ample time to make up its mind on the resolution. Clearly, the U.S. abstention shows a lack of concern for the situation in Chile and a failure to fully support the UN's effort to improve the situation in Chile.

I am also troubled about the continued reports of torture and repression in Brazil such as those reported in the Howe article. The situation in Brazil has received special attention from both the OAS Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and by the United Nations. The Commission has concluded there is a "persuasive presumption that in Brazil serious cases of torture, abuse, and maltreatment have occurred to persons of both sexes while they were deprived of their liberty." In the case of Olavo Hansen, a trade-union leader detained by the Government's political and labor police, the Commission concluded that:

The circumstances surrounding the death of Olavo Hansen constitute prima facie a very serious case of violation of the right to life.

The Government of Brazil refused to cooperate with the Commission in its requests for information and its request to make an on-site investigation to ascertain the facts.

The Commission's annual report to the 1974 session of the OAS General Assembly presents in detail the cases described above and the failure of the Government of Brazil to cooperate with the Commission. The Assembly did not discuss the Brazil cases or any other case considered by the Commission. By tradition the Assembly does not give any substantive consideration to the Commission's report.

The Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements recommended in its human rights report that the Assembly should give detailed consideration to the Commission's report. The Assembly should urge States—if not by name, then generally—to respect the Commission's requests and recommendations. Regrettably, at the present time, the United States also remains silent when the Commission's report is dis-

cussed. I hope that the Department will reconsider its position.

The Congress in reviewing the administration's request for bilateral assistance to Brazil—including \$60,000,000 in military credit sales and \$800,000 in military grants—should consider closely the findings of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and the innumerable press reports of repression in Brazil.

The material follows:

THE MEANING OF TORTURE

(By Anthony Lewis)

BOSTON, May 29.—The use of torture as a political instrument is an evil beyond justification or compromise, a practice officially condemned by every civilized society. Yet it goes on, in many places around the world, and arousing people's interest in the subject is singularly difficult. Perhaps we find the reality so unbearable that we turn away rather than contemplate it.

Such thoughts are provoked by fresh reports on the savagery practiced by the military junta in Chile. Evidence of torture in Chile has been published by, among many others, Amnesty International, the highly-respected group that favors no ideology except humanity. Amnesty's findings are summarized with telling simplicity in an article by Rose Styron in *The New York Review of Books*.

Victor Jara, a folk singer, was held with thousands of others in a Santiago sports stadium. He was given a guitar and ordered to play. As he did, the guards broke his fingers, then cut them off. He began to sing, and they beat and then shot him. Several witnesses have described that death. It is a relatively mild example of what Mrs. Styron relates.

Many reports tell of the use of electric shock to make prisoners "confess" to what their captors desire. Sexual assault is a common theme. Mrs. Styron mentions a women's prison, Casa de Mujeres el Buen Pastor, where young girls are sent from prison camps, pregnant, "with their hair pulled out and their nipples and genitals badly burned."

At least one complaint of such treatment has been made officially in the Chilean courts. Mrs. Virginia Ayres complained that her daughter, Luz de las Nieves Ayres, had been beaten, sexually abused, tortured with electric currents and—in a scene right out of "Nineteen Eighty-four"—had rats and spiders put on and into her body. The courts forwarded the complaint to the armed forces.

People are arrested, tortured and summarily killed in Chile for any reason or no reason. Large numbers of doctors have been arrested, some because they did not join in a strike last summer against the leftist Government of Dr. Salvador Allende. Amnesty has an appeal from Chilean doctors saying that 25 of their profession are in prison, held without any charges; another 65 are said to have been shot or died of torture or untreated wounds.

Last month the 28 Roman Catholic bishops of Chile, in an unusual public statement, condemned the practice of torture and arbitrary arrest. The junta routinely denies torture reports or, in the words of its Interior Minister, Gen. Oscar Bonilla, dismisses them as "damaging to the national interest."

But what has all this to do with the United States? Secretary of State Kissinger has told us that this country cannot reform the internal policies of other governments. As a generality that is fair enough. But it is not enough when we have a share of responsibility.

However much the Allende Government contributed to its own downfall, the United States made things worse by cutting essential economic assistance—except to the Chilean military. Since the coup, Washington has

given strong support to the military regime. Unlike other Western countries, we have offered no asylum to Chilean refugees. And we have said nothing, officially, about the murder and savagery.

Words would matter in this instance. If the United States spoke out against the torture, if our Embassy in Santiago was active in watching the trials and other visible manifestations of oppression, if more American lawyers joined international legal groups in protesting the junta's lawlessness, if Congress moved to attach conditions to aid, those who rule Chile would almost certainly listen.

But the present Government of the United States shows no concern for human rights. Henry Kissinger and his President were silent for months while their allies in Pakistan slaughtered the Bengalis. Washington has nothing to say about a Greek Government that rules by terror. Or about the Government of South Korea, whose kidnappings and brutalities make Communist regimes look almost decorous by comparison. (For a student to refuse to attend class in South Korea "without plausible reasons" is a crime punishable by death.)

Some of the nastiest governments in the world today were born or grew with American aid. That being the case, the most modest view of our responsibility would require us to say a restraining word to them occasionally. But we say nothing, we hear nothing, we see nothing.

There was a wonderful example the other day—funny if it did not involve so much suffering. The State Department said it knew of no political prisoners in South Vietnam, because Saigon's stated policy "does not permit the arrest of anyone for mere political dissent." Thus the thousands of non-Communists in South Vietnamese jails were made to vanish, the twisted creatures in tiger cages waved away. Thus the idealism that once marked America's place in the world has become indifference in the face of inhumanity.

FIVE ARRESTED MEN VANISH IN BRAZIL

(By Marvyn Howe)

RIO DE JANEIRO, May 29.—Political prisoners continue to disappear in Brazil despite assurances by the new Government headed by Gen. Ernesto Geisel that it will end abuses by the police.

Lawyers have asked the Government to produce at least five persons who were arrested recently and have disappeared. They are the following:

Fernando Augusto de Santa Cruz Oliveira, a civil servant; Eduardo Collier Jr., a former law student; Luz Ignacio Maranhão, a lawyer and former member of the Rio Grande de Notre state assembly; David Capistrano, a Communist journalist who fought on the republican side in the Spanish Civil War and was a hero of the French Resistance, and his friend José Roman.

The Brazilian Bar Association has raised with the Geisel Government the question of abuses by the security forces, including kidnappings, disappearances, arrests without warrant and torture.

GOVERNMENT'S POSITION

The Government's spokesman in Congress, Garcia Neco, recently asserted that police violence would no longer be permitted.

"The machinery is not yet completely under control," a source close to General Geisel said, explaining the continuing reports of police abuses.

The security services, in fact, still seem to act with autonomy. A wave of arrests in February and April was said to be due largely to zealous security services attempting to justify their existence with the new Government. Most of the 100 or so people arrested have since been freed.

One of the missing men, 25-year-old Fer-

nando Augusto de Santa Cruz Oliveira disappeared on carnival weekend.

"Fernando had come to Rio with his wife and 2-year-old baby to spend the holiday with the family," Mrs. Marcia de Santa Cruz Freitas, his 23-year-old sister, said in an interview this week.

"He was wearing Bermuda shorts and sandals, and told us he was going to meet an old schoolmate, Eduardo Collier," she went on. "He went out at 4 P.M. and she said he would be back at 6 P.M. but we have never heard from him again."

Mrs. Freitas recounted the family's long search for Fernando. Many other families have made similar searches for political prisoners who have disappeared within the labyrinth of the Brazilian security system.

REPORTS OF ARREST

The family at first did what families everywhere do when one of their members is missing: publish a note in the newspapers reporting the disappearance and check the hospitals, the police stations, the morgue.

There were reports, however, that Fernando had been arrested at Copacabana and taken away in a police car. And the friend, Eduardo Collier, had also disappeared.

The two families spent several weeks going from one security service to another in the Rio de Janeiro area. Finally they were told unofficially that Fernando had been transferred around March 13 from the Barao de Mesquita Prison in Rio to the army's anti-subversion unit at Sao Paulo known as the Department of Order and Intelligence.

"We don't know why Fernando and Eduardo have been arrested or where they are but we are still looking for them and hope for the best," Mrs. Freitas said.

IMPERIALISM IN REVERSE

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps a confirmation of the inability of our own country, among the other large powers, to formulate an effective response to extortionist policies pursued by smaller nations, that the amendment I shall be offering this week to suspend a sugar quota for Venezuela until fair oil prices are restored is regarded by some of our colleagues as such a novel and unthinkable approach.

But I believe we have failed to understand and react effectively to the methods smaller nations have discovered and applied with such zeal in recent years in order to manipulate the so-called superpowers and extract from them concession after concession.

Through the dawning years of the nuclear era, smaller nations discovered that dragging the superpowers into potential confrontations with each other could lead to important concessions of direct benefit to them. The art of manipulating the nuclear powers for the benefit of smaller nations was perfected and today remains a fact of international life which the nuclear powers have yet to come to grips with or find effective international means to avoid.

Now the smaller nations have discovered still another weapon of potentially equal value, the weapon of oil. And there is a similar absence of policy on the part

of our country in response to economic manipulation at the hands of the oil producing nations.

Therefore, in connection with the Venezuela amendment to be offered, it is perhaps useful as background to place into the Record at this point a thoughtful and important article by Prof. Henry M. Pachter, which appears in the June issue of Harper's magazine and is entitled, "Imperialism in Reverse":

[From Harper's Magazine, June 1974]

IMPERIALISM IN REVERSE

(By Henry M. Pachter)

The habit of imperialism has for so long been associated with the image of Western industrial nations that it came as an alarming surprise last winter when imperialistic flares were proclaimed by the small and ragged sheikdoms of the Middle East. The Arab oil embargo dispelled a number of romantic illusions, among them the necessary virtue of the so-called "Third World," and it proved that the colonial instinct does not depend on accidents of race or culture. The unhappiness in the West followed both from the magnitude of the extortion and from the summary manner in which the money was demanded. We objected not only to the fact of blackmail but also to the embarrassment of contemplating our own weakness.

Admittedly, this is the Western point of view. What appears to us as a hold-up may look like legitimate and land-office business to nations that have long thought themselves powerless and suddenly discover a weapon of great force. The coordinates of world politics have shifted, and it is possible that we have been witnesses to one of those watershed in world history which, like Waterloo, close one age and open another.

It is not simply that our dependence on small powers has been rather abruptly and unkindly exposed, nor is it that great industrial nations have been held hostage to obtain diplomatic concessions from a third state; it isn't even the sight of the late President Pompidou abjectly bowing before a Libyan usurper—distressing as these circumstances may have been, the big powers have put up with such inconveniences before. Have we not been blackmailed by generals threatening to buy their weapons from the Russians, by self-styled revolutionaries threatening to nationalize our corporations, by corrupt tyrants threatening to be overthrown unless we rescued them with further concessions? These are the burdens of empire. We know that we will be held responsible for every famine and disaster anywhere in the world, and we have become accustomed to paying conscience money.

In the past thirty years gunboat diplomacy has become impossible, and the big industrial states have become more vulnerable, psychologically and politically, than the small and backward states. This is a lesson that has been repeatedly demonstrated by wars in Korea and Vietnam and by the depredations of kidnapers, bandits, and hijackers. All this we knew, but we were shocked to learn that the power equation between "imperialists" and their poor cousins suddenly had been reversed. The oil embargo revealed a new dimension of imperialism. This was a declaration of political coming of age on the part of the smaller nations possessed of strategic raw materials. Nations that heretofore had been pawns in the chess game of world politics became major pieces, commanding ranks and files on the global board. No longer regarded as dervishes and petty kings, the rulers of these nations became claimants to the councils of international decision. It is not their wealth that has gained them access to these councils, but rather their astute and ruthless use of a monopoly in a peculiar constellation—which might not last and might

not recur. Understandably, therefore, they hurry to exploit their unique opportunity before it passes, and so they demand more money, more power, more weapons.

The usual order of events is now being reversed. The new imperialism does not follow the traditional course of long industrial development. Instead it must be financed by windfall profits that can buy the sophisticated weapons of the already-developed West. It used to be thought that it would take unskilled Bedouins at least a generation to learn the technology and discipline of modern warfare. The Yom Kippur war proved that push-button weapons can be used by anybody, and that advanced nations sell weapons not simply for profit but because they need to ingratiate themselves with their former retainers. Oil-exporting countries now demand computers, rockets, atomic reactors, and other instruments which, for the moment, merely enhance their self-respect but may in good time become instruments of power.

DREAMS OF GLORY

Contrary to widespread belief, world politics is not a new interest for underdeveloped nations; nor is it confined to the oil-rich nations. The small, underdeveloped countries have been engaged in more wars during the past twenty-five years than have the bigger powers. It is a myth that low standards of living induce peacefulness. Quite the opposite. Oriental statesmen always have spoken with pride about their ancient empires. India has fought over Kashmir twice with Pakistan, and she also has fought for Goa, Bangladesh, and uninhabited territory in China. Egypt intervened in Yemen and the Congo. Ghana attempted to become the Prussia south of the Sahara when she offered to "police" the Congo. Indonesia subdued West Irian and threatened Brunei. North Vietnamese troops have fought in Laos and Cambodia for twenty years. Nasser imagined himself the new Suleiman and gloried in the memory of Arab kingdoms in Spain. Africans rewrite their history books to celebrate the ancient kingdoms of Mali and Ghana. Léopold Senghor sings of negritude.

Jawaharlal Nehru, on writing *Glimpses of World History* in a British prison, proudly displayed the gruesome sequence of the great Mogul conquerors, and he noted with unmistakable satisfaction that Orientals can be as imperialistic as Europeans. To nations in of self-respect, a past military triumph seems to imply the promise of national renaissance.

All this, of course, contradicts the preferred image of the Third World, the image projected in its propaganda and proclaimed by its partisans in the West. The poor and oppressed not only enjoy our sympathy, but they also appear to be innocent victims of other people's guile. They are presumed to be peaceful, if only because the attempt to act like big powers would prove futile. The tactical decision of these countries to remain "nonaligned" in the struggle between the Western and Soviet "blobs" has endowed the Third World with the halo of impartiality and selflessness. Nobody bothers to mention that the halo might be made of brass. The mere suggestion of the sacred number three evokes the ideas of synthesis, transcendence, and a better life—exalted hopes which the biblical prophets associated with the meek; their long struggle for independence makes them heroes of mankind's march toward redemption.

Especially in the eyes of those who despair of the decadent, sated West, the hungry billions of the mysterious East appear as a liberating force and a scourge of God. Socialists who have come to doubt the revolutionary virtue of the proletariat now find a new champion in the Third World; alienated Bohemians study anthropology, not so much to understand human nature as to find their

own "other." Western blacks in search of "identity" expect the upsurge of dark Africa to liberate their own urban ghettos, where the daily misery seems to be beyond practical help. In brief, the Third World is seen as the avenger of our sins, and the bloody rites that Frantz Fanon and Malcolm X wanted to visit upon us are hailed as the purgation of a revolutionary rebirth.

The irrational core of this flagellant religion reveals itself in the ratings that various leaders receive in the radical press. The backward rulers of Yemen and the unspeakable Amin of Uganda are mentioned favorably, whereas the Shah of Iran, by comparison a modern despot who promotes agrarian reform, is described as a tyrant: his program of education and amelioration receives no credit from the radicals as long as the rhetoric of defiance and intransigence, especially of confrontation with the United States, is missing from his text.

The ideology of revolution evades the grave problems developing countries should face. It converts every domestic tension into a fight between the "we" and the Western "they"; instead of concrete measures, it proposes a crusade (now called "war of liberation"); and it identifies as the target of action not the real causes of backwardness (illiteracy, superstition, mismanagement, and corruption) but a mythical foreigner: what the Jews were to Hitler, the English to Mussolini, the Americans are to Third World ideologists. To disguise their own schemes, they are prepared to believe in a conspiracy of evil. Sadat, who has shown that he can reason when he needs to, once wrote that it was the aim of the Western nations to humiliate the East, to thwart its aspirations to keep it undeveloped, and to suppress progress. This at a time when U.S. and U.N. agents were swarming over the Middle East in search of governments that would accept development programs.

Another version of the same myth, as old as romantic literature, holds that the West never had any real culture but built one by sucking the blood of colonized nations, and in the process destroyed the web of ancient village society. This charge is of some importance because on it is based the call for "reparations," preferential tariffs, and special endowments.

It is certainly true that modern manufacture ruined the older cottage industries and that craftsmen had to find employment in the factories. As Marx so eloquently described it, the advent of capitalism put the weavers, potters, and candlestick makers out of business. This clearly was true in Europe then. But Marx was mistaken in one little detail about Asia: he believed that capitalism would revolutionize Asiatic society, dissolve the old feudalism, and free the people from their oppressive religion. None of this happened, and the reason it did not happen in India explains her present plight.

Even Nehru admitted that the Mogul empire was in decline when the English arrived. The society labored under a rigid caste structure, and a vicious system of land tenure, tax farmers, and feudal overlords undermined its prosperity. Britain was able to plunder it only because exploitation had been habitual, and 50,000 Britons were able to rule 50 million Indians because the Moguls and other conquerors had ruled and robbed India before. Likewise, the Inca and Aztec empires were rotten when the Spaniards came, and so also the Shilazi, the Kikuyu, and other African kingdoms before the arrival of the Europeans.

The present poverty of underdeveloped countries continues the poverty of the broad masses under previous systems. When the foreigners brought industries into various sites in the country, these usually were isolated oases in a desert of backwardness. The profits were taken out of the country, and

neither the colonialists nor the natives cared to create a community of interests. If the price of development has been heavy, however, underdevelopment exacts even higher costs: epidemics, famine, stagnation.

COSTS AND PRICES

The third world ideologists nevertheless construct a historical interpretation that a primer of elementary logic would call a fallacy: countries were poor after the colonialists left; hence, the colonialists wanted it so. This confusion between *after* and *because* is at the bottom of the dispute between the haves and the have-nots. We are not rich because they are poor; we would in fact be richer if they were richer, too. The imperialists first exploited their own nations to maintain their prodigal sons abroad. J. A. Hobson, a British historian of capitalism from whom Lenin drew most of his arguments, called imperialism "the outdoor sport of the ruling class." He showed that colonialism may be profitable for a few monopolists, but that it means a burden on taxpayers in the imperial country, low wages for its workers, higher prices for consumers—in brief, that it does not pay for the colonizing nation.

It is a mistake, therefore, to view the poverty of developing nations as the work of advanced nations. It is an even greater mistake to accept a burden of guilt in return for the supposed wrongdoing. The frictions that exist between the Northern and the Southern Hemispheres (most Third World nations are in the latter) are not metaphysical and moral but economic and therefore capable of definition and solution. They are serious enough. The relations between the financial center and the underdeveloped countries have often been exploitative, and nearly always asymmetrical. Debauched governments have contracted debts that are a burden to their successors; weak governments have been shored up with "loans" that ought to have been recognized frankly as political subsidies. Public utilities, railroads, and manufacturing establishments have been built with foreign capital, and the dividends on these investments still leave the country even though the original cost may have been paid back many times over. Latin America is now receiving less capital from abroad than it is sending back as interest and dividends. This is an unhealthy situation which must lead to inflation and bankruptcy. And aid, it is charged, has often developed facilities to suit the giver rather than the recipient.

Radical spokesmen of the Third World reject foreign aid altogether because they feel that it corrupts their governments, and prevents the people from developing a sense of self-reliance. The radicals also dislike foreign aid for reasons of domestic politics: the distribution of aid is a political plum; it offers opportunities for graft, nepotism, get-rich schemes; it helps the incumbent government by creating jobs, and it may create a middle class that intends to enjoy the fruits of independence rather than to waste them on harebrained crusades. If people are satisfied with their incomes, where then is the revolution? What happens to virtue?

But it is clear that governments that really desire a better life for their nations must come to some kind of accommodation with the West; they need capital and technological assistance. Thus the revolutionary generals of Peru and Bolivia first expropriated foreign corporations, then put advertisements in the Wall Street press to invite new investments. Even Allende was negotiating with a consortium of international banks on means of refinancing Chile's debts, including a roundabout way of paying token compensation for the copper mines. He might have stayed the hand of his murderers had he been able to resist the pressure of extremists who wanted a symbolic confrontation. The Arab kings are in a similar position: having called forth the demon of nationalism, they

are now its prisoners. They must support the radical irreconcilables whom they hate and fear. Nor is peace helped by the Russian strategy of fanning every fire that Western diplomacy is trying to extinguish.

One way out of the dilemma is dramatizing each technical problem and politicizing each economic issue. Every negotiation about a customs tariff is transformed into a confrontation between the worthy poor and the arrogant rich. In this way the governments of the Southern Hemisphere manage to pose as defenders of their peoples against foreign domination; but in order to convincingly mouth the rhetoric of their more revolutionary rivals, they must inject into international relations a note of bitterness not favorable to negotiations.

Here is the difficulty. Since negotiations may not bring total success, the national revolution calls for unilateral acts. The most visible proof of dependence, of course, is the presence of foreign corporations. To nationalize them is not only popular politically; it also means jobs for loyal servants of the ruling party, or actual positions of power which may outlast a change of government. I have indicated that in many instances economic conditions favor nationalization, but in the Third World the most popular motive is political, and I think this is another example of fallacious logic. Unsophisticated students feel that the political will of a nation should be paramount and override all economic considerations. Governments must deal with economic realities, and if these are explained to the politicians by the director of a foreign company, the logic of "after, hence because" leads to the conclusion that it is the foreign character of the influence that stands in the way of political desire. The trend toward nationalization must be welcomed, therefore, not for any ethical reason but because it will permit the nationalists to face their real problems. In the West nationalization is resisted mostly for ideological reasons. We must learn to look at it as a form of bankruptcy.

RICH REVOLUTIONARIES

It has long been recognized that foreign aid—with the awkwardness of giving it and the humiliation of receiving it—could be almost superfluous (except in emergencies and special situations of hardship) if consumers in the advanced countries were to pay more for their coffee and other basic commodities. We remember the days when Roosevelt fought the Depression by raising farm prices, dumping wheat into the ocean, and plowing little pigs under the soil. After World War II, international cartels controlled the markets in wheat, coffee, and cocoa. The sugar quota, too, is a form of cartel; the acreage of cotton and tobacco is rigorously controlled. A copper cartel functions from time to time, and two bloody dictators, Mussolini and Franco, had a monopoly of mercury. On the face of it, there is nothing especially revolutionary about raising and fixing prices.

The circumstances of the oil price rise—its defiant announcement in the wake of the embargo, the swiftness and steepness of the rise, the almost hysterical reaction of the consumers—have given this action a flavor of rebellion. From the point of view of the Arab governments, it undercuts the demagoguery of the radicals. It looks dynamic, it is anti-Western, and it seems to be a political act. Oil, customarily regarded as dirty and smelly, suddenly is pure. Politics is shown to dominate economics. The revolution of the poor nations is being led by some of the richest people on earth.

These developments may bring some regrouping to the leadership of the Third World. Some rulers, the new imperialists, may want to accommodate themselves with the old rich to whose club they will now be admitted. But the majority of the under-

developed countries will remain poor. It has yet to be seen whether the oil-rich countries will contribute any of their wealth to the starving fraternity of the Third World. Kuwait last year received over \$2 billion in oil revenues, and yet it offered only \$300,000 to assistance programs sponsored by the U.N. Saudi Arabia collected over \$4 billion in oil revenues and contributed nothing. The Shah of Iran has promised the World Bank a billion dollars; the ruler of Abu Dhabi will create a development fund of \$3 billion, and other Arab producers may be pressed to "invest" in a development bank—where they probably will practice "neocolonialism" on their poorer brothers, who are now called the Fourth World.

To take the heat off himself and other oil-producing countries, President Boumedienne of Algeria called for a Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly, to deal especially with questions of "raw materials." Last April he presented there his most demagogic demands, designed to restore the unity of the developing countries. Ironically, it was the Westerners who pointed out that the price increases worked their greatest injustices in the underdeveloped countries themselves, collectively and individually. The developing nations without oil resources will be required to pay over \$15 billion for oil imports in 1974, as opposed to \$5.2 billion in 1973, and for lack of fertilizer they may suffer famine. Another paradox was that the "socialist" countries defended the right of each producer to uphold his "sovereign" interest with the capitalist instruments of monopoly, whereas the capitalist countries decried and denounced such "socialist" measures as cartelization of an industry, and defended the right of free access for all to the riches of the earth.

The new imperialism of the oil-rich countries is even more parasitical than the old imperialism. It does not develop new resources but merely redistributes the income from resources already developed. It hides its own selfish designs behind the slogan of "sovereignty," which appeals to the poorest and most oppressed nations still under colonial or semicolonial control. But the really underdeveloped nations do not need more sovereignty; they need more internationalism, more recognition of the interdependence of all nations, more cooperation rather than revolution. They need to open themselves to a restructuring of their social framework which will create investment opportunities.

The old industrial countries began their ascendancy with cotton goods and sewing machines; the new countries start with steel mills. The old capitalism started out with rising wage levels; the new dictators begin by buying excessive weapons systems. This is the structure of underdevelopment which breeds underdevelopment.

For the time being, the new imperialists may continue to use their revolutionary rhetoric, but after the raw-materials conference and the other conferences that follow, it will become increasingly impossible for them to pretend that the politics of confrontation will help other underdeveloped countries to emerge from the colonial cocoon. The victories of last winter have had at least one beneficial result: the new nations have gained self-confidence. They need no longer feel that they must humiliate us in order to prove their own worth.

On the other hand, the advanced nations should understand that their developing peers are no longer their wards. They are partners in business, and they should be given the opportunity that they demand: to assume full responsibility for the fate of their own countries and for the management of their international affairs. The established nations have previously admitted to their

club nations which had once been underdeveloped—Italy, the Soviet Union, and Japan are examples. There is no reason to deny membership to any newcomer. On principle the international system is open.

But the question is not who shall rule but who shall die. One-third of the earth's population, a billion people in Asia and Africa, may be undernourished, perhaps starving, next year. The boom in raw-materials prices deprives them of oil, fertilizer, and grains. A more equitable distribution of all resources is possible only if all nations help to organize the exchange of goods. President Boumedienne has called for a new order in international relations. If that new order is not to mean simply the old system with new people in the top echelons, then the newly rich countries must abandon their unilateral ultimatum and submit their resources to the kind of international control that they now demand on a national basis. The anarchic planning by multinational corporations and cartels must be replaced, not by an even greater anarchy of national monopolies but by truly international agencies of planning for human needs.

THE WOMEN BEHIND HALE HOUSE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant drug programs going on in New York City takes place at Hale House, a facility which houses the children of addicted mothers and fathers. Clara and Lorraine Hale have committed themselves to saving these children and to assuring them the opportunity to grow and develop.

The following article by Bonnie Johnson in the May, 1974, issue of *Ms.* deals with the remarkable job the Hales are doing.

LIKE MOTHER, LIKE DAUGHTER

Clara Hale, 65, Lorraine Hale, 40, co-founders of Hale House, New York. Everyone at Hale House calls Clara "Mommy Hale," and she loves it. "Everyone" includes the 43 children of drug-addicted parents whom Clara cares for and 20 staff members. The only person who doesn't call Clara "Mommy Hale" is her daughter, Lorraine; she calls her Ms. Hale.

But the Hales' relationship is unique. "Mother and I have always been friends," explains Lorraine. "Maybe that's one of the reasons we can run Hale House together."

Clara Hale agrees. "We've been together a long time and we talk to each other, really talk. We've just reached the point where each of us understands exactly what the other is saying."

Clara's responsibilities as childcare specialist of Hale House include watching over the children, who range in age from four months to eight years, and supervising cooking, cleaning, and laundering needs. Lorraine's duties, as executive director, range from balancing the budget—Hale House operates on a shoestring and is always searching for grants—to hiring the staff. Included on staff is a fully accredited teacher who, in little-red-schoolhouse tradition, teaches first, second, and third grade to the dozen or so school-age children.

Hale House is a four-story Harlem brownstone which, with the help of Borough President Percy Sutton, was renovated for Hale House with Office of Economic Opportunity funds, and rented to the Hales for a nominal fee by the city.

Says Lorraine: "Staffing has been the most difficult task. Getting people who can meet the needs of children is almost an impossibility. People say they want to work here because they love kids. But we've had trouble finding people who like kids, much less love them. And many people still believe in corporal punishment, which is something we forbid at Hale House."

Also forbidden are discussions of drug addiction in front of the children. However, staff meetings center on that subject, since Hale House is one of the few institutions in the country studying the aftereffects of passive addiction. (Children of heroin addicts and methadone addicts are born addicted. Whereas heroin babies go into withdrawal within 24 hours after birth, methadone babies don't react for two or three days. With the aid of medications like phenobarbital and paregoric, all the children can be detoxified within seven days.) Hale House is now trying to find out if there are any long-range effects due to early passive addiction.

The parents of the Hale House children must be enrolled in a drug-rehabilitation program and are required to visit their children at least once a week, though some come more frequently. "We insist on parents visiting," explains Clara, "so that they're not total strangers to their children when it's time for the children to leave."

Although parents can take their children home at any time (there is a flexible five-year limit on a child's stay), parents' visits can be problematic. "I want to cry when a parent comes in high on drugs," says Lorraine. "Then I'll call my mother, because she can say things to the parents that I couldn't get away with. She'll tell them, 'You can't take that baby out; you know you're high. You shouldn't even come here like that.' And they respect her and say, 'I'm sorry, Mommy Hale, you're right.' And they go."

Clara Hale does little to hide her intolerance for addicts. "Those people have had their chance and they've ruined their lives. But that's no reason why these babies should be deprived of their opportunity."

Lorraine does make distinctions among addicts. "The methadone addicts are the ones that really offend me," she says. "They've just substituted one drug for another. They're still irresponsible and often punitive toward their children. On the other hand, a number of parents we see have joined drug-free programs, and they are no longer addicted. They're struggling hard to get it together."

The Hales know what it's like to struggle. Widowed more than 30 years ago, Clara Hale was left with three small children. She was determined to keep the family together. "I refused to go on welfare—I wanted to take care of my kids myself," she recalls. "So for five or six dollars a week for each child, I took care of others' children." She became licensed to care for children in her own home, and unmarried mothers soon started bringing their children to her. While they got their lives back in shape, Clara Hale cared for their children either during the week only, or full time, in cases where even weekend responsibilities proved too much for some mothers who were only teenagers themselves.

Lorraine, however, who has a Ph.D in Child Development, was responsible for putting Hale House on course. Five years ago she saw a young junkie nodding out on a Broadway bench. The baby in her lap was about to fall to the ground when Lorraine approached her. "I'm a very impulsive person," she says, "and

I saw there was a need. So I told her to go see my mother."

That infant was Clara Hale's first heroin baby. Word spread rapidly among the neighborhood's addict population, and within three months Clara Hale was looking after 10, then 15, then 22 heroin babies. "We decided to devote ourselves entirely to these infants," she says. For the first year and a half, Clara was financed entirely by Lorraine, who ultimately got some federal funding.

"There was never any discussion about my doing this work," Lorraine says. "Like everything else between my mother and me, it just happened naturally. How we work out our differences has a lot to do with mutual respect. I remember being aware at an early age of how hard it was for my mother to get by. That made me realize that I didn't want to make those sacrifices for a family of my own. They were too great, and I feel I owe myself something. I love these kids, but I also love getting in my car and going home at night. I feel I have a responsibility to myself to keep a busy social life going and to maintain relationships with adults. And getting my Ph.D. was like having a second full-time job."

Clara and Lorraine would like to see the Hale House concept expanded. "The appalling number of child-abuse cases in the courts today clearly shows the need we have for residential as well as child-care centers," Lorraine says. "It's about time society started providing for the needs of children themselves, not just providing for the needs of parents, with a fallout effect on their offspring."

LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I have just completed the mailing of my 1974 legislative questionnaire to my constituency, and I wanted to share with my colleagues the substance of the questionnaire because I feel the topics covered are both pertinent and salient. I will, of course, apprise the Members of the results once they have been tabulated. I am sure that most of the Members will agree with me that this method of communicating with constituents is invaluable in that it enables us to better understand the needs and desires of the voters and to better serve the interests of those whom we represent.

My questionnaire follows:

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

DEAR FRIEND: As your Representative in Congress, it is my responsibility to know your views on the important issues today. To assist me I am continuing the tradition I have established since coming to Congress of asking you to complete this questionnaire. I have attempted to include many of the most timely and crucial matters of national concern.

When all responses have been tabulated the percentage results of this district-wide poll will be made public, but your personal opinions will be kept in strict confidence.

If you would like to expand on the views you present in this questionnaire, or if you have a matter of personal concern that involves the federal government, I invite you

to contact me at either of the above addresses.

Also, if you are not on the mailing list to receive my monthly newsletter just indicate you would like to be added by checking the box provided near the place for your name on the questionnaire.

To return the questionnaire, detach it along the fold and mail as a postcard. Your signature at the bottom is optional, but to facilitate tabulation I would appreciate it if you could write in your town and zip code.

Most sincerely,

WILMER D. MIZELL.

1974 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE (Answer Yes or No)

1. On the basis of your knowledge at the present time, do you believe the President should be impeached?
2. In face of the current energy shortage, which of the following do you favor as a possible course of action:
 - a. Reduce Environmental Protection Agency air quality standards to allow increased burning of coal.
 - b. Reduce new car emission standards.
 - c. Legislation to tax excessive profits of the oil companies.
 - d. Legislation which will permit deep water ports for the purpose of importing oil.
3. Would you favor the diversion of highway trust funds for public mass transit systems?
4. Do you favor Federal legislation which would establish minimum standards for no-fault automobile insurance plans?
5. What action should Congress take in the area of inflation:
 - a. Re-establish firm wage and price controls across the board.
 - b. Limit Federal spending.
 - c. Increase Federal taxes.
 - d. Balance the Federal budget.
 - e. Other action.
6. Would you favor increasing the earning limitation for persons receiving social security benefits?
7. Do you favor Congress enacting a national health insurance program to cover catastrophic or prolonged illnesses?
8. Do you believe the tax payers should finance the campaigns of all candidates for Federal office?
9. In 1970 the U.S. Postal Service became an independent agency, and, for all intents and purposes, removed from Federal or Congressional control. How would you rate your postal service? Good, fair, poor.

AMERICAN AID TO SOUTH VIETNAM IS MUCH LARGER THAN RUSSIAN AND CHINESE AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, recently our Ambassador to South Vietnam, Graham Martin, told a group of visitors that the United States had to spend more on military aid for South Vietnam because Russia and China were spending so much on North Vietnam. According to Ambassador Martin, this has always been the case. He said:

Our intention all along was to balance the aid given by the Soviet Union and the

People's Republic of China to North Vietnam.

Last week, in response to my request, the Defense Intelligence Agency released their estimates of the amount of military aid the U.S.S.R. and the People's Republic of China have given to North Vietnam. The statistics make it clear that, contrary to administration propaganda, there is only one superpower that has been sinking billions and billions of dollars into Southeast Asia, and that superpower is the United States. They make it clear that while we were pouring in tens and billions of dollars to prop up a succession of government in South Vietnam, the Russians and Chinese were spending peanuts.

In 1973, according to these intelligence estimates supplied by the DIA, the U.S.S.R. gave \$175 million in military aid to North Vietnam and the PRC gave \$115 million—for a total of \$290 million. That same year the United States spent a total of \$5.3 billion in Southeast Asia, including direct military funding and MASF. That is 18 times as much as Russia and China spent.

The comparison is equally impressive if you chose to ignore the nearly \$3 billion the United States spent in 1973 to finance its own military operation in Southeast Asia. In 1973, the United States spent \$2.3 billion in military assistance service funding for South Vietnam, which was still a good eight times as much as Russia and China together spent on military aid to North Vietnam.

Even more revealing, perhaps, are the changes that took place in military aid spending by the United States and the two Communist powers from 1972 to 1973. In 1972, total military aid by Russia and China to North Vietnam was \$605 million. In 1973 it dropped by more than 50 percent to \$290 million. In 1972, U.S. spending on MASF was \$1,985 million. In 1973 it actually increased to \$2,271 million.

And what about the rest of the money spent during the course of the war, which Ambassador Martin says was only meant to "balance" Russian and Chinese aid?

These statistics, which I must emphasize were supplied by our own Defense Intelligence Agency, show that since 1966 the U.S.S.R. and the People's Republic of China have given North Vietnam \$3.65 billion in military aid—\$2.57 billion by the U.S.S.R. and \$1.8 billion by the People's Republic of China. Over the same period, according to official DOD figures, the United States spent \$107.10 billion on the war. In other words, these statistics show that since 1966 the United States has spent 29 times as much for military operations in Southeast Asia as Russia and China together.

I hope these statistics will succeed in putting to rest the tired old excuse that we did what we did in South Vietnam only because the Russians and Chinese were doing it too. In the case of military aid it is quite obvious this has always been an utter lie.

The statistics, showing military aid to Southeast Asia by the United States and the U.S.S.R. and China, follow:

MILITARY AID TO SOUTHEAST ASIA, 1966-73

[All figures in millions of dollars]

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
U.S.S.R.	500	675	415	175	90	165	375	175
PRC	110	155	115	140	100	115	230	115
Total	610	830	530	315	190	280	605	290
United States direct military	5,419	17,262	19,065	19,912	15,941	9,925	5,243	2,995
MAF	393	1,155	947	1,632	1,432	1,527	1,985	2,271
Total ²	5,812	18,417	20,012	21,544	17,373	11,452	7,228	5,266

¹ Totals for the U.S.S.R. and PRC supplied by Defense Intelligence Agency. Represent total military aid to North Vietnam. Virtually all Russian and Chinese military aid to Indochina was channeled through North Vietnam.

² United States costs for Southeast Asia from DOD. All figures represent outlays.

NEW POWERPLANTS VERSUS THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis triggered new interest in building powerplants to generate the electricity needed to light and heat our homes and run our businesses and industries.

Building new powerplants, however, is always opposed by those in the area of the proposed construction who feel they do not have any power to stop such construction. Residents of potential powerplant areas often point out the side effects of powerplant construction and urge us to find ways to build plants without compromising local environmental, aesthetic, or historical values.

As the New England Power Co. begins to solidify its plans for the Salem, Mass. area, local residents are eloquently fearful of the unattractive aspects of powerplant construction.

One such resident is A. N. Chagnon, and I would like to bring to the Congress attention his letter to the editor of the Salem Evening News:

LET ALL THE PEOPLE DECIDE THE FATE OF WINTER ISLAND

To the Editor:

In the April 3 edition of The Salem Evening News I learned that the proposed matter of the leasing of certain areas of Winter Island to the New England Power Company had developed to the point of arranging a public hearing in the next few weeks.

Since we may not be back at home in Salem in time to attend this contemplated meeting, I shall sincerely appreciate the privilege of expressing my views on this very controversial issue through the medium of this column.

Having had no legal training, I shall refrain from considering this question from that angle, but rather look at it from the viewpoint of a taxpaying citizen who is sincerely interested in the welfare of the city at large. I do, however, venture to state that, according to certain recorded documents, this particular area, as a whole, namely Winter Island, belongs to the city of Salem, not to Ward One, nor to the executive or legislative branches of our city. Therefore it is rightfully owned by the people. The records to which I refer are as follows:

In 1794 the fort on Winter Island was ceded to the United States.

In 1884 so much of the island as remained to the city was ceded by it to the government "for the purpose of locating further works

for the defense of our harbour," providing that the property should revert to the city whenever it should cease to be used for defense purposes.

In 1867 the War Department "turned over (not ceded) to the city "for public use" that part of the island not occupied by the fort, until it should be wanted for defense.

In 1869 the city conveyed its interest in the island, subject to the War Department's restrictions, to the Plummer School.

In 1922 an Act of Congress transferred by quitclaim deed the 32 acres, comprising the Fort Pickering reservation and the land occupied by the Plummer Farm School, to be used for a park or other public uses.

December 28, 1928, Salem's Park Department took formal possession of the island and planted some trees.

Although this parcel of land, with its shore and water rights may be under the jurisdiction of the Park Department, it is assumed that it still remains the property of the City of Salem, and not of any separate commission.

It is my firm conviction that this area should not be disposed of by sale, lease, or gift, permanent or temporary, without the common consent of the majority of the citizens.

My family moved to the Juniper Point section of Salem Willows in 1915. I have owned and occupied my present home in this same area since 1920. Also, since 1920, I have, either personally, or by absentee right, cast my ballot in each and every election.

Because of this long record of residence, I believe I am qualified to enter into discussion of this present controversy, or any other question of public concern that may arise in Precinct One of Ward One. May I here emphasize the fact that Winter Island does not belong solely to Ward One, it is the property of all the wards, one through seven, and is, therefore, their responsibility, as is all other publicly owned property, and as such, should be of serious and sincere concern.

I do not believe that the city officials, elected or appointed, no matter how legitimate or broad the scope of their power of office, should have the right to contract for the disposition of lands or property, such as in this present situation, without the consent of the people. But, I do believe that it is their moral obligation to make certain that the entire population shall be given any and all information relative to such transactions as above mentioned.

In 1915 the shore line on Fort Avenue was open from the end of Derby St., at the junction of Block House Sq., to the far end of Cat Cove, and over Winter Island Rd. to the island itself. The only buildings on the fort area of the island were the Plummer Farm School, the lightkeeper's house, and the lighthouse.

The first invasion of this picturesque, natural shoreline was the erection of the oil tanks. Next came the plant of New England Power. Then the takeover by Essex County for the sewage pumping station. And, finally, the transfer of the Smith Pool to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Thus has come

about the gradual elimination of public ownership of this area, with the result being, the last remaining shore with public access on this east side of Fort Avenue is Winter Island.

When New England Power was negotiating with the mayor and council for a permit to build their gigantic "tinker-toy like" towers to carry the high tension wires across the main artery to the Willows, in close proximity to the private homes, and over through Collins Cove, the citizens of Ward One protested. Oh, yes, we were granted a hearing, but we learned by this experience not to place too much confidence in these hearings. Often, as in this instance, they turn out to be "on-the-face" gesture of courtesy. The residents of Ward One attended, two or more hundred strong. But, before the close of the hearing, to many, it was a foregone conclusion just what the outcome of that session would be. Big business won out, because, we later learned on reliable authority, the majority of the members of the council had reached a decision beforehand.

I distinctly remember two questions that I directed from the floor to the representative of the company. The first: "Is it not possible for these wires to be carried underground over to Collins Cove?" The reply was, "Oh, yes, but it would cost an additional \$750,000, and that is out of the question."

My second query was more pointed and personal: "How would you like to have these towers and wires go along beside your own home and across your avenue?" He said, "Well, er, ah, I'll have to admit I wouldn't like it." The wires went up as originally planned.

The next objectionable move by New England Power is in the offing—this one the most alarming of all: the leasing of Winter Island. It has been my conviction for many years that if any issue arises, which shall concern the city at large, there should be hearings held in each and every ward, with the people well informed on the problem which is up for consideration, prior to the session. Salem does not have an auditorium or hall of sufficient size to allow for an "en masse" hearing; furthermore, the time element would not permit all those who might wish to be heard to present their pros and cons. If such problems are of major importance, particularly the disposal of public property, as in this present case, it should be placed upon the ballot. Let the people decide! Let the will of the people prevail!

Winter Island and its shores are an inheritance from our forebears, to be passed on to our children, and the children's children, for generations to come. It is our bounden duty to protect, preserve and defend the rightful claim to this area.

This is not the time nor the place for platitudes, maxims, or charming rhetoric, even if I were capable of rendering, but I am reminded of an undeniable truth which can be learned from a fable which I was taught in early school days. Do you remember the story of the camel that poked his nose into the tent, assuring his master that he only wanted to warm it? Then, little by little, he wangled

his way farther in, until finally there was not sufficient room for both him and his master, and the latter had to move out. New England Power may well be looked upon as a giant camel that bit by bit, keeps moving into adjacent area until, it is possible, and not improbable, may in the not too distant future, take over Winter Island in its entirety, and even encroach upon Juniper Point, should they so desire.

There is no absolute assurance that this proposed lease, if given, cannot or will not terminate in final and complete ownership of the island and the shore and water rights by this company.

In such case there would be no reclamation, if it should pass out of the city's control. Is this what we, the people, really want? Other cities and towns value their shorefront property, and to a far greater extent than Salem, have preserved them. A very good example is Marblehead, and the North Shore.

I recently read in the Evening news that New England Power now finds it necessary to postpone construction of this addition for a year or so. If this is true, there's plenty of time for the citizens to be properly notified of all the angles of this considered transaction. Let the majority of the people decide, and not exclusively the mayor and the council.

Heritage is a popular topic these days, and will be for many weeks to come. Great plans are being made for the commemoration of this historic event. What is the true significance of this word Heritage? It is many things to many people. To some it is Chestnut St., with its reflection of early grandeur and substantial evidence of opulence in the homes containing art and architecture, worthy indeed of preservation. Also, there is Washington Sq., and a few other scattered points on Federal St. Not to be forgotten are those of historical interest such as the Custom House, House of Seven Gables, Witch House, Peabody Museum, and Essex Institute, with others of equal importance and value. These have been jealously guarded and spared the influence of ultra-modern renovation. This is right and proper, and, for the same we are most grateful. But the passing on of the original owners and their heirs have in many cases, changed the status of many of these mansions; and too elastic zoning ordinances have permitted the encroachment of business, small and large, which has many times erased the last semblance of any pristine elegance.

These historic buildings could be wiped out by fire, and the inroads of time and the elements. Therefore, this, as a heritage, cannot be passed on with any degree of assured permanence, materially, nor guarantee of perpetual ownership. Our real heritage is something of imperishable quality—a pride of achievement, the building or a town, and finally a city. This in itself is tangible proof of the indomitable spirit of the earliest forebears, who loved these shores and, casting their lots here, working together brought forth a community worthy of preservation and bequeathed to their progeny.

Most important in the tangible sense of this inheritance were Salem's fine harbor and coves and shoreline, all accessible to the public. Beautiful to look upon, and a priceless God-given marine asset. Today, the greater part of this shoreline has been lost through the ownership of private industry, and public access and enjoyment prohibited. Who is responsible, and why? This is a pertinent question for all to ponder.

One hundred years ago, a truly great man, in heartfelt anguish, with gentle admonishment spoke these words:

"That this nation, under God, and shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Let us, one and all, accept our individual responsibility for the preservation of our heritage and keep this one, and all others,

complete and inviolate. May we, the people, continue to hold the gavel of authority, and never let it be wielded by a select and privileged few.

A. N. CHAGNON.

THE LATE BRUCE TUCKER

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, many of us in this Chamber were friends or were acquainted through congressional business with the late Bruce Tucker, a man whose life work was one of service.

Bruce Tucker was one of the true experts in the field of flood control, and he used this knowledge to help bring countless benefits to the citizens of the lower part of the Mississippi River. Mr. Tucker worked for a number of years as administrative assistant to the Honorable RUSSELL B. LONG, of Louisiana, before becoming executive vice president of the Lower Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, a position he also held for many years.

Bruce played a most vital role in countless flood control and navigation projects. The legacies of his life's work in the development of our water resources will truly be with us for many years to come.

I speak here today for many who share with me the good fortune of having been friends with this fine man who passed away last year.

The Honorable JOHN C. STENNIS, the distinguished Senator from the State of Mississippi, recently paid tribute to Mr. Tucker in words that tell full well of the works and deeds of this man.

Senator STENNIS, who is as keen a judge of men as he is of legislative matters, knew Mr. Tucker both on a friendship and business basis, giving his words of praise to Mr. Tucker both foundation and impetus.

I feel that it is entirely appropriate that I read to you at this time the statement made by Senator STENNIS before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee:

Thank you very much for being here. Before you gentlemen leave, I just want to say a few words about the late Bruce Tucker. This is the first full meeting of this kind, a hearing on the lower Mississippi Valley, that I have been able to attend since Bruce passed away, and I just want something in the official records here of the way I felt about this fine man. He was a long-time Executive Vice-President of the Lower Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association. He did the same splendid job for your Association that he did here on Capitol Hill for a number of years. As you know, he was a fine Christian gentleman. His word was his bond. This is an old saying, but it expresses a lot. And we want to bring that more back into prominence and meaning. His word was his bond.

He was greatly dedicated, I know, to the Lower Mississippi Valley and the tributaries, and problems that you had. It was his function, on behalf of the Levee Districts and the many concerned citizens of the Valley, to coordinate the efforts of those who were dedicated to improved flood protection in the area. He did a magnificent job of this, and the whole region is deeply indebted to him. He knew what had to be done, and how to do

it, and year after year he saw that it was accomplished. This Committee respected very highly all of his representations and his fine presentations that he helped you plan and present.

Bruce was a newspaper man when he was young. And then he worked for the Mississippi River Commission. The Army Engineers trained him in flood control work, and as usual they did a good job. He was here on Capitol Hill, as Assistant to the Louisiana Senator when I came here as a new Senator. The Senator he was with passed away within a few months, and Bruce would have—I do not know how many know this—he would have become my Assistant. I just did not know that he would be interested until the day after I had already selected someone else.

He was really a great man, with high standards and strength of character. He did you a fine service, and his Nation an extraordinarily fine service, and blazed a path that we can all well follow. I know how those of you who knew him personally feel. Many have already paid tribute to him at a time when I could not be here, but I am glad to have a chance to say something about him here in the public record.

Bruce was blessed with a fine family. His wonderful wife Emily helped him very greatly over the years, and is admired and respected by all. He has a son, Earl Bruce, Jr., and a daughter, Beth, and I know they are proud of what Bruce accomplished.

I do not know of anyone on Capitol Hill that I have been more favorably impressed with than Bruce Tucker. I mourn his passing, and I honor and cherish his memory.

WHO'S BACKING THE DISARMAMENT LOBBY?

HON. JOHN B. CONLAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Speaker, our recent refusal in the House to slash spending necessary to continue development of essential new strategic weapons was a gratifying rebuff to well-financed, well-orchestrated, well-publicized disarmament lobbyists who waged an all-out attack on U.S. defense improvement.

Several far left groups, including one calling itself the Project on Budget Priorities and located at 1620 I Street here in Washington, issued one propaganda volley after another in their attempts to scuttle the B-1 strategic bomber, the Trident missile-firing submarine, and proposed research to improve accuracy of our strategic ballistic missiles.

But our 358-to-37 vote for the weapons bill, sent to the Senate with those programs intact, adequately testifies to the importance given those programs by the American people. Especially at a time when the Soviet Union has surpassed the United States in almost every category of military hardware.

Despite that overwhelming vote, the disarmament lobby is still hard at work to derail the defense bill in the Senate. Some may wonder who is behind this unrelenting campaign. A recent editorial in the Arizona Republic, the largest statewide daily newspaper in my State, poignantly addressed that point. It was written by Pat Murphy, the Republic's editorial pages editor, and I would like to share it with all my colleagues:

[From the Arizona Republic, May 20, 1974]

MAN BEHIND ARMS OUT

Except in submarines and aircraft carriers, Soviet Russia has surpassed the United States in every category of military hardware.

It has more men under arms, more nuclear warheads, more missiles, more new long-range bombers, more new interceptor aircraft, more anti-ballistic missile defenses. Its submarine and carrier production soon will equal and surpass the U.S.'s inventory.

The Soviets also have completed agreements for nine new naval and aviation bases in Africa, the Mideast and India to extend its control of vital Indian Ocean sea lanes.

And Russia refuses, in current arms limitations talks, to curtail arms production.

Yet, a new organized effort was launched last week in Washington to arm-twist the congress into further stripping the Pentagon's budget (29 per cent of the total fiscal 1975 budget).

A group calling itself the Project on Budget Priorities faced the elite of the Washington press corps and solemnly said \$11 billion (12 per cent) can be cut from the budget, including a carrier for the sensitive Indian Ocean sector, the new Trident submarine and B-1 bomber and whole programs involving new weaponry and strategic defense.

What the Washington press corps failed to ask itself is, who are these apostles of military economy?

In point of fact, most of the Project on Budget Priorities panel were advisors of Sen. George McGovern in his presidential bid, and-or cross-pollinated workers in chic disarmament associations with a long history of naivete in the field of Soviet military intelligence.

The most interesting figure on the 21-member panel which produced the proposed \$11 billion Pentagon budget cut is Adam Yarmolinsky, former deputy assistant secretary of defense for international security under President John Kennedy. He was, in truth, the Pentagon's No. 2 man.

Washington insiders called Yarmolinsky the "Uncrowned King of the Pentagon" whose powers were enormous, and whose record was unbelievable.

A former State Department security official and later New York Times foreign correspondent, Frank Kluckhohn, did a study of Yarmolinsky, and found that:

The late FBI director J. Edgar Hoover sent directly to President Kennedy a warning that Yarmolinsky was a security risk, a warning that was shunted aside by Kennedy advisors who had been intimate political workers with Yarmolinsky.

Yarmolinsky's parents, Avraham Yarmolinsky and Babette Deutsch, were repeatedly cited by congressional and other security groups as workers for Communist front organizations from the early 1930s until the early 1960s.

His parents also published numerous pro-Soviet works through International Publishers in New York City. Identified by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as "the official publishing house of the Communist Party."

Yarmolinsky himself was head of the Marxist Club at Harvard.

In the 1930s, Yarmolinsky worked for Spanish War Relief, an organization which was formed by the Young Communist League to aid Communist revolutionaries.

In the 1950s, Yarmolinsky was head of the Fund for the Republic, recognized as one of the principal groups attempting to abolish all federal internal security agencies.

In the John Kennedy election campaign, Yarmolinsky served as an advisor, principally in recruiting top members of the President's new administration, among them Robert McNamara and George Ball, in whose law firm Yarmolinsky worked and who later was to become undersecretary of State.

Yarmolinsky wrote a paper debunking concern for domestic subversion as "popular hysteria," and appears to have influenced President Kennedy on March 17, 1961, to lift a government ban on Communist propaganda entering the United States.

With the Yarmolinsky credentials thus at hand, members of the Congress who may be tempted to wildly chop defense spending should pause and consider motives of gadfly panels geared temperamentally against a strong military.

Demonstrably, Soviet Russia is in the catbird's military seat right now, with the U.S. struggling to play catchup ball.

Heeding the Yarmolinsky-type arguments can only widen America's inferior position.

MORE SUPPORT FROM NATION'S MAYORS FOR AN URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, on May 21 I inserted in the RECORD copies of letters from the mayors of Omaha, Honolulu, St. Paul, Rochester, and Norfolk supporting my proposal to establish a standing Committee on Urban Affairs in the House through an amendment to the committee reform bill.

I am pleased with the growing unanimity among mayors from around the United States as to the need for such a committee and its justification in a Congress legislating the affairs of a nation whose population is nearly 70 percent urban. The latest letters of endorsement from the mayors of Minneapolis, Denver, Hialeah, Louisville, Miami, and San Bernardino speak for themselves, and I include them here in full:

CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER,

Denver, Colo., May 20, 1974.

HON. HERMAN BADILLO,
U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BADILLO: I have received your letter of May 6 wherein you advise me of your intention to propose the establishment of a standing committee on urban affairs in the U.S. House of Representatives.

My great concern as Mayor of one of the nation's large center cities is that the Congress of the United States realize this nation must realistically address the issues of center city decay and demographic change which has been the result of uncoordinated Federal categorical program funding. As the Mayor of Denver, I have looked forward with great hope to the passage of some form of block grant special revenue sharing which addresses the real problems of the cities of this nation.

As a political realist I am well aware that the attention I feel is necessary to center city problems by the Congress of the United States may be a very distasteful responsibility. However, I do feel that if we are to experience much more in the way of delay we will again face sudden and not too well

thought out decision-making in order to handle problems similar to those experienced by large cities in past years. As you know, many of the programs that we are utilizing today, with all of the constraints they operate under, evolved out of the nation's concerns with center city problems only after citizen reaction became so intense and dramatic that it received the public's attention. This, of course, resulted in the myriad Federal programs that we operate with today, allowing little or no flexibility to meet changing requirements at the local level.

I, therefore, would hope that your standing committee on urban affairs, if created, would become a vehicle wherein the interrelationships between center cities and their suburban partners may realistically be addressed. It is my deep concern that the problems of inner cities might become so paramount before proper attention is paid to try to solve the problem that the relationship between center city problems, suburban, and yes, even rural problems pales by comparison.

I wholeheartedly support any effort which will bring about realistic Congressional committee reform in order that Congress may adjust its work to the realities of the times and agree that any additional committee must not avoid dealing with the specific and most pressing problems of our urban areas.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for informing me about your proposed amendment. I wish you every success in this endeavor and petition you to do all you can to expeditiously pass a Better Communities Act.

Sincerely yours,

W. H. McNICHOLS, Jr.,

Mayor.

CITY OF LAKES,

Minneapolis, May 21, 1974.

HON. HERMAN BADILLO,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BADILLO: Thank you for the letter explaining your proposal to establish a standing committee on urban affairs in the U.S. House of Representatives.

We in Minneapolis are painfully aware of the failure of the federal government to provide essential aid to the cities, especially during the past few years. We're thankful for Congressmen like you and our own Don Fraser who work tirelessly to force Congress and the Administration to come to grips with urban problems. Your proposal would seem to facilitate this process and I support it.

Sincerely,

ALBERT J. HOFSTEDE,

Mayor of Minneapolis.

CITY OF HIALEAH,

Hialeah, Fla., May 28, 1974.

HON. HERMAN BADILLO,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REPRESENTATIVE: I am taking the liberty of answering your letter to the late Henry Milander as the new Mayor of Hialeah.

Please accept my endorsement of your proposal to establish a Standing Committee on Urban Affairs in the United States House of Representatives.

Your grasp of urban problems is heartening. Please be assured of our cooperation.

Should you be successful in your endeavors, I do hope that the Committee will be cognizant and cooperative in meeting the problems of not only the large municipalities but also the medium-sized ones such as Hialeah.

By copy of this letter I am asking for the support of Hialeah's two Congressional Representatives, Claude Pepper and William Lehman.

Sincerely,

DALE G. BENNETT, Mayor.

LOUISVILLE, KY., May 29, 1974.

Hon. HERMAN BADILLO,
U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BADILLO: I am writing to express my support of your proposal to establish a standing Committee on Urban Affairs in the U.S. House of Representatives by offering an amendment to the Bolling Committee reform bill.

I believe that the existence of such a centralized committee with jurisdiction over urban development, housing, environmental protection and similar matters would be most helpful and beneficial to urban officials such as myself.

I have written to Representative Ron Mazzoli of Kentucky to express my support for your proposal. Good luck and best wishes.

Sincerely,

HARVEY I. SLOANE,
Mayor of Louisville.

CITY OF MIAMI,
Miami, Fla., May 29, 1974.

Hon. HERMAN BADILLO,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BADILLO: This will acknowledge receipt of your May 6 letter and its attachment concerning your proposal to establish a standing Committee on Urban Affairs in the U.S. House of Representatives.

I agree wholeheartedly with your statements and you may count on my support.

Sincerely,

MAURICE A. FERRE, Mayor.

CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO,
San Bernardino, Calif., May 30, 1974.
Re Standing Committee on Urban Affairs.
Hon. HERMAN BADILLO,
Member of Congress, Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BADILLO: I wish to commend you for your efforts in trying to establish a standing Committee on Urban Affairs. This demonstrates a high degree of sensitivity to the major problems facing our nation.

Please feel free to call on me for any support I might render.

Very truly yours,

W. R. "Bob" HOLCOMB, Mayor.

THE ROLE OF NEWS MEDIA IN OPERATION OF GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, O. R. Strackbein, a renowned authority on news media, has written a second paper on that subject. It is well-worth reading, and is included as a part of my remarks:

PRESS CAMPAIGNS

(By O. R. Strackbein)

In a prior paper this writer reviewed the innocent character of the press at the time when our Constitution was written: the word "innocent" being used in the sense of relative harmlessness regardless of possible malice or intent to injure or to promote.

This innocence was considered in the first half of this paper as explaining the negative character of the First Amendment so far as it relates to the press. Congress was simply enjoined to pass no law abridging the freedom of the press. The provision was adopted

in recognition of the unquestionable value of a free press to a democratic society. At the outset it was not a part of the original body of the Constitution but it was made a part of the First Amendment. The main Constitution dealt in detail with the powers of the three branches of our government and the relations between the Federal government and the States, and with foreign powers.

Great care was exercised in spelling out the powers of the three branches of our government as well as the restraints placed on them. This care, it should be noted, provides evidence of the great concern of our Constitution-makers over the abuse of power. The separation of powers, whereby each branch would act as a restrainer on the other branches was established. Those restraints, in the end, came to rest on the electorate because of the limited terms of power extended to the elected officials.

Because the press in those days had limited circulation and a short radius of extension no efforts were made to set forth and define the function of what was the principal instrument of communication. The day of the high-speed press and the printing of hundreds of thousands and even millions of copies of newspapers and magazines, was not foreseen clearly enough to permit the writing of rules that might later become as necessary as those relating to the government itself.

Times do change and technology brings new considerations to bear on new and untested instruments of power. The press, later joined by the electronic media did grow and become instruments of great power. The phenomenon is worthy of both serious inquiry and the utmost concern. It is not something wholly new except in its present titanic dimensions.

From a force that was closely confined and local or at best provincial, it may be asked, how could the press, considering its beginnings and its seemingly innocent dimensions come to possess itself of the influence and power it now exercises? It could with equal wonder be asked, how did the monarchs of history achieve their power initially? There seems to be no better explanation than the fact of it, which was that they simply seized the opportunity of exercising power because the opening was there for anyone who by design and shrewdness and strength and possibly by the urgings of some who would in turn benefit by the assumption, somehow knew just how to move in and bring off the coup. The way for the press in this country, as we have noted, had been clearly opened by the "no trespass" sign against interference, posted by the Constitution. In time the kings invoked divine right as their source of power. Yet no one had proclaimed at any time that henceforth kings would govern by divine right. It was simply a power play. The press has copied the kings by simply moving into an opening and setting up shop, backed only by a business license. Then our Constitution came along and granted the press a privilege extended to no other element of society, understandably overlooking the principle of eternal vigilance that was its guide in shaping the framework of government.

Thus the press escaped the harness designed, for reasons already noted, for our government. If newspapers went wild or became too cantankerous they could always be answered so long as "reason was left free to combat error"; but to be left to do something without possessions of the means is a hollow freedom.

In time newspapers became accepted as a species of catharsis, and sometimes helped good people root out rascals and other undesirables, as the community mores dictated. Charlatans, crooks, frauds and similar ver-

min were often exposed, all to the good of society (one hopes), much as the Ku Klux Klan and Vigilantes thought they were doing when in their mind law enforcement failed. The social order came to owe much to the "free" press, a phenomenon that the late President Truman averred he had never encountered.

Unfortunately when monopoly reaches its powerful hand into almost any premises the scene changes. Reason is not then left free to combat error, except at the pleasure of the media. A monopoly in the hands of the Klan or the Vigilantes would hardly be regarded with equanimity by people jealous of self-government.

Oh, there are benevolent monopolists in the form of editors, publishers and broadcasters, just as there have been benevolent monarchs and even dictators; but benevolence in monopolists cannot be had on order nor assured of arrival on the scene when it is needed nor brought back when it is set aside. The same may be said of benevolence in newspaper editors. In any contest on the subject it is worth reflecting, the press easily has the last word.

A publisher or editor usually appears on the mundane scene uninvited. He develops his business just as a bicycle manufacturer or a peanut vendor. He may or may not prosper. The risks are his own. He remains relatively unknown in many instances, unobtrusively behind the scene until one day, should it so turn out by chance or by contrivance, he engages in a campaign (i.e., takes the apple from the tempting hand of Eve) and then engages in another and yet another campaign until he becomes addicted. Very likely he hits the jackpot in the form of excited public attention. He may surface, and surely sees to it, if he has good business sense, that he does surface on the side of the angels even though the path to hypocrisy may lie that way. In time, sometimes nearly a life span, he becomes a community force and has ample opportunity to savor his new power—and it feels good. He is now a duke or a prince in his own right even though never elected or exposed to an electorate, and not removable from his post. He can in fact establish a dynasty without fear of eviction from the outside. He is sought eagerly enough, for he disposes of that highly prized and feared commodity, power—power, moreover, quite silently to make or break, be it persons, movements or causes. He has become a fixture and whom he presumes to serve as a watchdog while also presiding over them as something of a tutor in civic morality and arbiter in almost everything. He need no longer in fact bother to stay on the side of the angels at all times.

Possibly it does not occur to the editor or publisher that when he campaigns he is in that unholy condition known as a conflict of interest; for how can he fill the demands of a campaign, and drive toward the victory it calls for, and at the same time avoid the biased reporting that makes him a bad journalist? The campaigner is inevitably dedicated to one side of an issue. If he is to be consistently and conscientiously fair he loses his effectiveness as a campaigner. If he does wish to win he is drawn by the strongest motivation to compromise journalistic principles. The temptation to conceal his bias waxes.

He has critical writers at his command who may be regarded as independent, but he does not have to keep them forever or promote them, and they know it. They will be able to deliver thrusts of rhetoric of their own, be the blade dipped in venom or in the milk of human kindness. The campaigning columnist or even the newswriter may himself become a Caesar or is so tempted and sometimes finds himself poorly resistant. Knowingly or not he may become a species of alter

ego of his employer, but simultaneously prizes his presumed independence as a holy icon; and, by heavens, he believes himself and in himself.

As an embattled columnist he is not unlike the unchained fierce watchdog in a well-fenced enclosure. He can become specifically obnoxious, snarling and abominably blood-thirsty, well knowing that no one can reach him. From this sanctuary he can tear the objects of his disaffection to shreds in quivering and squirming effigy. These cannot reciprocate effectively because (1) they have no newspaper appearing daily to carry their message, and (2) he does, sometimes by the hundreds. Moreover the critic has the First Amendment, as it is currently interpreted, to protect him, not to mention the hydra-headed last word. Moreover, he is well versed in the loopholes of the libel laws.

A part of the theory of such one-sided freedom seems to be that the ugly truths that people in a civilized society would never utter to each other for the sake of decent and neighborly regard, should be given currency under a special dispensation to the press—a view that would have more merit if it parroted of real reciprocity. The answer of the press is that the protected watchdog is needed, nasty as it is, because society is too torpid to look out for itself, as if we did not have the police and the courts for discovery and punishment of misdemeanors and felonies. The excuse of the Klan and the Vigilantes was the same: the constituted authorities did not perform their duties.

Now that the media have grown to lusty proportions they are bent on elbowing their way into precincts hitherto reserved to forces of government as provided in the Constitution. They use their power of bombardment to enshrine themselves both as tutelary deities and as avenging angels over officialdom, leaving the citizen or voter on the sidelines to suck his thumb. We might wonder what style of empire the Klan might have built had it enjoyed both the immunity of the press and its unparalleled power of offensive and defensive weaponry. Who could have dislodged the Klan?

The protection extended under the First Amendment opened the way to the expression of the most misanthropic tendencies, if they are present; and this liberation apparently is regarded as a good. Giving rein to those tendencies occasionally might even be good for the news business. There is good reason then why the temptation to blackmail or its threat might be weakly resisted by those holding the power. This might also explain why the elusive favor of potential *enfants terribles* should be sought as discreet insurance or as a valuable asset in the struggling world, by public men, candidates, prospective candidates, promoters of causes and large corporations. A more fertile soil for corruption is not readily to be found. Invitations to free help-yourself events, such as gourmet delights with generous outpourings; trips, games and sundry other diversions and excursions can be turned to good account as seeds of reciprocal future favors. Who needs a critic as an enemy, especially when the latter is a newspaper? Who needs a newsmen as an enemy when he could perhaps be cultivated as a friend—a friend of such immeasurable potentials?

The mayhem practiced by protected critics can be explained, aside from its commercial value, perhaps by one or both of the two human psychological tendencies or actualities known as sadism and masochism.

When man is let loose in a fully protected environment, having no need to fear reprisal from any source, no reason to think that he has anything to explain except to the boss, who perhaps likes what his hireling is doing, having possibly set him on his course and pointed him in the desired direction in

the first place—when man is thus liberated and freed of inhibition he is capable (do not doubt it) as it was done in San Francisco and elsewhere, of elbowing helpless Chinese pedestrians on the sidewalks out of his way, putting convicts in chain gangs (and not only on the Gulag Archipelago), abusing subordinates by flaunting in their faces overt evidence of exquisite contempt of their feeling and engaging in transparent hypocrisies as proof of invincible upperhandmanship! The critic may thus indeed write as obtrusively and irresponsibly as the balance sheet of his employer's medium may sustain, considering the formidable power of revenge that resides in the protected press.

It goes without saying that newspaper reporters, editors and commentators are generally quite professional in their attitude, and decent as men. The same may, however, also be said of politicians and public officials. Nevertheless the framers of our Constitution well knowing this, did not deem it sufficient protection of the public against the lapses into villainy, fraud, despotic behavior of men in power. They were too well aware of the cargo of aboriginal sin carried under everyman's skin, this side of sainthood, to be lured into a naive and helpless trust of human nature. Therefore they took the elaborate precautions we find in the Constitution.

Since the press was left out of this field of reciprocal restraints, our Constitution-makers left to its own devices a force in human self-government the dimensions of which they could not foresee.

Now the press presumes to be something of an overseer of government in all its departments. The debates over the powers of government proposed in the Constitution were detailed and prolonged. The press received no comparable attention. In view of the high office to which it now aspires and seems intent on filling without popular ratification, is it not time that the press be put through a comparable course of examination?

Assume if you will, how a proposal to dismantle and eliminate the Constitutional precautions applied to government would be received by the public! Answer that question and you will also have the key to the question of press responsibility.

THE HARD ROAD TO WORLD ORDER—V

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the fifth and final part of Prof. Richard Gardner's analysis of the need for, and the difficulties in the way of, achieving world cooperation, he makes several recommendations for U.S. policy that he considers critical for the establishment of a system of world cooperation.

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

THE HARD ROAD TO WORLD ORDER

V

If the functional approach to world order is to have any kind of chance, there are some obvious things the United States will need to do.

One obvious and pressing need is to take a hard look at the way the American government is organized to cope with the present sweep of multilateral negotiations. Multi-

lateral diplomacy increasingly cuts across the interests of many domestic departments. The effort to resolve foreign policy conflicts between agencies has led during the past decade to excessive concentration of power in the White House. The new practice of having cabinet officers like the Secretary of State and Secretary of the Treasury double as assistants to the President, with responsibility for directing policy in certain areas, offers a new opportunity to coordinate our approach to different multilateral negotiations, achieve consistent solutions to structural problems, involve the necessary disciplines and interest groups in the policy process, and exploit potential "trade-offs" between different negotiating sectors. The mechanism of the National Security Council (NSC) could be used more than it has been to achieve these objectives.

Moreover, for many of the multilateral negotiations discussed earlier, we could establish an interagency task force as a subgroup of the NSC, with a supporting staff in the executive department most directly concerned with the subject matter. The model could be the NSC interagency task force on the law of the sea and the new office established in the State Department for the law of the sea negotiations. It would also be useful for many of the ongoing negotiations to appoint an outstanding professional from within the government or from private life to serve as Ambassador-at-Large to direct the U.S. negotiating team. Regular congressional consultation and private-sector involvement through a working (not ceremonial) public advisory group—as is now the case on the law of the sea—could assure a more open and democratic policy-making process.

It is people, of course, not just boxes on organizational charts, that determine the effectiveness of a nation's policy process. Our ambassadors to the United Nations and other international agencies should be individuals with broad experience and deep substantive knowledge; their staffs should consist of the best talent our country can make available, not only from the foreign service but from the business, academic, professional and scientific communities. We will know we are serious about our "world order business" when we stop using positions in our missions and delegations to international agencies for political payoffs, and start applying the same requirements of excellence here that we apply in negotiations with the Russians and Chinese. Another test of our seriousness will be the extent to which we include in the very top structure of decision-making—in the White House and the key executive departments—persons experienced in and committed to the multilateral approach.

Third, we need to put a new emphasis on world order issues in our bilateral negotiations with former adversaries, nonaligned nations, and old allies. In particular, this would mean using our negotiating leverage to encourage the Russians and Chinese to take a more affirmative position on such matters as the law of the sea, international programs to curb population growth, U.N. peace-keeping and U.N. financing, and the reform of the decision-making and law-making processes along the lines mentioned earlier. This will be a difficult and long-term effort, but there will be a growing number of people in both countries who understand the necessity of tackling such issues in a cooperative and non-dogmatic way; we could strengthen their hand by the right kinds of initiatives. For example, we have created a dozen U.S.-U.S.S.R. bilateral commissions as the result of the summit meetings: we could use the SALT Commission to explore the possibilities of mutual nonintervention by the superpowers in Third-World areas and of limiting the spread of nuclear and conventional arms; we could seek support for global health and population programs in the bilateral health commission; and we could press in

the environmental commission for Soviet cooperation in global efforts to curb whaling, protect ocean fisheries, and regulate land-based sources of marine pollution. We could place a similar priority on world order issues in our relations with the European countries and Japan both bilaterally and in regional forums like NATO and OECD. And we could work harder to strike a "world order bargain" with the developing countries—showing more interest in their priorities in order to encourage their support for ours.

Most important of all, we need a more principled approach to the conduct of foreign policy. Instead of citing the U.N. Charter and other sources of international law when it suits our short-term interest and ignoring them when it does not, we would recognize our long-term interest in strengthening the norms and processes of a civilized world community. We would make a greater effort to use our armed force and economic power consistently with multilateral undertakings and with other sources of international law, submitting disputes wherever possible to third-party settlement. We would resort to unilateral action only in very exceptional circumstances where multilateral processes were clearly unavailable, and any unilateral action on our part would be carried out in a manner calculated to promote the restoration of multilateral processes. To be specific, we would abolish the CIA's "dirty tricks" department, avoid the excesses of unilateralism that characterized our Vietnam and Dominican interventions, do more to strengthen multilateral processes in foreign economic policy, and show a really objective concern with human rights questions on a global basis—whether within the borders of former adversaries, neutrals, allies, or in our own society. This does not mean unilateral disarmament or ignoring valid concerns of national security. It does mean recognizing that national security can only be promoted from now on by achieving a better balance between traditional preoccupations with power relationships and emerging requirements of global order.

Implicit in all these recommendations is a redefinition of our foreign policy objectives. We would make it clear that a "structure of peace" cannot be achieved merely by maintaining a precarious balance between five power centers—that it requires strengthened international institutions at the global and regional levels in which all interested nations have a chance to participate. By making "world order business" our central preoccupation we could help rebuild support for our foreign policy at home and abroad by identifying our purposes more closely with those of the rest of mankind. By demonstrating a commitment to constructive internationalism, we could find common ground between generations as well as political parties.

We were to commit ourselves fully to the multilateral approach, were we to enlist the energies of our Congress and our citizens, were we to exploit to the fullest what leverage we still have with other nations, we might begin, very gradually, to deflect the divisive tendencies of nationalism that are now emerging and to exploit the latent possibilities for strengthening the international system. Some may object that a generation of arduous and possibly futile negotiations on specific functional problems is not a very inspiring prospect to put before a democratic electorate. Let them ponder again the words of Dickens: "It was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to Heaven, we were all going direct the other way." We do have to aim in one direction or the other. The road to world order will still be a long and hard one, but since the short cuts do not lead anywhere we have no choice but to take it.

THE 1954 HYDROGEN BOMB TEST STILL TAKING DEVASTATING TOLL

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the 1954 hydrogen bomb test at Bikini atoll is still taking its devastating toll 20 years later. Today's New York Times carries a disturbing story by its well-known science editor, Walter Sullivan, relating some of the medical complications that have befallen those residents of Rongelap Island who were 125 miles away from the blast site.

The two latest victims will be entering the hospital to have surgery for a thyroid condition that is potentially cancerous. One of these victims was in the womb at the time of the blast.

Mr. Speaker, for the last decade and a half I have been working and organizing for a complete test ban treaty and for nuclear disarmament. If there was any one item that could make us all see the folly of the continued arms race, it is this article.

I now insert the article into the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, June 3, 1974]

RADIATION FROM H-TEST IN 1954

STILL TAKING TOLL

(By Walter Sullivan)

On March 1, 1954, a hydrogen bomb exploding at Bikini Atoll cast a cloud of radioactive coral dust that later rained down unexpectedly on islands far downwind as well as on a Japanese fishing boat.

This week two more natives of Rongelap Island, 125 miles from the site of the blast, will be operated on for thyroid abnormalities. One was in his mother's womb at the time of the test explosion.

The surgery will bring to 25, the number of inhabitants of that island who have undergone such treatment during the intervening 20 years. Apart from those conceived but not yet born, there were 89 on the island when the radioactive debris fell there.

THYROID NODULES

Since then one has died of leukemia. Of the 17 who were less than 10 years old at the time, all but two have developed nodules or tumors of the thyroid gland and in two cases the thyroid failed to function entirely and the growth of the children was stunted. Now, because of treatment with artificial thyroid hormones, the children's normal growth has resumed.

In the course of the followup medical program, four operations revealed cancerous tumors of the thyroid, one in a resident of another island, Rongerik, where the exposure to radiation was considerably less.

According to Dr. Robert Conrad, head of the medical team that has visited the island periodically over the last 20 years, the Rongerik case may be one of the small number of thyroid tumors that occur naturally.

The results of his most recent visit and the continuing need for surgical treatment were reported by the Friends of Micronesia, an organization based in Berkeley, Calif. Dr. Conrad, reached by telephone at the Brookhaven National Laboratory near Upton, L. I., where he is based, confirmed the report.

ISLANDERS NOW SAFE

Although the atolls of Bikini and Eniwetok, where the nuclear tests took place, are no

longer dangerously radioactive, it is still unsafe to eat coconut crabs from the north end of Rongelap. Dr. Conrad said that apparently the crabs eat their shells, thus perpetuating a relatively high level of such substances as strontium 90.

The latter is chemically enough like calcium that it becomes incorporated into shell or bone through the same biological process as calcium does.

The thyroid surgery will be performed at Cleveland Metropolitan General Hospital in Ohio, Dr. Conrad said. A third case uncovered by the screening program, a woman now 45 years old, who moved to the island after the blast, will also be treated surgically.

The woman was part of a "control" group of islanders not exposed to the original fallout who therefore could serve as a basis for estimating the effects of exposure.

Examination of the woman a few weeks ago disclosed thyroid nodules that in a normal population usually prove harmless. While hers do not appear to be cancerous, Dr. Conrad said, they are being removed as a precaution.

HIGH INCIDENCE FOUND

This is the second occurrence of such nodules among members of the control group.

Nearly 28 per cent of those who were exposed to the original radiation have developed nodules or tumors, in contrast to an average incidence of 3 to 4 per cent among Americans, Dr. Conrad said.

In addition, during the first five years after exposure the rate of miscarriages among the Rongelap women was also higher, but it has returned to normal, he said.

Two other groups were accidentally exposed to the radiation: 23 Japanese fishermen, one of whom later died, and 28 American military personnel. The fishermen were aboard a vessel that was less than a hundred miles from the site of the explosion.

The Americans, on Rongerik, 30 miles east of Rongelap, received a dose of only 60 rads (the rad being a unit of radiation exposure), whereas the people on Rongelap sustained 175 rads. Follow-up results on the Americans have apparently not been published.

Because in its chemical function the thyroid gland picks up iodine, the radioactive isotope iodine 131 is suspected as a cause of the thyroid effect. The development of nodules by someone who was in the womb at the time of the explosion could mean that iodine 131 crossed through the placenta. However, Dr. Conrad pointed out that the mother and the unborn child were also exposed to penetrating gamma rays, which could have played a role.

Dr. Conrad said that in his two decades of regular visits he has found the islanders to be generally cooperative and that he has come to regard them as friends. However, their experience has affected not only their health, he said, but also their way of life.

The United States gave the islanders \$950,000 in 1962 as compensation, but most of the money has been spent. Native industries have reportedly withered, and now the islanders are seeking more money. Dr. Conrad said he hoped that any further compensation would be incorporated into a trust fund for long-term benefit.

Agitation against the medical follow-up program included the assertion that the exposure had been intentional so that the islanders could be used as guinea pigs.

However, Dr. Conrad said an independent medical team consisting of two Japanese, a Briton and an American was appointed by the native legislature—the Congress of Micronesia—and that that step had helped end such contentions.

With both island test sites—Bikini and Eniwetok—now considered fit for habitation, Dr. Conrad said, three families have moved back to Bikini and 40 homes have been built there for the returnees. On Eniwetok the villages will have to be rebuilt before anyone can return, he said.

DISCREPANCIES IN TAX EVASION
SENTENCINGS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, for some time, I have been concerned about the confusing and varied administration of our Nation's tax laws and the conflicts which are created by the diverse routes of judicial appeal which may often be selected by the taxpayer and his counsel.

Under present law, after the taxpayer has exhausted his appeal rights within the IRS bureaucracy, he may carry his case to court. If he chooses not to pay the contested sum, he can go to Tax Court. The Tax Court was originally established in 1942 and consists of 16 judges who serve 15-year terms of office. The Tax Court has national jurisdiction. From it, appeals go to the 11 U.S. circuit courts of appeal. The appeal must be made to the court of the judicial circuit that covers the geographical area where the corporation or individual taxpayer has his principal place of business or residence. Depending on the decision of an area's circuit court and the action—or nonaction—by the Supreme Court, the tax laws of the Nation may vary considerably from court to court and region to region.

There is an alternative judicial appeal route. If a taxpayer pays the proposed deficiency, he may then file for a refund either in a district court or in the Court of Claims.

Obviously, there is a great opportunity for conflicting tax law opinion at any given time. It may be wise to consider a change in the tax judicial structure—which would make the same law apply equally to all citizens and which would prevent tax forum shopping.

Although the Agnew precedent has substantially mutilated the use of fear of prison as a deterrent to tax evasion, there is earlier evidence that cases could be moved to courts of light sentence. The District Court for Northern Alabama, for example, sentenced over 10 times as many tax evaders in the period between fiscal years 1946 and 1973, as the Federal District Courts of Middle and Southern Alabama. In the Northern Alabama District, only 9.5 percent went to prison, while in the Middle and Southern Alabama Districts, nearly 50 percent were imprisoned. There is more than a casual relationship between case volume and light sentence.

There is an incredible variation in the sentencing practices throughout the Nation for tax evasion and related cases. It is incomprehensible that a person in the Western Judicial District of Virginia has about one-seventeenth the chance of serving a prison sentence as a resident of the Western Judicial District of Washington. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Judicial Center or other offices would work for an improved uniformity in the treatment of tax evasion cases.

Following is a letter I recently received on this issue from Internal Revenue

Service Commissioner Donald C. Alexander along with a record of sentences and confinements for tax evasion for the period between fiscal years 1946 and 1973:

COMMISSIONER,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., April 22, 1974.
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VANIK: Your March 1 inquiry to then Assistant Secretary Morgan, requesting statistical data on indictments and sentencing practices in income tax evasion and related cases, was forwarded to the Service for reply.

We are pleased to enclose the following charts which contain the types of information you requested:

Number of Indictments and Informations in Tax Evasion and Related Cases for each of the Fiscal Years 1964 through Fiscal Year 1973, inclusive.

Sentencing Practices by Judicial Circuits and Districts for the period, Fiscal Year 1946 through Fiscal Year 1973, inclusive.

We would be happy to provide you with any other data needed similar to that contained in the enclosed charts.

With kind regards,
Sincerely,

DONALD C. ALEXANDER.

Enclosures.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE INTELLIGENCE DIVISION
INDICTMENTS AND INFORMATIONS IN TAX EVASION AND
RELATED CASES, FISCAL YEARS 1964-73

Fiscal year	Income and miscellaneous cases	Wagering	Total
1964	679	898	1,577
1965	823	1,096	1,919
1966	767	893	1,660
1967	677	665	1,342
1968	652	374	1,026
1969	631	18	649
1970	891	33	924
1971	952	4	956
1972	1,074	11	1,085
1973	1,176	10	1,186
Grand total	8,322	4,002	12,324

SENTENCING PRACTICES BY JUDICIAL CIRCUITS AND
DISTRICTS IN TAX EVASION AND RELATED CASES, FISCAL
YEARS 1946-73

Circuit and district	Total sentenced	Number imprisoned	Percent to prison
1st circuit	703	355	50.5
Maine	75	29	38.7
Massachusetts	500	274	54.8
New Hampshire	40	16	40.0
Rhode Island	88	36	40.9
2d circuit	2,567	855	33.3
Connecticut	280	126	45.0
New York:			
Northern	322	42	13.0
Eastern	704	249	35.4
Southern	1,021	408	40.9
Western	212	21	9.9
Vermont	28	9	32.1
3d circuit	1,610	483	30.0
Delaware	66	23	34.8
Pennsylvania:			
Eastern	474	137	28.9
Middle	518	161	31.1
Western	236	74	31.4
New Jersey	316	88	27.8
4th circuit	1,331	487	36.6
Maryland	383	228	59.5

Circuit and district	Total sentenced	Number imprisoned	Percent to prison
North Carolina:			
Eastern	61	8	13.1
Middle	107	40	37.4
Western	145	32	22.1
South Carolina			
Eastern	149	53	35.6
Western	9	3	33.3
Virginia:			
Eastern	243	84	34.6
Western	55	3	5.5
West Virginia:			
Northern	128	23	18.0
Southern	51	13	25.5
5th circuit	2,168	711	32.8
Alabama:			
Northern	200	19	9.5
Middle	18	10	55.6
Southern	12	5	41.7
Florida:			
Northern	25	13	52.0
Middle	91	51	56.0
Southern	413	213	51.6
Georgia:			
Northern	301	40	13.3
Middle	29	8	27.6
Southern	40	8	20.0
Louisiana:			
Eastern	193	66	34.2
Western	51	9	17.6
Mississippi:			
Northern	11	6	54.5
Southern	116	21	18.1
Texas:			
Northern	267	101	37.8
Eastern	58	30	51.7
Southern	112	54	48.2
Western	231	57	24.7
6th circuit	1,533	595	38.8
Kentucky:			
Eastern	26	12	46.2
Western	199	129	64.8
Michigan:			
Eastern	375	74	19.7
Western	46	17	37.0
Ohio:			
Northern	379	136	35.9
Southern	297	96	32.3
Tennessee:			
Eastern	48	33	68.8
Middle	120	62	51.7
Western	43	36	83.7
7th circuit	1,317	653	49.6
Illinois:			
Northern	548	312	56.9
Eastern	65	26	40.0
Southern	208	40	19.2
Indiana:			
Northern	60	42	70.0
Southern	232	138	59.5
Wisconsin:			
Eastern	181	79	43.6
Western	23	16	69.6
8th circuit	1,360	498	36.6
Arkansas:			
Eastern	68	20	29.4
Western	16	4	25.0
Iowa:			
Northern	49	13	26.5
Southern	106	70	66.0
Minnesota:			
Northern	271	73	26.9
Missouri:			
Eastern	281	186	66.2
Western	271	99	36.5
Nebraska:			
Northern	191	18	9.4
Southern	63	15	23.8
South Dakota:			
Northern	44	0	0.0
9th circuit	2,345	1,052	44.9
Alaska			
Northern	29	11	37.9
Southern	104	54	51.9
California:			
Northern	367	208	56.7
Southern	508	152	29.9
Central	225	76	33.8
Eastern	301	88	29.2
Hawaii			
Northern	80	47	58.8
Southern	79	21	26.6
Idaho			
Northern	68	15	21.7
Southern	77	25	32.5
Nevada			
Northern	238	137	57.6
Southern			
Western	71	51	71.8
Eastern	197	167	84.8
10th circuit	734	309	42.1
Colorado			
Northern	157	100	63.7
Southern	188	58	30.9
Western	79	45	57.0

Circuit and district	Total sentenced	Number imprisoned	Percent to prison
Oklahoma:			
Northern.....	41	19	46.3
Eastern.....	15	5	33.3
Western.....	104	16	15.4
Utah.....	107	51	47.7
Wyoming.....	43	15	34.9
District of Columbia.....	32	16	50.0
U.S. total.....	15,700	6,014	38.3

TONY TURTURICI IS NAMED PUBLIC WORKS MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pause for a moment to recognize the achievement of Tony Turturici who will receive this year's Public Works Man of the Year award in San Jose this June 13.

Tony Turturici deserves this award as few other public works directors in this country do. Tony first came to work for the city of San Jose in 1951. Since that time he has seen the city grow from a small, somewhat rural community to the thriving metropolitan area that it is today. As always, growth brings problems along with benefits. Tony has been there throughout to try to meet these problems. His many efforts are really too numerous to list, but his participation in water quality control with the task force on clean water for the League of California Cities and with the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board, among numerous other groups, cannot go unmentioned.

Just recently, Tony has helped with the planning of 27 neighborhood parks and sport fields and the Police Athletic League sports complex. He has also been instrumental in planning the new main library in San Jose, along with six branch libraries. Under his guidance, plans have been prepared to improve lighting throughout the city of San Jose, and to improve city street signs.

His efforts in behalf of environmentally sound sewage disposal for the city San Jose cannot be overlooked. In fact, all his many efforts have been directed toward enhancing the San Jose area—toward making it a better and healthier place to live for all its citizens.

How many of us ever give a thought to the tremendous work and dedication that goes into the planning of services that we use every day of our lives—services like proper sewage disposal, readable street signs, efficiently designed fire stations? I am afraid that the answer is that very few of us think about these things. In fact, we do not have to worry about it because a talented and dedicated Public Works Director Tony Turturici has already taken care of the problems.

So, I am delighted that, after all his important efforts over so many years, Tony is being honored this June. It is certainly about time that all of us in San

Jose show our appreciation and gratitude for a job well done.

SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATION LIST TO BE ABOLISHED BY EXECUTIVE ORDER

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people will be happy to learn that the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations is to be abolished by Executive order. One does not know if this means: First, our leaders no longer feel that there are individuals and organizations within our country who would overthrow our constitutional system of government; second, the list was detrimental to détente and our new Communist business partners; or and third, whether the Constitution has already been sacked. I include a related newsclipping at this point:

[From the Washington Star-News, June 2, 1974]

SUBVERSIVES LISTING TO END

(By Margaret Gentry)

President Nixon plans to abolish the attorney general's list of so-called subversive organizations, a product of the 1950s Red scare era, administration sources say.

The White House has drafted an executive order which would do away with the list and Nixon plans to sign it, the sources report.

Atty. Gen. William B. Saxbe recommended the move, after reviving a review of the list initiated by former Atty. Gen. Elliot L. Richardson.

"The list is irrelevant and legally we're in a bind on it," a White House official said. An official of the department's criminal division has called it "absolutely worthless."

In 1947 President Truman ordered the department to maintain a list of "totalitarian, fascist, Communist or subversive" organizations as a tool for screening applicants for government jobs.

Four years later, the Supreme Court ruled no group could be placed on the list without a hearing. Later court decisions blocked the government from refusing to hire an applicant solely because of his membership in one of the questionable group.

The list dropped into obscurity after the Red scare subsided.

Nevertheless, some 300 organizations officially are still labeled subversive. Only about 20 still exist.

The list includes the Communist Party USA, the Ku Klux Klan and such other groups as the National Blue Star Mothers of America and the Committee to Uphold the Bill of Rights.

The militant groups of recent years were never added to the official listing. The FBI and other government agencies have conducted surveillance operations against those groups without formally declaring them subversive. The FBI refuses to disclose its policies and procedures for placing an organization and its members under surveillance.

Nixon tried to revive the list three years ago by instructing the highly paid but unproductive Subversive Activities Control Board to monitor and update it. Congress opposed the move and cut off all funds for the board, which went out of business in 1973.

MIZELL'S NEWSLETTER FOR MAY

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I have recently sent my constituents a newsletter reporting on legislative topics of interest to them with which the House has dealt during the month of May. Keeping our constituents informed of our actions on their behalf is one of our most important jobs as Members of Congress, and I want to share with my colleagues the substance of my newsletter.

My newsletter for the month of May 1974 follows:

MIZELL NEWS

The House of Representatives has been busy in recent weeks with a variety of legislative issues, and I wanted to take this means to inform you of action taken on matters of interest to you.

BLUE RIDGE

I have received many letters regarding the status of the proposed Blue Ridge Power Project, and I am happy to report that on Tuesday, May 28, the Senate passed by a vote of 49 to 19 a bill similar to the one I introduced in the House, authorizing a study of the New River in North Carolina and Virginia for possible future inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. I am pleased that hearings on my bill have been scheduled for June 3 by the National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, chaired by Representative Roy A. Taylor of North Carolina. The Senate Interior Committee concluded that the project is of dubious economic value and would destroy valuable recreational, biological and historic resources unnecessarily. I am greatly encouraged by the progress of our efforts to date, and I want to thank the many citizens of the 5th Congressional District for the active interest they have taken in this issue. Along with other North Carolinians whom I have invited, I will be testifying before Representative Taylor's subcommittee and will certainly continue to push for favorable consideration of my bill by the full House as soon as possible.

BUSING

After Senate action on the education bill, I stated that I was disappointed that the Senate version of the measure did not include the House language permitting the reopening of previously decided court cases regarding the forced busing of children to achieve racial balance in our schools. I am in agreement with most Americans and a majority of the citizens of the 5th Congressional District that forced busing is harmful to the educational process and has created administrative chaos in our schools. It is obvious also that the policing of busing undermines public support of our schools. Those of us in the House who oppose busing have introduced an amendment to the Constitution which would settle the issue once and for all, but the amendment process is long and arduous. Thus, we are also working hard to insure that the House instructs its Conferees, who will negotiate with the Senate on the education bill, to insist that the House language is retained in the final bill. Congress has both the authority and the responsibility to end illogical and self-defeating policy before it destroys the best public educational system yet produced by any nation.

HIGHWAYS

Another matter of concern to citizens of the 5th District is the traffic load on some of

our Federal highways. Recently I met with North Carolina Secretary of Transportation Bruce Lentz and the North Carolina Congressional Delegation to discuss possible remedies for an inadequately designated and funded Federal-Aid Primary System in the State. As a result of our meeting, the delegation has written U.S. Secretary of Transportation Claude S. Brinegar emphasizing our belief that the 402 miles of highway recommended by the Department under the new Priority Primary Routes program "should represent the absolute minimum of Priority Primary Route mileage allotted to North Carolina." Included in the proposed mileage in North Carolina are the I-40 bypass at Winston-Salem, U.S. 52 between Winston-Salem and Lexington, and U.S. 311 between Winston-Salem and U.S. 220.

COST OVERRUNS ON ABM'S

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Army has juggled its books making it impossible to determine the true cause of nearly \$1.3 billion in cost overruns on the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system (ABM). I am releasing a General Accounting Office report which outlines the problems in determining the true cause of these overruns.

I believe that the Army has violated Pentagon rules in identifying the cause of costs and may have consciously concealed part of these cost overruns.

A \$1.3 billion cost overrun is the difference between the original May 1969 planning estimate for a two-site ABM and a current one-site system near completion in Great Falls, N. Dak. According to GAO the two ABM sites will cost \$4.185 billion. Today one ABM site will cost \$5.403 billion.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to determine the extent of cost overruns on a one-site ABM as the Army claims it never developed a one-site ABM estimate. Only a two-site estimate was developed by the Army in 1969 when the ABM program was first proposed to Congress.

It would be unfair to the Army to take the original cost estimate for two sites or \$4.19 billion divided by half \$2.09 billion and claim any cost increase above that amount should be labeled a cost overrun. Such a calculation would be too rough and would not properly allocate the cost of research development for the entire ABM.

Army records are apparently incomplete or nonexistent making it impossible for GAO investigators to precisely determine the reason for the cost increases. The ABM program was limited by the SALT I agreement to two sites and subsequently Congress decided to cancel an ABM site planned for construction in the Washington, D.C., area.

Before the signing of the treaty, ABM costs contained in quarterly reports to Congress were based on a four-site system. When the three sites were then canceled the Army continued to include in its cost estimates increases associated with the three sites even though they would

never be built. It appears the Army has concocted an accounting scheme devised to deceive Congress and the public on the terribly high cost overruns that have occurred on the Safeguard program.

The Army would like to blame Congress and the signing of the ABM treaty for these cost overruns and have so muddied the waters that it is impossible to completely assess the true dimensions of the Army's foul-up.

WEEKLY ENERGY REPORT EDITOR LISTS WHAT IS WRONG WITH H.R. 11500

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in concise form the editor of Weekly Energy Report in his June 3 issue lists why the bill H.R. 11500, which would cut the Nation's coal supply by up to one-third, is unacceptable by the administration. Eleven reasons are listed as follows:

INTERIM REQUIREMENTS

The interim compliance requirements of the bill during the period from its enactment until permanent standards are established are considered unworkable. The requirements would prevent opening new mines and bring existing mining to a halt because adequate time is not allowed for specifying interim requirements, says the Administration.

DESIGNATING LANDS UNSUITABLE FOR MINING

The bill appears to create a general presumption that all lands are unsuitable for mining unless the contrary case is justified in accordance with burdensome and time-consuming procedures.

SURFACE SUBSIDENCE OF UNDERGROUND MINING

Rigid and unrealistic requirements for control of surface subsidence could prevent the mining of 17 to 117 million tons of coal in 1975.

EXCLUSION OF SURFACE MINING IN NATIONAL FORESTS

Coal could not be mined in national forest lands even when the best application of multiple use principles demonstrated that such mining was the best use of the lands.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

The bill's provision with respect to maintenance of hydrological balance, mining on steep slopes, and returning lands to "approximate original contour" would amount to an outright prohibition of mining in some areas and an adverse impact on production in others (e.g., provisions relating to mountaintop mining, thick seams and spoil on the down slope would result in a production loss of up to 59 million tons in 1975).

SURFACE OWNER PROVISIONS

The bill in effect would provide a new right to surface owners of lands where the Federal Government owns subsurface rights.

PERMIT APPLICATION DATA

Extensive data required by the permit applicant would adversely affect small operators who mined 34 million tons in 1972.

RECLAMATION OF PAST MINED LAND

The bill would result in charges to current consumers of coal for correcting past practices. First priority must be given to reclaiming land associated with current surface mining.

PROGRAM FOR NON-COAL-MINE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CONTROL

Non-coal mine regulations should be included only in conjunction with a full non-coal regulatory program and not be included in coal surface mine legislation.

CITIZEN SUITS

The bill would go beyond the scope of any citizen suit provision presently in other environmental laws; it could subject operators, the Federal Government, and State regulatory authorities to serious risk of undue harassment. This could result in the frustrating implementation of the Act and prevent the needed increase in coal production.

MINING AND MINERAL RESEARCH CENTERS

The bill would authorize establishment of mining and mineral research centers in a manner which would fragment and undermine current research efforts and priorities. (A bill passed by the 92nd Congress containing similar provisions was vetoed by the President.)

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a statement of my financial assets and sources of income.

The information given follows the form of the official financial disclosure statement required by rule XLIV of the House of Representatives, including both the public and nonpublic portions of the statement.

Mr. Speaker, I also include a complete statement of my securities holdings and their value, some of which are not required to be disclosed in the official statement.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I also include a statement of Federal and State—Indiana—income taxes paid by me during tax year 1973:

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS

1. Securities Holdings: (Value as of May 20, 1974).

279 shares Mass. Inv. Trust.....	\$2,926.71
25 shares General Motors.....	1,156.25
50 shares Advanced Ross.....	158.00
200 shares Sea Containers.....	3,328.00
50 shares Union Carbide.....	1,992.00
50 shares Xerox Corp.....	5,650.00
6000 AT&T 8 1/4% of 200 bonds.....	6,067.20

2. Income from professional organizations: None.

3. Income from a single source exceeding \$5,000, including salary: None.

4. Capital gains from a single source exceeding \$5,000: None.

5. Reimbursement for expenditures from a single source exceeding \$1,000: None.

6. Sources of honoraria aggregating \$300 or more from a single source (1973): American Institute for Imported Steel; Task Force on Continuing Education (Univ. of Notre Dame); University of Southern California Andrus Center; Brookings Institution; Hood College; Memphis State University; Ball State University; NBC Today Show; American Orthopsychiatric Association; Order of Ahepa, Pennsylvania Chapter; University of Southern California School Superintendents Assn.; National School Boards Assn.; Committee of the States; Amherst College. Total: \$8,485.00.

7. Unsecured Indebtedness exceeding \$10,000: None.

8. Federal Income Taxes paid, 1973: \$8,257.04.
 9. Indiana Income Taxes paid, 1973: \$1,258.86.

THE NEW ARMY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, if we are to believe the latest announcement, members of the U.S. Army are no longer to be classified as Americans, but rather groups, mostly Asian or Latin in origin broken down into 12 ethnic minority groups, mostly Asian or Latin in origin and "other."

The new official ethnic designation apparently includes Negro, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Cuban-American, Spanish-descent, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Philippino, Asian-American, Caucasian, or "other." Apparently the only problem is those who have mixed parantages, since the Army also reports that those who do not identify with one of the new categories or who refuse to take part in this new program of ethnic proportions may so indicate.

This being so, some may give as their ethnic designation that they are American.

I insert a related newsclipping:
 [From the Washington Post, June 1, 1974]

ARMY ADDS TO ETHNIC LISTINGS

(By Fred S. Hoffman)

Starting today more than 23,000 soldiers will be given a chance to come out from behind ethnic anonymity.

They are men and women whose Army records list them as "Other" rather than Caucasian or Negro.

The Army says it is expanding official ethnic designations to cover 12 groups, mostly Asian or Latin in origin. Also included are American Indians, Eskimos and Aleuts. Officials estimate these groups account for about 3 per cent of the Army's 789,000 men and women.

"For the past several years, everyone in the Army has been pushed, shoved and squeezed into one of three racial groupings—Negro, Caucasian or other," the Army's Command Information Division said in a circular to the field.

"... This catch-all classification 'other' could hinder the Army's efforts to achieve equal opportunity for these minority groups."

The Army said it needs more detailed ethnic data to check on whether everybody gets a fair break in promotions, assignments, retention and separation.

So unit commanders were instructed to act during June "to properly identify the ethnic group of each soldier, and this will then be entered on the appropriate military personnel rosters."

The new official designations include Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Cuban-American, Spanish descent, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino, and Asian-American.

The Army said soldiers who do not identify with one of the new categories, or who refuse to take part, may so indicate on the forms.

The Air Force, Navy and Marines are expected to follow suit by the end of the year.

The new move marks a turnabout from the early 1960s when the Defense Department eradicated all racial and ethnic identifica-

tions from military personnel records. At that time, officials said such identifications opened the way to possible discrimination.

In another development, the Army has come up with a new recruiting theme: "Join the People who've joined the Army."

This approach, the Army said, "will dramatize personal challenge, pride in service and opportunity to grow and get ahead."

To many old soldiers, this is a vast improvement over an original all-volunteer Army recruiting pitch that used to set their teeth on edge: "Today's Army wants to join you."

That slogan was dropped quietly some time ago after complaints from Army professionals that it had too much of a hat-in-hand sound.

THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN OF BROOKLINE, MASS., CONDEMNS ARAB TERRORISTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to attach herewith the resolution adopted unanimously by the Board of Selectmen of Brookline, Mass. at their meeting on Monday, May 20, 1974.

This moving and compelling statement describes in a graphic way the fearful situation which the Israelis must confront on a daily basis.

I commend this statement to my colleagues:

RESOLUTION BY BROOKLINE, MASS., BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Whereas, Arab terrorist groups and their affiliates are continuing their attacks on innocent children and adults alike; and

Whereas, said barbarous attacks inevitably invite reprisals; and

Whereas, the most recent barbarous attack on school children at Maalot Moshav in Israel is comparable to a holocaust and has shocked the sensibilities of the civilized world; and

Whereas, Arab terrorists have been operating and continue to operate from bases on the soil of sovereign nation members of the United Nations and are subject to the jurisdiction of those sovereign nation members; and

Whereas, said terrorists have placed their camps either within, or directly next to, refugee camps operated on the sovereign soil of Arab nations and thus invite reprisals on civilians; and

Whereas, sovereign Arab nations have encouraged, subsidized, supported terrorist bases on their soil and have taken no action to eliminate them; and

Whereas, so long as said Arab nations fail to eliminate said terrorist activities and allow numerous incursions to occur on Israeli soil and elsewhere those nations are not fit or capable of being members of a civilized national community or of maintaining their sovereignty,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the United States of America

1. Demand that those nations harboring, subsidizing, encouraging or in any way aiding or abetting terrorists forthwith cease said activities.

2. Introduce a resolution in the United Nations for the institution of sanctions against nations harboring, subsidizing, or in any way aiding or abetting terrorists.

3. Withdraw diplomatic recognition of any nation that harbors, subsidizes, encourages or in any way aids or abets terrorists.

4. Refuse, cancel and deny all aid economic, military or moral to any nation that harbors, subsidizes, encourages, or in any way aids or abets terrorists.

5. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the members of the Senate of the United States from Massachusetts and the Members of Congress from this Congressional District.

ROBERT C. COCHRANE, Jr.
 SUMNER Z. KAPLAN.
 HERBERT ABRAMS.
 ELEANOR MYERSON.
 EDWARD NOVAKOFF.

INDIA INVENTS A SUBSTITUTE FOR EATING

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, very recently India exploded its first atomic device, terming it a "peaceful atomic explosion," whatever that is. Using the logic so unique to them that we have become accustomed to, India promptly announced that it was as vigorously opposed as ever before to military uses of atomic energy.

Most international observers indicated that this new fact would almost immediately exacerbate tensions in that entire area of the world. Pakistan already is exhibiting signs of intense unease. It should also be noted that much of India's nuclear work has been aided by Canada, which, in response to India's action, has announced the suspension and review of such aid programs. It should be noted that Canada supplied the most crucial aid by training India's key nuclear scientists in the sixties. There were taught to build a nuclear reactor and to use it to make plutonium.

I for one have little faith that Trudeau's regime is doing anything more than throwing out a smoke screen because of the hue and cry over India's atomic test. They have been quite selective in making arms and military assistance available. In the name of morality and peace he forbids Canada from shipping any military material to Israel, but he finds nothing wrong in shipping nuclear equipment and material to India. Such is modern morality in the gaudy era of third world independence.

India is completely free of formal treaty restraints, largely because that self-appointed conscience of mankind has refused to sign the landmark 1968 nonproliferation treaty, which was the world's first tentative step toward trying to curb the nuclear beast unchained almost 30 years ago. One other nuclear country which refused to sign the treaty is France, perhaps America's worst enemy. France has been aiding India in planning fast-breeder reactors, which produce more weapons-grade plutonium than they consume.

Some of the other consequences which are inevitable now include the creation of new rivalries. Other nations will now hasten their entry into the nuclear club

because of India's example. India's initiative will make it much easier for other nuclear-capable nations to enter the club. In effect, the heat is off them.

It is also a fact that the three nuclear power plants in India have been in part supplied with uranium by our country. We therefore have had a direct hand in bringing India into the nuclear club and these programs should be forthwith discontinued.

Twenty-nine countries have thus far refused to sign the nonproliferation agreement. Next year that treaty would have been up for full review, and observers had hoped that many nonsigners would agree to the treaty. That hope is now gone. The arms limitation agreements being worked on by the United States and Russia are also undermined by India's action.

There is yet another aspect of this situation worthy of mention. For many years now, India has postured and posed as the "spokesman of the Third World," lecturing the rest of the world, particularly the West, on how to behave in international relations. India has emerged as the France of Asia, hating and opposing the United States while demanding aid and understanding from us.

In this manner, we have underwritten most of the policy mistakes of the Indian Government. While India pursued foreign imperialistic adventures of her own, she came to the United States for vast food shipments, technical aid, military aid and foreign policy support.

Meanwhile, she butchered the Assam hill tribesmen, invaded European colonial possessions on the subcontinent, waged aggressive war against several other nations and refused a fair plebiscite in Kashmir, which contains an overwhelmingly Moslem population.

Simultaneously, India took a consistently pro-Soviet, anti-American line, taking us to task for virtually every policy we pursued. Further, nothing has changed. Yet we were continuing to pour food and dollars into India, for which we received vilification.

India's foreign policy reeks of hypocrisy, perhaps even more than does that of France. At least we know the French openly hate America, and will sell weapons to any and all who want to kill their neighbors. At least the French do not pretend to be moral. India does. The Congress would do well to bear all this in mind when India makes another mighty pronouncement about nuclear arms and asks us for more foreign aid.

Already certain international organizations, including the United Nations, are wringing their hands about the world food situation. I personally feel that we should aid as many people as possible in the usual manner in which America has shown compassion. However, how in the name of all that is holy can we stand still for the impending Indian aid request in light of this latest and most intolerable nuclear adventure by that country?

For years we have been regaled with tales of horror about Calcutta and other Indian communities, where people lie on the streets in broad daylight, dying of starvation. America, despite the fact that

India publicly spits in our face and aids our enemies, has poured out largesse, knowing India will never repay us, in the name of compassion. And India has used our aid to feed her people while she bought weapons, including an entire MIG factory, from Russia, and has used other aid to help in building this atomic bomb she has just exploded. I for one know of too many projects in my congressional district crying out for attention and Federal funding, to pour more money down Mrs. Ghandi's gullet so she may posture in front of her anti-American "third world" friends as head of a nuclear State.

In Brooklyn and Queens we do not need Indian atom bombs. We need housing, mass transit aid, better schools, a national health plan, pollution controls, updated programs for the elderly and increased efforts to rid our streets of thugs. The people of the Nation, I believe, share these feelings and want the Congress to express their thoughts in the form of votes.

The United States has no business underwriting India's nuclear program, even indirectly. No further atomic assistance in the name of peaceful uses of the atom should be made available to that nation. Nor should the United States make available any further aid to India in my form for any reason. If the Russians can sell them weapons, then they also can make available to them the other needs they are coming to America for. The time has come for an end to this outrage.

Perhaps when the awful famines predicted for India arrive, and the people call for bread, Mrs. Ghandi will ask that they eat enriched uranium. That ought to make the poor starving masses of India content with their lot. After all, they are the dying citizens of a nuclear power. Is that not peachy-keen?

FATE OF THE MISSING IN ACTION

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that a tight airline schedule prevented me from registering my vote today in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 271, which expresses the strong concern of Congress about the fate of U.S. servicemen missing in action in the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam.

It was my privilege to sponsor a similar resolution which was also considered by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and I am quite pleased to see that House Concurrent Resolution 271 was overwhelmingly approved today.

Under the terms of the Paris peace agreement, there is a clear and unambiguous commitment on the part of the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam to fully cooperate in ascertaining the status of each and every U.S. citizen listed as missing.

A thorough and cooperative effort in complying with this commitment must be initiated before any diplomatic or eco-

nomie relationship can begin between the U.S. and the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam.

Within the contexts of both international law and simple human decency, the justice of the demand entailed in this resolution is evident.

In the future, there exists the possibility that our country and the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam can establish meaningful and peaceful relations.

But these relationships can begin to blossom only when we are as certain as humanely possible as to the fate of all Americans listed as missing in action.

The resolution passed by the House today will serve a useful purpose by expressing the resolve of Congress on the MIA matter. The terms of the Paris agreement must be met, and the people of America must know the fate of her missing sons.

SEGREGATION PERSISTS 20 YEARS AFTER BROWN AGAINST BOARD OF EDUCATION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrated the 20th anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown* against Board of Education we were reminded that the great goals enunciated by the Supreme Court in that decision to end segregation in educational facilities are still to be accomplished 20 years after the date of that historic decision.

Among the best analyses of how far we have come and how far we still have to go which were published during the period of commemoration of the *Brown* decision was two articles in the May 13, 1974, issue of the *New York Times* which examined the impact of the *Brown* decision in the North and the South. These articles, which I place in the *RECORD* for the information of my colleagues, show that we have made great strides in some areas of the South while permitting the North, in many instances, to use more subtle means of resistance to integration to fight the integration directive of the Supreme Court. In some instances, the article points out, schools in Northern cities have become increasingly segregated in 20 years since *Brown*.

It is my hope that this analysis will provide us with a context in which we can face the problem which is still with us—the provision of equal educational opportunity for all our citizens in an integrated social context which benefits both minority and white communities in our efforts to find ways in which we can live peaceably together.

The articles follow:

SCHOOL INTEGRATION RESISTED IN CITIES OF NORTH

(By William E. Farrell)

In the two decades since the United States Supreme Court's historic ruling against "separate but equal" school systems, public school systems in large Northern cities have

largely resisted integration and in numerous instances have grown increasingly segregated.

According to interviews with education specialists and a survey of a number of large cities, the meager—some say “disastrous”—record of the North in creating biracial classrooms results from antipathy to busing for purposes of integration, the complacency and timidity of school boards and other units of government, protracted litigation, the exodus of whites to the suburbs and segregated housing patterns.

Integrationists, citing 20 years that have elapsed since the Supreme Court's historic decision in the case of *Brown v. the Board of Education of Topeka*, are increasingly disillusioned by the results of voluntary integration plans in cities. More and more, they are seeking relief in the courts.

INNER-CITY CONCENTRATION

None of these developments is new. The United States Commission on Civil Rights long ago documented the concentration of blacks in inner-city schools, even before the accelerated movement of whites to the suburbs in the late nineteen-sixties and early nineteen-seventies.

What is relatively new, however, is the widespread recognition by ordinary politicians, school officials and lower-court judges that so-called de facto segregation—that is, school segregation caused by housing patterns rather than overt political decisions about the placement of pupils—presents what might well be the most painful and ambiguous question facing the nation.

On one side are millions of black children trapped in schools that remain, for the most part, separate but unequal. On the other are millions of white parents who do not regard themselves as racist but who look with evident dismay on the idea of returning their children to the cities and school systems they fled.

The complexity of the question is illustrated by random comments from those most affected:

A black mother in Philadelphia, Mrs. Shirley Waites: “I’m in favor of busing to achieve racial integration. Obviously, you can’t achieve it any other way. The schools work on a neighborhood system, and the neighborhoods are segregated. Separate but equal doesn’t work [because] the white politicians don’t care about black schools.”

A black mother in Detroit, Mrs. Doris McCrary: “I don’t discuss busing. As far as I’m concerned I’ve always been against busing. I have built my kids where they have self-confidence in themselves. If you take them out to Grosse Pointe where they would be looked down on, that would do something to their self-image.”

A white school superintendent in a suburban blue-collar area near Detroit, Timothy Dyer: “I’m a strong advocate of integration . . . but cross-district busing would be disastrous. I think *Brown v. Board* was a great decision, but it would be best served if we had neighborhood integration.”

A white mother in Pontiac, Mich: “I’d go to jail first. We moved out here to get good schools.”

SUPREME COURT APPEAL

Not surprisingly, the question has worked its way, unresolved, to the Supreme Court, which must soon decide whether one of the proposed remedies—the controversial concept of exchanging pupils between suburban and city school systems—is both practical and constitutional.

The notion of urban-suburban cross-district busing for integration purposes was argued recently before the Supreme Court in a case involving Detroit and neighboring suburbs.

There are those involved in civil rights activities who view the eventual outcome of the Detroit case as a possible milestone, ranking it almost as important as the 1954 ruling

against “separate but equal” school systems in the South.

Based on figures amassed by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the school integration record of the South, a region scorned by Northern liberals and others for its bigotry—has long since surpassed that of the North.

According to the H.E.W.’s 1972 figures, the percentage of minority group pupils in schools with enrollments more than half black in 1972 was 53.7 per cent for public schools in the 11 states of the old Confederacy. The figure for Northern public schools was 71.7 per cent and it was 68.2 per cent for the Border states and the District of Columbia.

ADDITIONAL FIGURES

Similarly, the figures for black students in schools with minority populations constituting less than half the enrollment were 46.3 per cent in Southern public schools, 23.3 per cent in Northern public schools and 31.8 per cent in the Border states and the District of Columbia.

In the Detroit case, a Federal Appeals Court last June ordered busing for integration between the city schools and those in neighboring affluent white suburbs in Wayne, Oakland and Macomb Counties.

In a similar case a year ago, involving Richmond and its suburban counties, the Supreme Court split 4 to 4, leaving the issue unresolved. Associate Justice Lewis F. Powell Jr., who once served on the Richmond School Board, abstained in that decision.

“There’s a kind of moratorium,” said Herbert Hill, national labor director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. “School districts are waiting on the Detroit decision.”

“Twenty years later,” Mr. Hill said, “instead of what should have been a joyous celebration of progress we’re in the middle of the second post-Reconstruction.”

“If the court rules against the civil rights movement on this,” said Dr. Kenneth B. Clark as he discussed the Detroit case, “I would interpret it as a sort of a dilution of *Brown*. To that extent it is important.”

Dr. Clark, a psychologist and educator, is the only black member of the New York State Board of Regents, the state’s highest education policymaking body.

MAJOR PROBLEM IN NORTH

Dr. Clark, whose psychological findings were cited in the 1954 Supreme Court decision outlawing school segregation, said that “the major problem now in the desegregation of the schools is clearly the Northern urban problem. There is no question of this.”

He asserted that the major stumbling block to effective integration of Northern schools “is the intransigence of the Northern school boards—their refusal to obey the law.”

Southerners, he said, were by and large more “honest and direct” in their resistance to integration while their Northern counterparts “made one policy statement after another” supporting integration while creating “an unmitigated disaster, and worse than that was the flagrant violation of the law in the *Brown* decision.”

Like others involved in resolving racial imbalance in the schools, Dr. Clark felt that the era of voluntary integration efforts was nearing an unsuccessful end.

“I don’t think there’s any recourse other than the courts now,” Dr. Clark said, echoing the sentiments of others who were interviewed.

John Morsell, assistant executive director of the N.A.A.C.P., said the lackluster integration performance in the North resulted primarily from “lack of will, lack of imagination on the part of school authorities.”

“We have to get remedy through litigation,” he said.

Eugene Mornell, who heads a detailed study on integration for the United States Com-

mission on Civil Rights, was asked why the South moved faster on integration than the North.

He replied that the Federal Government had moved vigorously to enforce the *Brown* decision in the South but that in the North integration became increasingly a political issue with the vast majority of officeholders, both major and minor, taking an antibusing stand.

Caroline Davis of the Civil Rights Commission staff said that her focus recently has been on trying to achieve integration in smaller Northern communities.

“We really haven’t concentrated very much on the very large cities because so little is being done there,” aside from “the usual patterns of gerrymandering” of school districts, she said.

“There are so many vested interests,” she said, “a school board is damned if it does and damned if it doesn’t.”

Spot checks of a number of large cities showed the following:

Chicago’s public school system is more racially segregated than ever before, according to the Board of Education’s annual census published last November. The census showed that for the third year in a row, the percentage of black students increased as did the number of elementary and high schools that are either all black or 95 per cent black.

MORE ALL-BLACK SCHOOLS

Of Chicago’s 537 elementary schools, 259 now have black enrollments of 90 per cent or more, while 104 are 90 per cent or more white. The number of all-black elementary schools increased to 144 from 128 in 1972.

“In terms of pupil integration, we can deal with that very quickly,” said Mrs. Carey B. Preston, vice president of the Chicago Board of Education, “because the board hasn’t done anything about that. The board has never addressed itself to any plan to achieve student integration since I’ve been on the board,” she said. She has held the position since 1968.

In New York City, the Board of Education recently declared in a report to the New York State Board of Regents that its racial integration program was being jeopardized by whites fleeing the city. More than four-fifths of New York’s black pupils attend schools with black enrollments of 59 per cent or more. And nearly half attend schools that are virtually all-black.

The report implied that an exchange of city pupils with suburban school districts might be needed to carry out integration.

Dr. Clark, in his role as president of the Metropolitan Applied Research Center, a private organization, responded to the board’s report by saying that city education authorities had “fostered the maintenance of racially segregated schools” in New York.

The Cincinnati school board approved a sweeping plan last December for desegregating the city’s public schools as one of its final acts before a newly elected board took office.

A month later, the new board members, who were elected on pledges to resist integration, decided “not to implement” their predecessors’ plan which, among other things, would have allowed high school students to transfer to other high schools as long as the transfer improved the racial balance.

Similarly, in Pasadena, Calif., where an integration plan has been in effect for several years, a new and conservative board is seeking ways of jettisoning the plan.

APPEAL IN BOSTON

In Boston, where there is a strong pattern of de facto segregation in the schools, a state court ruling requiring racial balance has been appealed by the five-member Boston school board to a higher court as unsuccessful negotiations between the city’s elected school board and state education officials over integration enter their ninth fruitless year.

In Los Angeles, a desegregation ruling has been enmeshed in litigation and the case has been pending before the California Court of Appeals for nearly four years.

In St. Louis, a local parents group brought suit in Federal District Court charging the St. Louis Board of Education with maintaining illegal racial segregation in the city's schools.

In Omaha, the Federal Government is charging in court that the Omaha Board of Education is intentionally segregating its schools using "most, if not all" of the methods found illegal by a United States Supreme Court justice in ruling against the Denver school system.

Last June, Supreme Court Justice William Brennan ruled that the Denver school board must prove that it did not deliberately segregate students by race in drawing school boundaries. If it cannot prove that, the decision said, the city must racially balance the entire Denver school system.

And in Topeka, Kan., where the suit brought in the name of 10-year-old Linda Brown resulted in the landmark Supreme Court ruling, the school district is back in court, accused of discriminating against black pupils by assigning them to segregated schools with inferior facilities.

DESEGREGATION OF SOUTHERN SCHOOLS SINCE 1954 PRODUCES CONFUSING PATTERNS OF IMPRESSIVE GAINS, BITTER SETBACKS

(By B. Drummond Ayres, Jr.)

ATLANTA.—On the grass in front of Notasulga High School in east center Alabama, white and black youngsters tumble and laugh together in integrated frolic. Diehard segregationists once burned the main building.

In a corridor of the predominantly black Maggie Walker High School in Richmond, a white teacher orders a black pupil to put out a cigarette and is told to "go to hell."

A mile away at John F. Kennedy High, also predominantly black, the Student Human Relations Council has no problems on its agenda.

In Jackson, Miss., black and white students amble together toward a gym class. Across the street, the autographed visages of Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama and Prime Minister Ian D. Smith of Rhodesia smile down on the work being done in the offices of the Southern Independent School Association, an organization that represents 400 newly built all-white, private "academies."

Twenty years after the Supreme Court outlawed segregation in the nation's public schools, there is no clear, easily comprehensible picture of what has happened in Dixie, the initial target of the decision.

THE BARE STATISTICS

The bare statistics say that the South's classrooms are the most integrated in the country, with fewer than one of every 10 black youngsters still in all-black schools.

But the figures do not explain why. Nor do they tell what desegregation of classrooms has done to the quality of Southern education, the make-up of Southern society and the distinctiveness of the Southern psyche.

The answers to such questions are best found by going back to places like Notasulga, Richmond and Jackson, more or less typical Southern way stations on the long road to racial equality.

What emerges is a mosaic of a South in which most rural schools are fairly well desegregated, despite a flight by whites to the so-called "seg" academies. On the other hand, many urban systems remain steadfastly segregated and even harder hit by the whites' exodus.

Where desegregation has gone smoothly, the key factors have frequently been strong classroom discipline and the favorable public attitudes of school officials, local politicians and business leaders.

SEPARATE WAYS

No matter how successful the desegregation has been, however, whites and blacks still tend to go their separate ways once out of the classroom and off the playing field. There is minimal mingling in the lunchroom, at the senior prom (if it has not been canceled).

Most integrated schools have begun "tracking" or "ability grouping" their better students into accelerated courses, a procedure that sometimes resegregates whites and blacks.

Where black and white systems have been merged, black principals and teachers have sometimes been demoted or dismissed.

Where discipline is a major desegregation problem, black students often are punished more severely and more frequently than whites.

"Over all, it's a picture that is at once encouraging, discouraging and terribly confusing," says Mel Leventhal of Jackson, a veteran civil rights lawyer for the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.

He adds:

FEW FIXED RULES

"What works great in one place sometimes will fail miserably in another—and for no apparent reason. There just aren't many fixed rules and set formulas.

"Jackson has one of the most desegregated public school systems anywhere in the country, North or South. It also has one of the strongest private academy systems.

"Maybe the best thing that you can say about the South today is that it isn't any worse than the North, particularly Northern cities."

Whatever the case, much ground has been covered since the days when troops were called in to complete the integration of Central High School in Little Rock, Ark., and Virginia's Prince Edward County closed its public schools rather than desegregate them.

In the rural South, supposedly the ultimate stronghold of what civil rights workers call the "redneck seg," there is an explanation as to why it is now the national leader in school integration.

In rural counties, blacks and whites often live next to one another, either on farms or in small towns. Thus, it is difficult to justify segregated schools on the basis of housing patterns, the justification that has kept so many Northern and Southern cities segregated.

Rural integration has been accomplished quietly in many areas. But violence has occurred, though it appears to be on the decline.

PEACE AND VIOLENCE

The people in Alabama's Notasulga area, a farming section that is half black and half white, have known peace and violence.

A decade ago, when a Federal judge assigned six blacks to Notasulga High School, whites established an all-white academy. Shortly thereafter, the abandoned public building was burned.

The school was rebuilt, but white pupils did not start trickling back until a handful of influential white leaders, among them Robert Anderson, the school principal, began speaking out in favor of integrated education.

"It was tough going at first," the 31-year-old Mr. Anderson recalls, adding:

"There were four or five of us—several coaches, a former school board member, an insurance man—and we just began to talk to folks and say that the town and the county would never survive if we destroyed public education.

"Some people got mad at us. I got threats. My girl left me. I moved out of town to a safer apartment. But then, slowly, white kids started to come back.

EQUAL TREATMENT

When they did, we made sure that everybody, black and white, got treated the same, punished the same, everything, right down to making cheerleading squads 50-50.

"Things like that are very important, just as important as getting community leaders to back you."

Today, Notasulga High is half white and half black. Bumper stickers in the town's thriving shopping thoroughfare proclaim: "Notasulga's Back."

No one can remember the last racial incident. The school's Parent-Teacher Association has more members than ever. White merchants raise money to send integrated athletic teams on road trips. The whole town turns out for the annual homecoming parade, led by an integrated band.

A black senior, Willie Woods, says:

"When we were first all thrown together, everybody stood around just waiting for trouble. But everybody got treated the same and we soon discovered—sports helped a lot—that we were all pretty much alike."

A PHONY WORLD

A white classmate, Gary James, says:

"The kids down at the other end of the county who still go to those all-black schools and that all-white academy just don't know what life is all about these days. They're living out of it in a phony world."

What of the quality of education now offered at Notasulga?

Mr. Anderson concedes that it is extremely difficult to make comparisons with the past. He notes, however, that today's Notasulga graduates seem to have little trouble finding work or going to college.

"Look," he says, "nobody anywhere can prove anything one way or another. All I know is that my kids, black and white, do O.K. and the blacks no longer are going to school in tarpaper shacks."

The experience in another rural area—Virginia's Prince Edward County—has been less happy. But even there, where whites slightly outnumber blacks, some progress is being made.

The all-white Prince Edward Academy that sprang up in Farmville during the five years the county's public schools were closed is still operating. But its enrollment is 1,100, from a high of almost 1,500 in 1959.

By contrast, the Prince Edward public schools, reopened by the courts in 1964 after the barren years when blacks received mostly home and church instruction, have almost 2,000 students, 200 of them white.

"That doesn't sound like many whites, but consider that five years ago there were only 50 in the public system," says Clarence Penn, the 32-year-old principal of Prince Edward County High School.

"We're going to win this one," he says. "Every year, we get back several dozen more whites. The academy's tuition has shot up to about \$700 now, and that's got a lot of white daddies hurting and a lot of white mommies working."

"And the word is out that blacks and whites in the public schools are getting along and learning. Just ask any of our kids."

The story they tell is much the same as that told at Notasulga, except that the white youngsters in the Prince Edward schools, being much in the minority, seem a bit more reticent. For example, few white boys go out for sports and only now are white girls trying out for the cheerleading squad.

WE GET ALONG FINE

"There isn't any interracial dating, and whites and blacks still tend to congregate with their own kind when they eat and the like," says Malcolm Shields, a white senior at Prince Edward High. "But all in all, we get along fine. It's the grown-ups you have to convince."

A black classmate, Fay Scott, says:

"Some diehard segregationists like to mouth around that we're not learning anything. But colleges are recruiting us, including what used to be an all-white teachers' school right in Farmville."

Farmville and surrounding Prince Edward County are undergoing other significant racial changes.

Recently, the local Jaycees named Clarence Penn the "outstanding young educator" and admitted him to membership. Many whites immediately quit the organization. In leaving, they noted that Mr. Penn's presence would cost the Jaycees the food concession at the Prince Edward Academy athletic field.

Still, the academy thrives, offering what even its black detractors concede are quality courses. It is perhaps one of the healthiest of the thousand or more private schools that have been built in the South in the last two decades.

THERE'S A PRICE

"People who want quality education will pay \$600 or more per kid if that's the price," says Robert Redd, the academy's principal. He said that his students were the offspring of both millionaire industrialists and tenant farmers.

The full strength of the South's academic movement is difficult to gauge because not even the Federal Government keeps precise records. Schools are constantly opening and closing or losing and gaining accreditation.

One frequently heard estimate is that perhaps one of every 10 white youngsters in the South is in a private school. The movement seems to be growing fastest in Memphis. Churches, especially Baptist, are sponsoring many of the new facilities.

Memphis has been backed into a legal corner by the courts and must desegregate most of its schools. Other cities—Atlanta, Montgomery, New Orleans—are still fighting total desegregation, though room to maneuver is increasingly limited.

FLIGHT TO SUBURBS

The situation in almost every case is much the same as in Northern cities. Fearful whites are steadily fleeing to the suburbs, threatening to set up private schools if the courts tag along and merge suburban and city schools.

Twenty years ago, Atlanta's schools were about 70 per cent white and 30 per cent black. Today, they are 80 per cent black and 20 per cent white.

Part of the whites' flight was due to the desire for a bite of greenery. But no one denies that the color black also played a key role.

Tentatively, pending court approval, a compromise has been struck in the Atlanta situation.

In return for high administrative positions in the school system, blacks have stopped demanding massive busing. Such busing, they concede, would probably drive out most of the remaining whites, along with their much-needed tax base.

Other American cities have sent representatives to Atlanta to study how the compromise has worked out.

MUCH CONFUSION

In Richmond, massive busing—and massive flight by whites—is under way. There is much confusion.

One school, in a neighborhood that is 95 per cent white, draws 95 per cent of its students from a neighborhood across town that is 95 per cent black.

At Maggie Walker High, the predominantly black school where the white teacher ordered the black student to put out the cigarette and was told to "go to hell," walls are covered with graffiti, windows are broken, students mill in hallways during class hours, racial fights break out periodically.

One teacher complains privately:

"It's the lack of discipline, the failure to take the high ground at the start, the

failure to be consistent with everybody, black or white.

"Things are so bad that kids come to school without pencils, without paper, without books—and go home the same way. I have to keep a supply of everything and pass it out each day at the start of classes. This isn't education; this is chaos."

A DIFFERENT STORY

But then there is John F. Kennedy High School a mile or so away, where the Student Human Relations Council has nothing on its agenda.

Kennedy is three-fourths black. There has been no serious racial incident on its neat, well-trimmed grounds for several years. Its graduates, black and white, are in colleges and universities all over Virginia and much of the East Coast.

George Jones, the black principal who has been known to shake the shoulders of students, says:

"Leadership and discipline across the board, from my office right down to the classroom level—you have to know when to be out front of a kid, when to walk beside him, when to get behind and push. And you have to be there—all the time.

"One of the things that helped us a lot was good old community leadership. When Linwood Holton was Governor of Virginia, he came over here and enrolled his daughter personally. That showed folks something."

Mr. Holton returned early this year to his home in Roanoke when Mills E. Godwin succeeded him as Governor. But his daughter stayed in Richmond and took up residence with a family friend so that she could complete her schooling at Kennedy.

A GOOD SCHOOL

A white classmate, Katy Jennings, says: "Slowly, ever so slowly, the word is getting around in my neighborhood that J.F.K. is a good school, that you don't have to run to the suburbs, that just because we have some kids who have trouble figuring out how to make change for a quarter, that doesn't mean you can't get in classes that will get you ready for college.

"The problem is convincing parents, who always seem to want to believe the worst."

Believing the worst in Montgomery, Ala., whites fled from one neighborhood so fast that it turned all-black in less than a year. To speed the sale to blacks of the empty houses, real estate dealers included the phrase "Carver area" in each newspaper advertisement.

Carver High School, predominantly black, was the school the whites were fleeing.

Such flight hurts a city economically. They can nibble away at a tax base, as in Atlanta's case, or they can scare away new industry, as in Jackson's case.

PRICE TOO HIGH

Jackson finally decided that the price of continued resistance was too high when a tractor manufacturer said he would move a 2,000-employee plant to the Mississippi capital if it solved its school dispute.

The city went straight to the bargaining table. The bargaining did not solve every problem, however.

Mel Leventhal, the Legal Defense Fund lawyer, says that black pupils and teachers now face a more subtle form of discrimination—"pushout."

"It's the old business of over-disciplining blacks or 'tracking' them into 'ability' groups below their level, all in the hope that they will drop out or stay away," he says.

"Merge a black and white school, and guess which principal ends up as the assistant principal? Have a teacher opening, and guess who gets hired?"

Civil rights workers from Atlanta who recently studied teacher pushout across the South concluded that at least 6,000 black teachers and principals had been dismissed,

that "thousands more" had been demoted and that 25,000 whites had been hired to fill jobs that should have gone to blacks.

A similar study of pupil pushout found that while only four of 10 pupils in Little Rock were black, eight of every 10 students suspended were black. In Columbia, S.C., the study discovered that blacks accounted for half the student population but three-fourths of the suspensions.

It is, as Mr. Leventhal says, a "mixed bag" in Dixie these days, 20 years after the Supreme Court outlawed segregation in schools.

Those who would draw both hope and despair from the bag might keep in mind that when a black and white started fighting recently in an Atlanta school, a white was seen holding the black's coat.

IVORY CROCKETT IS BEAUTIFUL

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the whole Nation was thrilled when another of those "impossible to break" sports records fell by the wayside as Hank Aaron smashed Babe Ruth's long standing record of 714 lifetime home runs.

We all remember the years of speculation that no one could ever run a 4-minute mile, but Roger Bannister did the "impossible" in 1954 when he ran the mile in 3.59.4, and since that time the 4-minute barrier has been broken consistently by a number of runners.

On May 11 of this year, in Knoxville, Tenn., track history was made again as still another "impossible" feat was achieved when Mr. Ivory Crockett, a resident of my home town of Peoria, Ill., ran the 100-yard dash in 9 seconds flat. Actually, one of the four official stop watches clocked him at 8.9 seconds, two were at 9.0, and one at 9.1, thus making the official time, 9.0 seconds.

An editorial appearing in the May 15, 1974, edition of the Peoria Journal Star calls our attention to Mr. Crockett's other outstanding attributes as a human being and certainly his life and his achievements contradict a theory often expressed that there are no heroes in America today and no one that our young people can look up to. I insert the editorial at this point in the Record and also ask that my colleagues join me in extending our sincere congratulations to Mr. Crockett for his marvelous feat.

IVORY CROCKETT IS BEAUTIFUL

Ivory Crockett is beautiful.

The Peorian is not only the fastest sprinter on earth but also the living end when it comes to practical philosophy.

Listen to him saying how he broke the world's record in the 100-yard dash last Saturday:

"If you have a goal, you ought to write it down and one day you'll accomplish this goal as long as it's real. That's true whether it's a job or an athletic accomplishment. A goal is what motivates you."

Crockett had taken a piece of paper, written 8.9 on it, and tucked it into the toe of his track shoe last Saturday in Knoxville, Tenn. One of four official stop-watches clocked him at that speed, two read 9.0, and the fourth read 9.1.

The official time was therefore 9 flat, put-

ting Crockett all alone at the pinnacle of the sports world.

On Sunday morning the Journal Star splashed the great news on page one—along with an Associated Press picture of somebody who was supposed to be Ivory Crockett. It wasn't.

But Ivory Crockett is beautiful. He didn't even mention our gaffe when we interviewed him after he came home.

More important is what Crockett did Monday morning. He went to work like the rest of us do. And he made another sale for IBM before noon.

"Just a regular day," said Crockett.

Ivory Crockett is beautiful.

Three months ago we began to realize the beauty of the Tennessee share-cropper's son who became an outstanding sprinter at Southern Illinois University, married Peorian Sylvia Jordan, and walked into IBM and asked for a job.

Sportswriter Stan Hieronymus tried to interview him about foot-racing then, but what came out was something inspiring to kids who might be ready to give up from a man they could believe.

"I flunked out of school almost . . . I had this thing the world owed me something. I was black and poor . . .

"It bothers me to see so many kids throw their lives away. So many kids are smoking dope, dropping drugs . . . I could have been one of them, but here comes a man who says 'You don't have to do that.'"

That man straightened out Ivory Crockett, who went on to say something to us adults: "Peoria is a beautiful city and has got some beautiful people . . . but people need to get involved—really involved—with kids. That includes me.

"If you can save an individual kid, it's worth a million dollars. They need somebody to look up to that is something in life . . ."

Somebody like Ivory Crockett, who sets a world record on Saturday and is back at work Monday morning.

JOSEPH CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1974

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on May 25 Cleveland was honored by a visit from his Eminence, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty. Cheers reverberated throughout our city, estimated by some as the second-largest Hungarian city in the world after Budapest, in tribute to this great man, hero to Hungarians everywhere and a symbol of freedom to all. Of the more than 1,000 people who gathered, Cardinal Mindszenty was able to bless 150 persons. However, he has blessed us all in his unrelenting stand as Defensor Ecclesiae et Patriae.

His last visit to our city was in 1947, only 2 years before he was so cruelly imprisoned for his outspoken opposition to the communization of Hungary. Fully aware that religious freedom would not survive under the atheistic system of communism, he chose to stay in his country and seek the expulsion of bolshevism. Regretfully, his prediction was realized and epitomized by his imprisonment. The indomitable spirit of the Hungarian people enabled them to rise against their oppressors in 1956, and the freedom fighters liberated Cardinal Mindszenty

from captivity. However, their independence was short lived. The Soviets sent tanks right into the heart of Budapest. The Cardinal was able to escape to the safety of the American embassy where he stayed in exile from his beloved countrymen for 15 years. In 1971 he left Budapest for Vienna. Then last February, Pope Paul VI removed him as Roman Catholic primate of Hungary.

The cardinal is now taking his message of freedom to others, and the people of the United States, of whatever heritage, are indeed grateful for his visit. For we who voice our love of freedom do recognize the manifestation of freedom in this remarkable man who has remained true to his convictions. I join the people of Cleveland in wishing that Cardinal Mindszenty may soon return to a Hungary free to choose its own government and religion, for he is truly the "good shepherd."

SUGAR GIVEAWAY

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my opposition to the Sugar Act, H.R. 14747, which is due for consideration on the floor this Wednesday.

In the past year the world price of sugar has increased by over 300 percent. The retail price has also risen sharply, particularly in the Northeast where the price has more than doubled in this year alone.

In spite of the fact that there is a world scarcity of sugar and the price is skyrocketing, the American taxpayer continues to subsidize the sugar grower. Although the bill to amend the Sugar Act, H.R. 14747, which will be on the floor Wednesday, June 5, purports to reduce the subsidy, in fact, the growers will still be receiving \$90 million a year. Although the Federal Government under the proposed revision will only be paying \$27.5 million, the remaining \$62.5 million will be paid by the processors to the growers. The cost I have been assured will be passed directly on to the consumers by way of even higher prices.

For too many years the American taxpayers and consumers have been unjustifiably subsidizing the growers. The sugar legislation is 40 years old and over the course of the years the sugar situation in this country and the world has changed drastically. The legislation has not been correspondingly modified.

Let us disprove a recent newspaper article which indicates that Congress will not be taking action on the sugar bill to benefit consumers. I will be introducing amendments which will eliminate all subsidy payments to sugar growers and also eliminate the cost passthrough to processors. I urge you to support my amendments and to finally provide the consumers with the assurance that their interests are being protected.

The following articles and letters supporting my position are offered for the information of my colleagues:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1974.

HON. PETER A. PEYSER,
House of Representatives,

DEAR MR. PEYSER: Your proposed amendment to eliminate subsidies under the Sugar Act is consistent with my testimony before the Committee on Agriculture on February 19 when I stated that there has been a rapid trend away from payments as an income for farm commodities. For example, farmers have accepted the termination of "wheat certificate", cotton, and feed grain payments and are finding the marketplace a more satisfactory answer to their growing income needs.

Sincerely,

EARL L. BUTZ,
Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS,
New York, N.Y., May 24, 1974.

HON. PETER A. PEYSER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEYSER: On behalf of the consumers of New York City, I urge you to oppose the adoption of H.R. 14747, the Sugar Act Amendments of 1974.

Last summer Congress enacted the Agriculture & Consumer Protection Act, which revised government supports on most crops. Under the new system, farmers are encouraged to increase acreage yield and processors are given needed incentives to improve facilities.

This action should make food prices responsive to free market conditions and hopefully bring down retail prices for the shopper. At the same time, the farmer is protected because the government guarantees that he will be reimbursed for production costs.

Sugar, however, was not included in this reform. The proposed Sugar Act Amendments would continue farm subsidy payments to sugar growers at a time when the domestic price of sugar is higher than it has ever been and almost three times as high as it was one year ago.

Particularly during this time of rapid inflation, Congress must recognize its responsibility to the American consumer to keep food prices down. We urge you to oppose the passage of the Sugar Act Amendments of 1974, and encourage your colleagues to do similarly.

Sincerely,

ELINOR GUGGENHEIMER.

[From the Washington Star-News, June 2, 1974]

THE SUGAR ACT: A SOUR DOSE FOR CONSUMERS
(By Yale Brozen)

Once again, Congress is getting ready to renew the Sugar Act—almost 40 years after it was first introduced by President Roosevelt as an emergency relief measure for Depression farmers.

Despite recent Department of Agriculture suggestions—since withdrawn—that the program has outlived its purpose and should be abandoned, the House Agriculture Committee has reported out a bill renewing the program which is scheduled to be considered by the House this Tuesday.

Much has been written about certain aspects of the Sugar Act—especially about the highly dubious system which encourages richly paid lobbyists for foreign sugar producing countries to scurry around Capitol Hill trying to win favor—and expanded sugar import quotas—for their client states.

Other weaknesses of the program deserve attention, too. A new study written by University of Chicago Professor D. Gale Johnson for the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research concludes that the sugar program costs the American consum-

ing public an average of \$616 million unnecessarily each year and does nothing but support an expensive, non-competitive industry.

For this, the consumer gets nothing but artificially high sugar prices, because the program keeps normally cheaper foreign sugar from freely entering the U.S. market. This not only boosts the price of table sugar, but of a wide variety of food products made with sugar, too.

The small farmer—who was originally supposed to benefit from this legislation—gets little from the program because he has been overwhelmed by large sugar producers. Sixty percent of our domestic sugar is produced by just 16% of this nation's sugar farms; they reap nearly all the benefit from the artificially inflated price of sugar.

Other big beneficiaries of the sugar program are sugar refiners. They have managed to get sugar refining—hardly a farm program—protected along with sugar growing. By imposing strict quotas on imports of refined sugar, the Sugar Act keeps a large slice of the refining pie for the highly inefficient, high-cost domestic refiners. Oddly enough, the Sugar Act not only restricts the importation of refined sugar from foreign countries, but from U.S. territories (Puerto Rico), and the state of Hawaii as well.

The basic structure of the sugar program hasn't changed since 1934. Each year, the secretary of Agriculture determines the amount of sugar needed to fulfill U.S. consumption requirements—about 100 pounds per capita. Fifty-five percent of this is allocated to domestic producers, and the rest to foreign producers in the form of import quotas.

Domestic producers may be required to abide by their "proportionate share," a fixed limit on the acreage they can plant with sugar beets and cane. (However, proportionate shares have not been imposed in any domestic sector of sugar growing—except for mainland cane—since 1966.) In return for abiding by the program, farmers receive "benefit payments" that total about \$82 million annually.

More important, to protect high-cost domestic sugar from cheaper foreign sugar, a quota system is used to strictly limit sugar imports.

There were three original objectives of the sugar program: to protect and preserve domestic sugar farming; to limit the domestic expansion of this high-cost industry; and to keep down the cost of sugar to consumers. Only one of these objectives has been achieved—preserving a domestic sugar-growing industry. And achievement of this objective is, on the whole, regrettable. It keeps some U.S. farmland engaged inefficiently in sugar production, when it could be diverted for badly needed crops which are more efficient producers. The result is a net loss all the way around.

Probably the weakest argument advanced for renewing the Sugar Act is the claim that it lowers the price consumers pay for sugar. It is not true.

Advocates of the program are quick to state that in the past year the world market price of sugar has been more than five cents a pound higher than the U.S. price. These advocates point out that the U.S. consumer has benefited substantially as a result, since even imported sugar is sold here at the lower U.S. price.

Professor Johnson's study of comparative sugar prices, however, reveals that for two decades the United States has nearly always been paying substantially more for its sugar than the world market price; 1973 was an aberration.

In 1970, for example, the world market price was 3.75 cents a pound while the U.S. price was 6.95 cents. In 1968, the discrepancy was even greater—the world market paid a

low 1.98 cents per pound for sugar while the U.S. paid 6.54 cents! In those years the U.S. consumer paid dearly for the sugar program.

The chart below, comparing world market and U.S. sugar prices, shows that in recent years—with the exception of two—the U.S. consumer consistently has paid more for sugar than he would if world prices were allowed to prevail.

If 1973 was an exception to the general pattern, it was largely a short-term reaction to the extraordinarily low price of sugar on the world market in the late 1960s. With prices now at record highs, a swing back to ample supplies can be expected.

In the AEI study, Professor Johnson estimates the cost of the sugar program by calculating the difference between what the consumer pays for sugar under the program and what he would pay if there were no Sugar Act. (i.e., if American consumers could benefit from the generally lower world market price). He computes the difference to be—based on a 10-year average—\$616 million annually.

Of this excess, about \$418 million flows from consumers directly to American producers (the remainder goes to foreign growers). The amount of money which U.S. farmers actually realize as net added income from this, however, is much smaller. Two-thirds—or about \$300 million—goes into the extra costs of growing sugar in this country. Only about \$100 million remains as the net added annual income for farmers growing sugar. This means that the program cost the taxpayer four times what it is worth to the American farmer—we are spending four dollars to get back one.

This doesn't seem drastic until one considers what the consequences would be if every government program was run this way.

(Some pro-sugar congressmen frequently state that the sugar program costs us nothing, because it costs the government nothing. The amount of money paid out to farmers in the form of direct benefit payments, they observe, is offset by the revenue collected in the form of tariffs and duties on imported sugar. But they gloss over the fact that the price of maintaining a high-cost domestic sugar industry is passed on to the consumer in the shelf price of sugar.)

With a net annual income benefit of only \$100 million, it is not surprising that the sugar program has not made sugar cane and beet farming profitable for small farmers.

An end to our artificial props for sugar would mean that many U.S. farmers would find it more profitable to switch to other crops. The nation then would be in the position of importing most of its sugar from lower-cost foreign producers.

In these days, when memories of the Arab oil embargo are still vivid in American minds, fears of international commodity blackmail get much attention. But agricultural cartels have tried to get higher prices by cutting back on production before, and the strategy inevitably fails. Alternative producers—attracted by the high prices—have too great an incentive to break the shortage.

In the early 1920's, for example, the British passed the Stevenson (Rubber Restriction) Act to cut back the production of rubber in its colony of Malaya. Malaya then supplied most of the world's rubber—and the cut shot the price of rubber up from twenty cents to over a dollar a pound.

The high price, however, stimulated rubber production in other countries. Rubber grows in five year cycles—and five years later, Borneo rubber appeared on the market and brought the price back down between 12 and 14 cents—lower than it had previously been.

Outbacks in production have also failed with coffee, tin and cocoa cartels. Alternative sources are always found when the price goes up.

The United States can be assured of a wide variety of sugar sources—more than 35 countries now lobby in Congress for sugar import quotas. Many of them—especially Brazil—would increase their sugar production if they could find a market outlet.

Granted, there are some responsible authorities who do not expect sugar supplies to bounce back immediately from the 1973 lows. Their predictions of shortage, even if they were true, would provide no justification for perpetuation of the Sugar Act, however. The Sugar Act is a program to restrict imports, to keep foreign sugar out of our markets. By opening our doors to foreign-grown sugar, and by providing a huge new market to entice new foreign growers into the field, repeal of the Sugar Act could only help to ensure adequate supplies for the American consumer.

This year there has been intensive lobbying on the Hill to keep the Sugar Act, partly because the price of sugar is hitting record heights and world demand seems to be growing steadily.

Rather than seizing on the temporary high price as an excuse to expand and reentrench the sugar program, it is time to reckon with the program's overall implications and recognize its real costs.

The program should be either phased out gradually, or done away with immediately in one step—in either case, with the long-range goal of setting up a liberal trade policy for sugar.

The most acceptable solution would be a transition approach—which gradually abolishes the program, giving farmers and the refining industry time to adjust to new conditions.

In his study, Professor Johnson recommends the following intermediate approach:

Eliminate import quotas, domestic marketing allocations and "proportionate shares."

Establish a target price system for sugar, based on price objectives as established in Section 201 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended in 1971.

Make deficiency payments to each sugar beet and sugar cane producer based on the difference between the target price and the actual market price of sugar.

Continue Sugar Act benefit payments for three years, ultimately eliminating them in two equal reductions at the end of five years. The excise tax on sugar should be maintained at 0.5 cents per pound for three years, and then reduced at the same rate as the Sugar Act payments.

During the transition, producers should be permitted to abandon sugar cane and beet production in whole or in part and still continue to receive both deficiency and Sugar Act payments.

This will mean, of course, an end to the subsidy of sugar farming and with it, an end to the market edge of domestic sugar over imported sugar. In the future we would probably import most of our sugar.

As for the "national security" implications of this—even though sugar accounts for 17 percent of our total caloric intake, it is hard to justify it as a national security commodity. If we produced no sugar domestically, most of our supplies would still come from the American continent. Such shipping lanes would not be difficult to protect.

As for the price stability of sugar, Johnson shows that it is our own restrictive trade policy on sugar—and those like ours in other countries—which bear much responsibility for wild gyrations of the international sugar market.

There will be no easy way to end the sugar program. Over the years, resources have been committed, investment encouraged and expectations heightened that the program will go on forever.

It must be remembered, however, that the

sugar subsidy program was originally intended only as a temporary measure. It was meant to relieve the disastrous oversupply situation that existed on farms during the Depression. It was never intended to be a permanent industry subsidy.

Unfortunately, it has gone the way of many government programs labeled "short term" or "experimental"—they are extended and re-extended until they are entrenched and almost impossible to get rid of.

Prolonging the sugar program has made little sense—it has cost the consumer dearly, for few benefits. Current sugar prices may be a tempting incentive to keep the program for a while longer, but in the final analysis they are only one more excuse.

Now that the Sugar Act legislation is up for renewal, the Congress should have the courage to throw it out. It has promised the American people a break from higher food prices for a long time—making a move towards lower sugar prices would be a good start.

U.S. AND WORLD MARKET SUGAR PRICES

Year:	U.S. price	World price
1953	5.43	3.41
1954	5.21	3.26
1955	5.00	3.24
1956	5.10	3.48
1957	5.30	5.16
1958	5.41	3.50
1959	5.35	2.97
1960	5.35	3.14
1961	5.36	2.91
1962	5.56	2.98
1963	7.27	8.50
1964	5.98	5.87
1965	5.80	2.12
1966	6.03	1.86
1967	6.32	1.99
1968	6.54	1.98
1969	6.75	3.37
1970	6.94	3.75
1971	7.39	4.52
1972	7.99	7.43
1973	8.65	9.31

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 17, 1974]

THE BITTER OF THE SWEET: PRICES OF SUGAR AND PRODUCTS USING IT JUMP AS A RESULT OF ARABS' PURCHASES

(By John Valentine)

NEW YORK.—The next time you go to the grocery store and pay much higher prices for everything from a bag of sugar to soda pop to Jell-O, you are being clobbered once again by the Arab nations' new policy of charging more for their oil.

Early this year, the Arab nations took some of their bloated petroleum revenues and began buying raw, unrefined sugar in world markets. Seemingly disregarding price, these countries placed orders for about two-thirds of their estimated 1974 import requirements of about one million tons; in previous years, buying was more selective and spread out over a longer period.

The world sugar price soared to an unheard-of 26.25 cents a pound in February—partly because of extra-strong demand and partly because some sugar-producing nations that were forced to pay record prices for oil simply added the higher costs to the Arabs' sugar bill. Eight months ago the world sugar price was 8.35 cents a pound. The world price has eased only to 23.5 cents a pound because many suppliers say they expect the Arabs to come back and buy more sugar.

REACHING CONSUMER POCKETBOOKS

All this reaches the pocketbooks of U.S. consumers by way of the sugar marketing-quota system, which is intended to assure reasonable prices for consumers and fair returns for domestic producers. The U.S. imports almost half of the sugar it needs every

year, and this year the Agriculture Department boosted the import quotas by 500,000 tons to 12.5 million tons in an effort to increase supplies and thus—it was thought—help stem rising prices.

Instead, U.S. buyers were forced into the tight world market to compete with the free-spending Arabs. Regular suppliers were running short and some were selling in the hot world market before meeting their U.S. commitments, trade sources say.

As a result, granulated sugar prices in Northeast supermarkets are now about \$1.20 for a five-pound bag, up to from 79 cents in March and 55 cents a year ago. The price could go to \$1.50 within the next several weeks, industry sources say, because the domestic raw-sugar price is at a near record of 23.5 cents a pound—versus 10 cents a year ago—and because refining and other costs also are rising.

But it doesn't stop there. A great many food products contain sugar, and price increases for many of them are being posted or are pending. General Foods, for instance, recently raised prices of several of its products as a direct result of higher sugar costs. Its line of Post cereals was boosted by 6% last Monday, an average of three to four cents a box. Its beverage prices were increased an average of 10% to 12%.

And Jell-O prices were increased by 22%, which works out to about a three-cent rise on a three-ounce box. A spokesman for General Foods, which makes Jell-O, says that sales haven't suffered because of the increase. Jell-O and other brands of gelatin desserts contain substantial amounts of sugar.

Moreover, the General Foods spokesman says, "sugar-price increases are only beginning to be felt. As of now we see no end in sight."

The food processors, bakers and candy and beverage makers are paying \$28.10 for a 100-pound bag of refined sugar, more than double the \$13.55 of a year ago. They say they haven't been able to raise their product prices enough to fully compensate.

"We're still not recovering sugar costs," the General Foods spokesman says.

"We're fighting just to stay in place," agrees Harold S. Mohler, chairman and president of Hershey Foods. "To stay abreast of rising product costs is about all you can expect to achieve these days." Besides sugar, Hershey has to contend with cocoa prices that also have doubled in the past year. In that same period it has raised its product prices by about 40%.

Hershey's standard-size chocolate bar was raised five cents to 15 cents at the beginning of this year; it was 10 cents for two years and five cents for many years before that. The bar size was increased to 1.4 ounces from an average of one ounce, Mr. Mohler says.

"But we are very concerned about raising prices and we don't do it lightly because the (candy) bar is almost like an institution. We will try to hold the 15-cent line, but if costs keep spiraling as they are, there will certainly have to be some consideration of the 20-cent or even 25-cent bar," Mr. Mohler says.

There is more than consideration at Nestle, which has marketed a new 1½-ounce bar that is being sold in vending machines for 25 cents. "Reaction has been slow thus far, but the real impact is yet to come," a Nestle executive says—implying that a 25-cent bar won't look very expensive in a few months.

Though it isn't talked about openly, an estimated 5% to 15% of all candy is sold in the U.S. through vending machines. During the past two years most candy-vending machines have been converted to 15-cent prices from 10 cents. Now there is talk of raising all vended candy prices to 20 cents or 25 cents. "I hope it doesn't get off the ground," confides one candy executive, who thinks consumers will resist these higher prices.

FROM RASPBERRY TO APRICOT

He has a point, because consumers aren't resignedly accepting higher and higher prices. Paul Smucker, president of J. M. Smucker Co. of Orville, Ohio, the jelly and preserves maker, says that housewives are switching from higher-priced, fancy types of preserves, such as black raspberry and blueberry, to less expensive kinds, such as apricot and peach. Old standbys such as strawberry and grape continue to sell well, he says, but housewives are buying larger sizes to take advantage of lower per-ounce prices.

Similarly, a spokesman for PepsiCo Inc. says that while the 16-ounce bottle of Pepsi-Cola remains the most popular size, "buyers are reaching up to larger and larger sizes, including the 64-ounce bottle, and they haven't reduced consumption." Pepsi-Cola prices have risen because of higher sugar costs, but the spokesman didn't specify the amount.

Some companies are able to hold off on price increases now because they made marketing and product-ingredient changes some time ago. Peter Paul Inc. of Naugatuck, Conn., for instance, began last September to increase the size of its candy bars, charge higher prices for them and reformulate the chocolate coatings by replacing some of the expansion cocoa butter with vegetable oil. "Reactions to the new coatings have been extremely favorable with respect to flavor, texture and shelf life," an executive says.

The Peter Paul executive thinks that "prices of sugar are expected to remain at current high levels and maybe even go higher during the summer months, which is the season of high consumption for both individuals and industry." But he adds, "we are told we can expect relief later in the year, about September or October."

That's when the sugar harvests start coming in. World sugar production during the 1973-74 crop year is estimated at 81.8 million tons, a 6% rise from last year, while world consumption is predicted at 81.3 million tons, up 4% from last season. This will be the first time in three years that production has outpaced consumption. The Arab nations' buying spree touched off such a sharp price reaction in part because reserve stocks in the past three years have dwindled. At the end of the 1972-73 season on Aug. 31, 1973, world stocks were 15.8 million tons, about a two-month supply.

While reserve stocks increase slightly this season, the supply-demand balance still will be precarious, sugar analysts say. They think next season there will be increased production in Brazil, the Philippines, Australia, and South Africa.

Meanwhile, the European sugar-beet crop, which accounts for 33% of overall world sugar output, is likely to be smaller this year than last because of cold, dry weather. And the U.S. beet crop, which declined last year because of dry weather in the West, is expected to shrink further this year. Many farmers are turning to wheat, corn, cotton, soybeans or potatoes, all of which currently offer better returns than beets. Last year, beet sugar accounted for about half the annual U.S. output of 6.9 million tons.

VENEZUELA AMENDMENT

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, in order to afford timely notice of the amendment I intend to offer to the U.S. Sugar Act to suspend the quota for Venezuela, I am

herewith printing the text of the amendment in the RECORD:

Amendment to be offered by Mr. GUNTER: Page 6, line 10, at the end of the computation beginning at line 10, insert the following proviso:

Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of this Act the quota or any portion thereof for Venezuela shall be suspended and a quantity of sugar equal to the amount of the suspended quota shall be prorated to the other countries listed in this paragraph until such time as the Congress, pursuant to section 202(e), does not disapprove of the restoration of such quota.

IMPLICATIONS OF PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED DRUG ABUSE BUDGET FOR INNER CITY COMMUNITIES

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposed drug abuse budget reflects a decrease of nearly \$15 million from fiscal 1974 to fiscal 1975. The impact of this decrease in the amount requested for Federal drug abuse programs is analyzed in an article in the present issue of Focus magazine, the publication of the Joint Center for Political Studies and in a recent report issued by the Drug Abuse Council.

The President's fiscal 1975 drug abuse budget means a retreat at a time when we are making significant progress in decreasing the amount of drug addiction independence in our Nation. The significant progress that has been made in recent years has been brought about because of the Federal commitment to provide funding for States and localities, for more effective law enforcement activities, and perhaps most importantly the opening of treatment rehabilitation programs to serve the legion of addicts who before this Federal commitment were not able to find adequate treatment and rehabilitation opportunities. It is clear that for many reasons the drug abuse problem is diminishing particularly in suburban and small town areas.

In inner cities such as the Harlem and East Harlem communities that I represent, however, the problem remains acute. Even though the amount of heroin available on the street because of the Turkish opium poppy ban has decreased, we still have in our community the largest single population of addicts in the United States. I, therefore, regard it as alarming that the Federal Government would begin to decrease its financial support of drug abuse treatment and rehabilitation programs at a time when my community and interested communities throughout the Nation needs continued Federal commitment to providing answers to the illness which saps the vitality of our communities. It is my hope that the Congress, in examining the President's drug abuse budget proposals, will take action to provide the same level of Federal concern and support for these programs as we have provided in the past.

I include in the RECORD an analysis by Mr. Eddie N. Williams, president of the Joint Center for Political Studies of the implications of the President's drug abuse budget.

ANALYSIS

(By Eddie N. Williams)

Budgets make policy and the federal budget is no exception. Consequently, we must view with alarm the policy implications inherent in President Nixon's proposed 1975 budget on drug abuse. The federal budget reflects the debatable notion that the heroin epidemic is over. It asks for fewer dollars, reorders spending priorities, and drapes a smothering "new federalism" shroud over a problem which, unfortunately, affects disproportionately a large number of black and Spanish-speaking Americans.

This budget takes on added significance when one weighs the racial implications in the nation's response to the drug abuse problem. Rep. Charles Rangel (D-N.Y.) sums up the response this way:

"Black leadership had been calling for federal help to combat heroin addiction for more than a decade (since the 1950s) and our appeals were ignored. But when heroin filtered out beyond the ghetto walls to the suburbs and the complexion of the junkies became white, the President declared a national crisis."

There followed a dramatic increase in federal drug abuse expenditures, from \$82 million in 1969 to \$760 million in 1974.

The result of this "massive" effort is a mixed picture. Some complain about waste, rip-offs, racial genocide, dehumanization. But there also is a positive side: the thousands of individuals helped, increased knowledge about the treatment of opiate dependence, program development, and about how to deal with the drug problem in schools, media, employment, and so on.

Another racist implication of this massive federal response lies in the fact that although the nation may have turned the corner toward solving the drug problem among whites, the problem continues in black and Spanish-speaking communities.

It is in this context that one must review the President's proposed drug abuse budget, which reflects a decrease of nearly \$15 million—from \$760 million in 1974 to \$745 million in 1975. While this drop may seem relatively small, it results in several major changes of emphasis in the federal response to the drug problem. For example:

1. There is a proposed decrease of \$54.7 million for treatment and rehabilitation. This means institutional capabilities will suffer at the very time they are ready to make real headway on the drug problem.

2. There is a proposed increase of \$10.2 million for programs which will be substantially turned over to the states but which will not be "categorically" designated for drug abuse activities. Consequently, as in revenue sharing, agencies may spend any amount or none of this money on drug abuse.

3. There is a proposed increase of \$39.8 million for law enforcement, including jailing of users and imposing other forms of penalties which brand people as criminals. This "get tough" policy is one of the most alarming aspects of the proposed budget.

It is now up to Congress to decide what the federal response ought to be and how much money is to be appropriated. Before making its decision, Congress, through its committee staffs or the newly created Office of Technology Assessment, ought to determine the extent of drug abuse among minorities and the nature of program responses; investigate the absence of minorities in key policy-making positions dealing with drug abuse; assure that the monies actually get into communities where they are needed, and set aside special funds to encourage the develop-

ment of a cadre of minority group experts—from scholars and researchers to program operators and street leaders—who can move against the drug problem in areas where others seem fearful of treading.

Because this has not been done the accusation of "genocide" has become a politicized response. But those who stand on their lofty podiums and pooh-pooh this accusation, without understanding its genesis or meaning, are equally guilty of playing politics with the lives and welfare of a great many human beings.

MIT STUDIES THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, when the energy crisis became a matter of widespread concern last fall, the Nixon administration offered its Project Independence Plan as a means of insuring that Americans will not depend upon other nations to fulfill their energy needs in the future.

A recent study released by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology maintained that stockpiling oil would be a much cheaper method of achieving energy self-sufficiency. According to the study,

Self-sufficiency as a form of "insurance" against disruption of price increases will be purchased at a very high cost.

Mr. Speaker, because the energy issue is one of the most pressing concerns before this body, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress, Victor K. McElheny's New York Times article reporting on the MIT study.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1974]

U.S. ENERGY PLAN FOUND TOO COSTLY—MIT STUDY RECOMMENDS STOCKPILING RATHER THAN TOTAL SELF-SUFFICIENCY

(By Victor K. McElheny)

If the United States tries to meet all its energy needs from domestic sources by 1980—the goal of the Nixon Administration's Project Independence—the price of all forms of energy could be driven as high as the equivalent of \$12 a barrel of oil, according to a group of economists and energy experts at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The group's study of the potential economic impact of the project was made public yesterday at a conference on Management Amid Scarcity in Chicago.

The group said the additional price increases above their calculated 1974 average domestic oil price of \$7 a barrel could be as great as the 1973-74 surge in imported oil prices, which they estimated at \$4 to \$9 a barrel.

The experts recommended that the nation consider a \$1-billion-a-year program of stockpiling oil as a cheaper form of "insurance" against future oil embargoes and price increases than total energy self-sufficiency.

The findings of the group, of which oil expert Morris A. Adelman was a member, are to be printed as the entire May issue of Technology Review, a nationally circulated M.I.T. publication.

The study indicated that "prices of \$10 to \$12 per barrel (oil equivalent) will be neces-

sary to bring forth enough additional supplies of fossil fuels [coal, oil and gas] to satisfy demands in domestic energy markets" by 1980.

"This means that, even if concerted efforts were made to remove the bottlenecks that now exist in these markets (such as Federal price regulation of natural gas), there would have to be yet another round of price increases for consumers as great as that experienced in 1973-74," the group said.

HIGH PRICES SEEN

"In short, self-sufficiency as a form of 'insurance' against disruption or price increase, will be purchased at a very high cost."

Associated with the 10 authors of the study, who are members of the policy study group of M.I.T.'s energy laboratory, were 15 other energy experts at M.I.T. and at Duke, North Carolina State, Pennsylvania State, Harvard, Michigan and Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

Their report recommended against special tariffs to cut down on imports, arguing that oil prices were "high enough to extract present domestic oil and gas reserves with high levels of efficiency."

Also not recommended was the establishment of a "floor" under current energy prices, because prices seem likely to remain high.

Like many others in the energy field, the M.I.T. group recommended relaxation of controls on the wellhead price of natural gas, which averaged 35 cents per 1,000 cubic feet in 1973 and may reach 50 cents for new contracts this year.

If 3 cents were added each year to the new-contract price, the group estimated, supply and demand for natural gas would be in balance in 1980 at 33 trillion cubic feet. * * * continue, it was estimated that demand would total 40 trillion cubic feet and supply only 30 trillion, for a "shortfall" of more than three times the current 3 trillion cubic feet deficit.

Because of environmental problems and

difficulties in assembling both miners and mining equipment, the M.I.T. experts doubted that United States coal production would exceed 800 million tons per year in 1980. It runs about 600 million tons now.

Construction problems and technological challenges stand in the way of a large contribution to the nation's energy supply from such synthetic fuels as gas or oil from coal, oil from shale, or methanol from coal, it was estimated.

"It might take a doubling of price to provide enough of an incentive to bring about the large-scale commercial development of synthetic fuels in the near future; and their development is not sufficiently promising of large supplies to justify such high prices for all energy," the report said.

A plan preferred by the experts was the negotiation of special contracts by the Federal Government with synthetic fuel producers to buy specified amounts at a guaranteed price.

SENATE—Tuesday, June 4, 1974

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, we know not what a day may bring. But, whatever it brings, may all who serve in this place be prepared by Thy Holy Spirit to act honestly, wisely, and courageously for the welfare of this Nation and for the rule of righteousness throughout the world.

We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8215) to provide for the suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes until the close of June 30, 1976.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 81) relating to unaccounted for personnel captured, killed, or missing during the Indochina conflict, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 14833) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 18 months, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 14833) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 18 months, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal proceedings of Monday, June 3, 1974, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VACATING OF ORDER FOR SENATOR MONTOYA TO SPEAK TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time allocated to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA) to speak today, be invalidated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN ITEMS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 862 and 863.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS WITH REGARD TO TORT CLAIMS OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS AGAINST UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 572) to waive the statute of limitations with regard to the tort claims of certain individuals against the United States which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "Act", insert a comma and "or their successors,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the time limitation contained in section 2401(b) of title 28, United States Code, with respect to beginning action on tort claims against the United States shall not

apply in the case of any action filed within six months after the date of enactment of this Act by the individuals named in subsection (b) of this Act, or their successors, on claims for damages arising out of an explosion, which occurred on December 30, 1970, in the Finley Coal Company mines numbered 15 and 16, located near Hyden, Leslie County, Kentucky. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

(b) The individuals referred to in subsection (a) and the capacity in which they may bring actions pursuant to subsection (a) are:

- (1) Nettle Couch, administratrix of the estate of Alonzo Couch, deceased;
- (2) Dewey Collins, administrator of the estate of Fred Collins, deceased;
- (3) Maultie Couch, administratrix of the estate of Holt Couch, deceased;
- (4) Letha Henson, administratrix of the estate of Price Henson, deceased;
- (5) Bobbie Bowling, administratrix of the estate of Arnold Sizemore, deceased;
- (6) Dalsey Couch, administratrix of the estate of Howard Couch, deceased;
- (7) Nancy Mae Gray, administratrix of the estate of Lawrence Gray, deceased;
- (8) Robert Mitchell, administrator of the estate of Lee Mitchell, deceased; and
- (9) Dalley Young, administratrix of the estate of Denver Young, deceased.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MONROE A. LUCAS

The bill (H.R. 6979) for the relief of Monroe A. Lucas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

QUORUM CALL

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.