

Upon the disposition of the Jackson amendment, any rollcall votes ordered on the Kennedy-Cranston amendment would occur.

At the hour of 1 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, the so-called ceiling amendment will be called up by Mr. HUMPHREY, on which there is a time limitation of 1 hour and 15 minutes.

Upon the disposition of the Humphrey amendment the Senate will proceed to vote on the final passage of the military procurement bill. That will also be a rollcall vote.

Upon the disposition of that bill, in the event action has not been completed on the energy appropriation bill action would then be resumed thereon.

Other bills which may be called up on Tuesday and subsequent thereto are—but not necessarily in that order—S. 3523, a bill to establish a temporary national commission on supplies and shortages; S. 585, a bill to amend section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934; H.R. 8217, an act to exempt from duty certain equipment and repairs for vessels operated by or for any agency of the United States—a so-called tax bill. Of course, there are other measures on the calendar which will be cleared for action by next week. Conference reports may be called up at any time and yea-and-nay votes can occur thereon.

The debt limit bill will come along before the end of June. The House is expected to complete action on at least eight appropriation bills, plus perhaps a continuing resolution by the end of June, so Senators are informed that several appropriations bills will be cleared for action by the Senate Committee on Appropriations and will be on the calendar and ready for floor action by the end of June.

Friday sessions may be expected from now on. Rollcall votes can be expected to occur daily.

That is about it.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in ac-

cordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 a.m. Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 4:30 p.m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 10, 1974, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 7, 1974:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officer of the U.S. Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

John S. Calhoun

The following Reserve officers of the U.S. Coast Guard to be permanent commissioned officers in the Regular Coast Guard in the grades indicated:

Lieutenant commander

James F. Brodie, Jr.

Garran C. Crow

Lieutenant

William G. Fisher

Larry J. Balok

Robert W. Cathey

James C. Arritt

Charles E. Hughes

Michael F. McCormack

Daniel L. Farr

Milton D. Moore, Jr.

William A. Dickerson, III

Charles W. Belsky

Howard F. Wirt

Richard E. D'Entremont

William M. Roney

John W. Warren, Jr.

Desmond B. Connolly

Robert L. Joubert

Gary E. Hodge

Milton H. Meekins

John W. Massey

John R. Cotter

Walter D. Moulton

George C. Tureman

Hal W. Cohoon

Peter B. Pontneau

Johnnie L. Johnson

Roger D. Chvalier

Carl D. Main

Peter T. Isaksen

David L. Crede

Lieutenant (junior grade)

The following temporary officers of the U.S. Coast Guard for promotion to chief warrant officer, W2:

Frederick R. Hill

Robert E. Drake

James E. Andrews

Charles W. Belsky

Howard F. Wirt

Richard E. D'Entremont

William M. Roney

John W. Warren, Jr.

Desmond B. Connolly

Robert L. Joubert

Gary E. Hodge

Milton H. Meekins

John W. Massey

John R. Cotter

Walter D. Moulton

George C. Tureman

Frederick R. Hill

Robert E. Drake

James E. Andrews

Charles W. Belsky

Howard F. Wirt

Richard E. D'Entremont

William M. Roney

John W. Warren, Jr.

Desmond B. Connolly

Robert L. Joubert

Gary E. Hodge

Milton H. Meekins

John W. Massey

John R. Cotter

Walter D. Moulton

George C. Tureman

Jeremiah J. Donahue

Kenneth F. Dalton

Dale W. Croteau

Thomas J. Jozwiak

Donald E. Sapp

Charles R. Blarar

William W. Arrington

Eugene Lister

Robert C. Jacobson

Robert L. Ferguson

Dennis G. Johnson

Junius S. Clemmons

William J. Gural

Robert S. Tekesky

Donald A. Perillo

Kenneth R. Land

Jack E. Voss

Phillip R. Mell

Richard A. Eppley

John W. Mullaney, Jr.

Richard W. Collins

Clarence W. Parker

Elson C. Brittle

Jesse O. Rowe

Gerald D. Kerns

Carl W. Fell

Joseph A. Petit

Frederick M. Harrison

Charles E. Kelly

Leonard J. Antoszewski

Victor H. Huck, Jr.

Charles J. Cannon, Jr.

James P. Contratto

David E. Clark

Robert L. Sturgis

Donald J. Dokken

William R. Garinger

Angel M. Lopez

Charles A. Brinson

Gordon L. Pierce

Dale R. Wilkins

Jose G. Jimenez

Charles E. Isgett

Thomas J. Hickey

Demetrio F. Aspiras

Carl D. Maddy

Howard E. Hall

Norman L. M. Peleholani

Lonnie L. Hyatt

Richard E. Rainville

James A. Irwin

John C. Leith III

Larry H. Olszewski

Thurman G. Fogelstrom

Denis J. Mayberry

Ronald E. Curtis

Norvie S. Gillikin

Gary L. Perry

Carl L. Ditmars

Samuel G. Cottrell, Jr.

Darold W. Smith

Larry M. Conard

Walter J. Hanson

Kent W. Kramer

Ronnie L. Kunz

Dennis C. Dougherty

James R. Stith

Jack B. West

Henry L. Riebel

William E. Richardson

Robert G. Hunter

Norman A. Swanson

Edward F. Nuzman

Nich V. Swanson

Marion C. Parker

Noel E. Crowley

Patrick J. O'Hara

Frank H. Legate

James J. O'Brien

Alice T. Jefferson

Russell R. Griffin

Robert T. McLaughlin

Librado Torres

William Heelan

Michael J. Monroe

Bernard A. Kincaid

Terry O. Gallaher

Harry R. Bishop

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 6, 1974, not listed in RECORD of June 6:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

J. William Middendorf II, of Connecticut, to be Secretary of the Navy.

(The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HERB HOFFMAN—A DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT—RETIRES

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, after 30 years of public service, Herb Hoffman, counsel to the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice of the House Judiciary Committee, is retiring.

I first came to know Herb when he headed the Legislative Office in the Department of Justice, and through the years came to respect his legal judgments, boundless energy, and dedication to the public interest.

When my predecessor as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee enticed Herb to join the committee staff 3 years ago,

I joined hundreds of others who bade him farewell at a reception in the Deputy Attorney General's office.

Now, Herb is leaving the committee staff and retiring from Government service. However, I am pleased that the American Bar Association has seen fit to avail itself of Herb's talents as director of its newly created governmental relations office. I congratulate the ABA on its choice, and wish Herb every success in his new career.

The ABA release which announced the appointment follows:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION NAMES HOFFMAN DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS OFFICE

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 28.—The American Bar Association today appointed Herbert E. Hoffman, of Arlington, Va., as director of its newly named Governmental Relations Office here.

Hoffman, who is counsel to the House Com-

mittee on the Judiciary, succeeds Donald E. Channell, who for the past 17 years served as director of the Association's Washington office. Channell, who recently resigned to enter private practice in Washington, will serve as a legislative consultant to the ABA.

Hoffman's appointment was announced here by Bert H. Early, ABA executive director. Under Hoffman's leadership, Early said the American Bar Association will expand its public service efforts with the Congress and with the federal agencies. He added that the ABA's office here also will provide a wider range of governmental information services to state and local bar associations and to other affiliated bar groups.

As the ABA's highest staff officer in Washington, Hoffman will direct the Association's liaison with the three branches of the federal government. The headquarters of the 180,000-member ABA is in Chicago.

Hoffman, a native of New York City, was graduated from New York University with a bachelor of science degree in 1937 and received his law degree there in 1939. He prac-

ticed law in New York City for two years before World War II and for two years after.

During that war, he served as a chief warrant officer and for two years as an assistant division judge advocate, 11th Airborne Division. His work took him to the South Pacific and Japan.

Hoffman joined the legislative section, Office of the Deputy Attorney General, in 1948 and was named its chief in 1961. He has served the House Judiciary Committee since 1971.

Hoffman since 1967 also has served as adjunct professor of law at Georgetown University Law Center. His teaching specialty has been legislation. He also has lectured on legislation for the U.S. Department of Justice and the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

He and his wife, Beth, who is principal of the Drew Model Elementary School in Arlington, are the parents of three children. Their son, David, is an attorney in Tucson. Their daughter, Joan, teaches in Arlington, and their daughter, Barbara, studies at Johns Hopkins University.

AMERICANISM AT FRANCIS A. LOMBARDO AMERICAN LEGION POST 1031

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1974, I had the great pleasure of attending the seventh annual dinner-dance festival of the Francis A. Lombardo American Legion Post 1031, of Buffalo, N.Y.

In addition to being a pleasant social event, it was also an inspiring occasion during which the annual Americanism Award was presented to Mr. James M. Hooker, director, Buffalo regional office, U.S. Veterans' Administration, and I had the honor of presenting Mr. Hooker with an American flag which had been flown over our U.S. Capitol for him.

Post 1031's commander, Samuel C. Nicosia, had warm greetings for those in attendance, and I join in congratulating Chairman Vito Andriaccio and Cochairman Charles J. Monteleone.

As Commander of the Francis A. Lombardo, American Legion Post No. 1031, this past year has been a challenging opportunity to service my fellow comrades.

This evening highlights for all good Legionnaires the activities which a cooperative organization can accomplish with able assistance of the Ladies Auxiliary. The attendance conveys the friendship and support we receive from not only Legionnaires but from the local community. I invite all veterans who are not members of veterans organizations to close ranks and be counted again.

This year's committee headed by Vito Andriaccio, chairman and Charles J. Monteleone, co-chairman are to be congratulated for the success of tonight's affair.

The toastmaster, New York State Senator John La Falce, did an excellent job, and the program was impressive, with a particularly fine speech by Buffalo City Court Judge Carmelo Parlato.

Post 1031 is named in honor of Cpl. Francis A. Lombardo, who died in action during the invasion of Italy in World War

II. His brother Joseph was reported missing in action at that time, but was fortunately spared and returned to Buffalo. Another brother, Michael, was wounded in the Philippines, but refused to allow a recommendation for a Purple Heart for fear of further distressing his mother. In April 1973, our office was able to assist in research medical records, and Michael received his medal 27 years late—but, sadly, only 2 months later he died.

I had the privilege of serving in the Buffalo Common Council with a fourth brother, the late Anthony Lombardo. The gallant mother of these men, Mrs. Catherine Lombardo, was one of the distinguished guests at the festival.

James Hooker is certainly a most deserving recipient of the Americanism Award this year. His biography follows:

James M. Hooker, a native of Western New York, is Director of the Buffalo Regional Office of the United States Veterans Administration and also Chairman of the Federal Executive Board.

After pursuing his education locally, he joined the United States Air Force in December 1942. He saw thirty-six months service with the Twelfth Air Force in Africa, Sicily and Italy, receiving an honorable discharge in December 1945. Shortly thereafter he was accepted into membership of Troop I American Legion Post No. 665 in Buffalo.

A career employee, he joined the Veterans Administration when offices were opened in Buffalo in March 1946, serving in various responsible capacities until June 1966 when he was transferred to the Baltimore Regional Office of the Veterans Administration as Assistant Director. In September 1970, he returned to the Buffalo Office serving as Assistant Director until receiving his current appointment.

As Director of the Veterans Administration Regional Office, he has jurisdiction over and responsibility for the integrated program of veterans' benefits consisting of compensation, pension, education, loan guarantee and veterans assistance activities in the 31-counties of Western and Central New York. He has been recognized on numerous occasions by the Veterans Administration for sustained and outstanding performance rendered in providing service to veterans and their families.

While assigned to the Veterans Administration Regional Office in Baltimore, Maryland, he was actively involved in establishing one of the initial Federal Executive Boards in the nation, as directed by the President. Upon return to the Buffalo area he continued his involvement, currently serving as Chairman of the organization of Federal executives dedicated to improving delivery of Government services in the Niagara Frontier. On June 19, 1973, he was awarded the John E. Foley Memorial Award by the Federal Executive Board of Buffalo for outstanding service within the community and for an exemplary record of integrity and devotion to public service.

Although a member of a number of veterans' organizations, he has been most active as a Legionnaire, currently serving as Commander of Troop I American Legion Post No. 665.

It was a great pleasure for me to present the flag to Mr. Hooker, and I would like to insert my statement:

"Americanism"—an endless quest for something new—to make our country and our community a better place to live in. It is almost a religion—it is a thing of spirit. It is a goal, not only for a free life—but a better life.

To achieve this goal, Jim Hooker not only carries out his Federal functions in a fair, humane, and understanding way, but has expanded his talents to the community in the field of youth activities, the West Side Boys Club, the Front Park Hockey Club, to mention a few, and all of these added efforts directed at making better citizens and a better community and a better life.

I would like to join your post in honoring this man by presenting to him a flag that flew over the Capitol, specifically for him.

All in all, it was a memorable event—a refreshing display of patriotism and recognition of service to our country. With people like these respecting our honorable, hard-won traditions, we can feel the future of our Nation is secure.

DR. BURNS SPEAKS ON INFLATION

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. Speaker, on May 26 the distinguished Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Dr. Arthur F. Burns, addressed the graduating class at Illinois College. He patriotically and perceptively spoke on a subject of vital importance to the young people in his audience, because he identified a problem that threatens their life styles, their economic opportunity, and their freedom. But, Mr. Speaker, his message is a message that should be heeded not just by the recent graduates of Illinois College but by every citizen of our country, because the problem he discussed threatens us all with the same debilitating consequences.

Dr. Burns discussed the problem of inflation—its causes, effects, and remedy. In defining the seriousness of the problem of inflation, Dr. Burns stated:

The gravity of our current inflationary problem can hardly be over-estimated . . . If past experience is any guide, the future of our country is in jeopardy. No country that I know of has been able to maintain widespread economic prosperity once inflation got out of hand. And the unhappy consequences are by no means solely of an economic character. If long continued, inflation at anything like the present rate would threaten the very foundations of our society.

Dr. Burns listed the following among special causal factors contributing to the inflationary pressures that abound in the land:

With production rising rapidly across the world, prices of labor, materials, and finished products were bid up everywhere. To make matters worse, disappointing crop harvests in a number of countries in 1972 forced a sharp run-up in the prices of food last year. The manipulation of petroleum supplies and prices by oil-exporting countries gave another dramatic push to the general price level last autumn and early this year. . . . Recently, our price level has also reacted strongly to the removal of wage and price controls—a painful, but essential adjustment in the return of free markets.

But Dr. Burns went on to identify the more basic causes of inflation as being increased dependence on Government enterprise and less on individual initia-

tive in the attainment of economic objectives. He properly pointed out that while Government endeavors to foster prosperity and to mitigate economic adversity are laudable objectives, they have resulted in the governmental budgetary affairs getting sorely and dangerously out of hand. He termed the inflation that ensued from this loss of budgetary restraint as "the most dangerous economic ailment of our time."

Dr. Burns told his audience what we must do as a nation and as individual citizens to cope with this crucial problem. He stated we must resist swift expansion in money and credit. Our Federal budgetary affairs must be handled more responsibly. We must improve our industrial efficiency and individual productivity. We must strengthen competition in our private enterprise system. Augmented incentives to produce should be adopted. As consumers, we should adopt more careful spending habits.

This distinguished American concluded his remarks by observing that while there is no easy way out of our inflationary morass, the elimination of inflation is essential to our Nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of Dr. Burns' remarks to the graduating class at Illinois College at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD CHAIRMAN
ARTHUR F. BURNS

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

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

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

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

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

To make matters worse, disappointing crop

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

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

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

Ironically, the roots of that bias lie chiefly in the rising aspirations of people everywhere. We are a nation in a hurry for more and more of what we consider the good things of life. I do not question that yearning. Properly directed, it can be a powerful force for human betterment. Difficulties arise, however, when people in general seek to reach their goals by means of short cuts; and that is what has happened.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This is a well-meaning proposal, but it is neither sound nor practical. For one thing, there are hundreds of billions of dollars of outstanding contracts—on mortgages, public and private bonds, insurance policies, and the like—that as a practical matter could

not be renegotiated. Even with regard to new undertakings, the obstacles to achieving satisfactory escalator arrangements in our free and complex economy, where people differ so much in financial sophistication, seem insuperable. More important still, by making it easier for many people to live with inflation, escalator arrangements would gravely weaken the discipline that is needed to conduct business and government affairs prudently and efficiently. Universal escalation, I am therefore convinced, is an illusory and dangerous quest. The responsible course is to fight inflation with all the energy we can muster and with all the weapons at our command.

One essential ingredient in this struggle is continued resistance to swift growth in money and credit. The Federal Reserve System, I assure you, is firmly committed to this task. We intend to encourage sufficient growth in supplies of money and credit to finance orderly economic expansion. But we are not going to be a willing party to the accommodation of rampant inflation.

As this year's experience has again indicated, a serious effort to moderate the growth of money and credit during a period of burgeoning credit demand results in higher interest rates—particularly on short-term loans. Troublesome though this rise in interest rates may be, it must for a time be tolerated. For, if monetary policy sought to prevent a rise in interest rates when credit demands were booming, money and credit would expand explosively, with devastating effects on the price level. Any such policy would in the end be futile, even as far as interest rates are concerned, because these rates would soon reflect the rise in the price level and therefore go up all the more. We must not let that happen.

But I cannot emphasize too strongly that monetary policy alone cannot solve our stubborn inflationary problem. We must work simultaneously at lessening the powerful underlying bias toward inflation that stems from excessive total demands on our limited resources. This means, among other things, that the Federal budget has to be handled more responsibly than it has been in the past.

Incredible though it may seem, the Congress has been operating over the years without any semblance of a rational budget plan. The committees that consider spending operate independently of the committees that consider taxes, and appropriations themselves are treated in more than a dozen different bills annually. All of this means that the Federal budget never really gets considered as a whole—a fact which helps explain it is so often in deficit.

Fortunately, after many years of advocacy by concerned citizens and legislators, this glaring deficiency in the Congressional budget process is about to be remedied. Bills that would integrate spending and taxing decisions have passed both the House and the Senate. This is a most encouraging development, and we may confidently expect final action soon by the Congress on this landmark legislation.

Procedural changes, however, will mean little unless the political will exists to exploit the changes fully. And this can happen only if the American people understand the nature of the inflation we have been experiencing and demand appropriate action by their elected representatives.

As you leave this hall today, I urge you to give continuing thought and study to the problem of inflation. If it persists, it will affect your personal lives profoundly. Where possible, I urge you to assume a leadership role in getting people everywhere interested in understanding inflation and in doing something about it. In the great "town hall" tradition of America, much can be accomplished if people organize themselves—in their offices, trade unions, factories, social

clubs, and churches—to probe beneath the superficial explanations of inflation that are the gossip of everyday life. Productivity councils in local communities and enterprises, established for the purpose of improving efficiency and cutting costs, can be directly helpful in restraining inflation.

While I am on the subject of what individuals can do to be helpful, let me note the need for rediscovery of the art of careful budgeting of family expenditures. In some of our businesses, price competition has atrophied as a mode of economic behavior, in part because many of our families no longer exercise much discipline in their spending. We have become a nation of impulse shoppers, of gadget buyers. We give less thought than we should to choosing among the thousands of commodities and services available in our markets. And many of us no longer practice comparative price shopping—not even for big-ticket items. Careful spending habits are not only in the best interest of every family; they could contribute powerfully to a new emphasis on price competition in consumer markets.

I do not expect that the path back to reasonable price stability can be traveled quickly. Indeed, our government will need to take numerous steps to reduce the inflationary bias of our economy—besides those I have emphasized. The forces of competition in labor and product markets need to be strengthened—perhaps by establishing wage and price review boards to minimize abuses of economic power certainly through more vigorous enforcement of the anti-trust laws, besides elimination of barriers to entry in skilled occupations, reduction of barriers to imports from abroad, and modification of minimum wage laws to improve job opportunities for teenagers. Impediments to increased production that still remain in farming, construction work, and other industries need to be removed. And greater incentives should be provided for enlarging our capacity to produce industrial materials, energy, and other products in short supply.

But if inflation cannot be ended quickly, neither can it be eliminated without cost. Some industries will inevitably operate for a time at lower rates of production than they would prefer. Government cannot—and should not—try to compensate fully for all such occurrences. Such a policy would involve negotiating with one hand what was being attempted with the other.

But government does have a proper ameliorative role to play in areas, such as housing, where the incidence of credit restraint has been disproportionately heavy. The special burden that has fallen on homebuilding should be lightened, as is the intent of the housing aids which the Administration recently announced. And my personal judgment is that it would be advisable, too, for government to be prepared, if need be, to expand the roster of public-service jobs. This particular means of easing especially troublesome situations of unemployment will not add permanently to governmental costs. And in any event, it would conflict much less with basic anti-inflation objectives than would the conventional alternative of general monetary or fiscal stimulus. A cut in personal income taxes, for instance, would serve to perpetuate budget deficits. Not only that, it might prove of little aid to the particular industries or localities that are now experiencing economic difficulty. Much the same would be true of a monetary policy that permitted rapid growth of money and credit. There is no justification for such fateful steps at this time.

In concluding, I would simply repeat my central message: there is no easy way out of the inflationary morass into which we have allowed ourselves to sink through negligence and imperfect vision. But I am confident that we will succeed if the American people become more alert to the challenge. I

hope that the members of this graduating class will join with other citizens across the country in a great national crusade to put an end to inflation and restore the conditions essential to a stable prosperity—a prosperity whose benefits can be enjoyed by all our people. This objective is within our means and is essential to our nation's future.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE SHOULD ENFORCE ITS SUBPENAS IN COURT

HON. HAROLD V. FROELICH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken out on several occasions about the desirability of the Judiciary Committee seeking to enforce its Presidential subpoenas in court. Certainly, the President does not have the authority to reject in toto the committee's legitimate demands for information; but I am equally certain that the committee's authority to demand evidence from the President is not unlimited. Regrettably, the latter view, up to this point, has not found much favor among my colleagues on the committee.

On Wednesday, June 5, 1974, the Wall Street Journal published an outstanding editorial on this very issue; and I am happy to report that the Journal's editors have taken a position similar to my own. This cogent editorial may cause many of the members of the committee to rethink their positions on the role of the courts in the impeachment. The editorial appears below:

IMPEACHMENT AND THE COURTS

We do not see how Congress can vote on the substance of a case for impeachment unless it first encourages the courts to handle questions of evidence and executive privilege, which otherwise will be intractable procedural snarls. While the House Judiciary Committee has so far refused to seek adjudication, we hope and trust the matter is not yet closed.

As one straw in the wind, we note that Senate Majority Leader Mansfield has asked the Supreme Court to forego its usual summer recess, holding itself ready to decide questions affecting Watergate. In allowing Special Prosecutor Leon Jaworski to skip the usual appellate level and scheduling a July hearing on his subpoena of Oval Office tapes, the Court not only took the majority leader's advice but expressed its own willingness to involve itself in Watergate proceedings.

We are at a bit of a loss to understand the Rodino committee's adamant opposition to invoking the court. But we have been increasingly impressed by its general handling of the impeachment probe, and we would be far from surprised if it yet decided to go to court in the face of presidential refusals to yield more evidence. Surely the committee can understand that the nation deserves a vote on the substance of alleged presidential wrongdoings, not on the prerogatives of Congress versus the prerogatives of the Executive.

The committee's refusal to go to court would be easier to understand if it had been less careful generally, for the quickest explanation is that it feels it needs the procedural issue to make a case against the President. The House could find no grounds on which to impeach Andrew Johnson, for example, until it forced him into an impasse

on prerogatives. Similarly, we now learn, when Tammany Hall Democrats impeached and removed a threatening New York governor, the grounds were campaign fund violations and refusing to cooperate with the impeachment panel.

As we have said before, we think the committee's demand for further evidence is entirely justified by the ambiguity of the transcripts so far released; we think the President ought to accede or at least ask the courts to rule and accept the outcome. But it is also true that by demanding more and more the committee can keep the procedural issue alive forever, regardless of any issue of substance. It can unilaterally create its own grounds for impeachment.

If the committee allowed the courts to arbitrate, procedural issues would be grounds for impeachment only if the President decided to defy both branches. In that case they would be good grounds indeed. But by allowing the courts to impose limits on its demands, the committee would lose the one option through which it can assure itself of grounds for impeachment. No doubt a fear that the substantive case alone will not be enough is the reason some partisans paint the whole idea of adjudicating as something of a Nixon plot, but the committee itself ought to be above that kind of thinking.

There are of course more solid fears about involving the court, as the discussion nearby shows. To rule on evidence, the courts would have to decide in their own minds what constitutes an impeachable offense. But surely the argument that they cannot do this without asserting the power to overrule Congress' eventual decision strains at gnats and swallows elephants.

We also doubt that the Congress really wants to argue that the courts have no place because impeachment is a purely political matter anyway. It is of course true that public opinion will eventually be decisive, but the public is too sensible to see the impeachment issue as one of prerogatives of the branches of government. We should think that all branches should try to meet the real issue, which is whether or not the President is guilty of wrongdoing.

Obviously a great many people have already made up their minds, both pro and con, on the President's guilt. But there are also those of us who find the current evidence quite ambiguous and are interested in trying to establish the truth about so serious a matter. The truth will not be established by impeaching the President for refusing subpoenas or citing him for contempt of Congress. Going to the courts is the best route for forcing out the relevant evidence; Congress' function is to then render its judgment on where the truth lies.

In accepting the Jaworski appeal, the Supreme Court has moved some way towards accepting its part of those tasks, though the issues in that case will still be far from those that would arise in the full context of an impeachment probe. Congress' next step ought to be a suit putting the issue squarely, even at the risk of giving up sweeping but ultimately empty claims of unilateral jurisdiction. In deciding whether to take that course, Congress needs to ask which is more important, rhetorically defending its prerogatives, or arriving at the truth about Watergate.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, in the interests of more fully acquainting the

American people with the financial affairs of their elected officials, I recently made public information with respect to my income during 1973, and the taxes paid by me to the Federal Government and to State and local governments.

To augment that information, I am at this time publishing details concerning the assets which Mrs. O'Hara and I have accrued over the years.

Mr. Speaker, my wife and I and our seven children have a home in Utica, Mich. We purchased that home in 1958 for \$17,000, and paid off the mortgage in April 1974. We also have a residence in the Washington area which we purchased in 1967 at a cost of \$50,000. The mortgage balance on this house is \$34,348.94.

We have two family cars—a 1970 Dodge Dart and a 1972 Dodge Sportsvan on which we owe \$1,507.09. We have a sailboat which we purchased last year for \$1,500.

In addition, we have \$9,296.13 in savings in the Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union, and approximately \$524.23 in my checking account. I also own one share of A.T. & T. stock which presently has a market value of \$46.50.

I am one-third owner of three pieces of investment real estate which I purchased jointly with my brother and a friend. They are an unimproved lot which we acquired for \$9,500; a house which we purchased for \$6,500 with the intention of renovating and then renting it; and another house for which we paid \$15,400 and on which we have a mortgage balance of \$12,400.

Looking toward the future, I am contributing to the Federal employees retirement plan into which I now pay 8 percent of my congressional salary each year and in which I have an equity of \$37,160.05.

Mr. Speaker, I am publishing this information, not because of any requirement of law or regulation, but solely in the public interest. In so doing, I recognize there are conflicting rights involved. On the one hand, there is the right to privacy, which, I submit, public officials possess just as much as do private citizens. On the other hand, there is the people's right to know.

By releasing our financial information in this instance, Mrs. O'Hara and I are giving up some of our right to privacy. But if it helps in a small way to restore public confidence in those who the people elect to represent them, our doing so will have served a useful purpose.

STATE DEPARTMENT GOES HIGHRISE IN TOKYO

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a new U.S. embassy building in Tokyo may not seem of great importance since all indications are that the State Department and foreign aid crowd are running the United States for the benefit of foreigners.

But a 12-story reinforced concrete structure, covering 3.2 acres, a garage for 72 cars and housing about 700 employees at an estimated cost of \$12,253,529 may cause some Americans to wonder if we are providing a mission to Japan or if we are planning on turning it into a colony.

The fact that the State Department experts claim that the cost of the new chancery may be paid for through Japanese land deals will also be little solace to the American taxpayer. He may wonder why if the State Department is making profitable deals on his overseas investment, the money is not returned to the public treasury like a portion of the taxpayers' is.

Some people still remember the lavish State Department complex in India at a cost of \$6 million, to separate the State Department personnel who lived like kings from the average poor Indian, and then was given to the Indian Government. Some may wonder if this may be the fate of our new "Empire" State Department building in Tokyo, when we Americans are ousted from there. I insert related news clippings to follow my remarks at this point:

[From the Washington Post, June 2, 1974]

U.S. READIES TOKYO SITE FOR EMBASSY

(By Ian Mackenzie)

TOKYO.—The wrecker's ball is tearing the innards out of the sedate white-walled chancery of the United States mission in central Tokyo to make way for a 12-story reinforced concrete structure.

The new office building, due for completion in mid-1976, will be the largest U.S. embassy building in the world, housing about 700 employees now scattered in seven area buildings.

An embassy pamphlet describes the old chancery and two adjacent apartment buildings turned into offices as "two story structures . . . built in an eclectic style with Oriental, Spanish and American colonial overtones."

"The exterior was stucco with extensive use of wrought iron, copper and decorative pillars. Inside, many of the walls were paneled in American walnut and the floors were primarily of Vermont marble," it adds. Whatever the style, the old chancery added a touch of serenity to a busy corner of Tokyo, and many are sad to see it go.

The ambassador's residence, built in the same style, will remain just behind the new building.

A document recovered from the cornerstone of the old chancery says the American mission has been on the same site since 1888.

The land originally was a graveyard when purchased by Baron Okura in 1888. He erected a building on the site for the American minister and in 1889, the Japanese government bought the land from the baron and leased it to the American government.

The original buildings, including the ambassador's residence, chancery, office buildings and stables, stood until September 1, 1923, when they—along with much of the rest of Tokyo—were destroyed in an earthquake.

Ground was broken for the new building in 1929, and it was completed in 1931 at a cost of \$553,005. President Herbert Hoover was criticized at the time for the projected cost.

During World War II, the embassy building was cared for by the Swiss legation.

But a postwar acquisition by the U.S. government has more than covered the cost of the new chancery—\$12,253,529.

The allied occupation forces took over the nearby offices of the South Manchurian Railway Co. in 1945.

The U.S. government in turn bought the brick office building from the Japanese government in 1952 and turned it into an annex for the overcrowded embassy. Now the U.S. has sold the annex to a development company.

The new chancery, covering 3.2 acres, will consist of a 12-story high-rise tower, a three-story rise portion and a basement. It will include a garage for 72 cars, auditorium and cafeteria as well as embassy offices.

[From the Washington Post, July 16, 1973]

U.S. TO END AID PROGRAM IN INDIA

(By Lewis M. Simons)

NEW DELHI, July 15.—In the next couple of days, as soon as Prime Minister Indira Gandhi gets over a case of flu, U.S. Ambassador Daniel Patrick Moynihan will call on her and close out an era.

The ambassador will inform the prime minister that the much-maligned U.S. aid program to India is officially ended, at her government's insistence, after 22 years and an expenditure of \$10 billion.

Moynihan will also present Mrs. Gandhi with a proposal for disposing of \$840 million in Indian rupees held by the United States as a result of Indian payments for American grain supplied during the famine years of the 1960s under the Food for Peace program.

Finally, Moynihan will turn over to the prime minister a \$6 million complex of luxury buildings occupied by the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) in New Delhi. The complex was completed just two years ago.

So far as the Indians are concerned, the most important of the three components of the package will be Moynihan's proposition regarding the U.S. rupee holdings.

These rupees are held in the Reserve Bank of India and they represent a drain on the Indian economy because of the enormous interest the account commands—interest that is piling up faster than the rupees themselves can possibly be spent.

The ambassador, who recently returned from consultations with President Nixon, refuses to reveal details of the plan until he has seen Mrs. Gandhi. He said only that the proposal falls "somewhere between zero and infinity." In other words, it will not insist that the mammoth account remain in the Indian bank, nor will it write off the entire matter, as the Indians would like.

Sources familiar with the proposal say it is a good one, from India's viewpoint and that Mrs. Gandhi is likely to accept it. Her only reason for rejecting it, the sources speculate, would be political, not economic.

The prime minister and members of her government periodically trot out the "rupee problem" when they want to accuse the United States of worming its way into the Indian economy. But the United States may not spend any of its rupee holdings without India's express consent.

Moynihan hopes his plan will be the first important step toward putting Indian-American relations on a normal nation-to-nation basis.

As such an ideological variants and military alliances, the donor-debtor relationship has helped sour India on the United States and vice versa.

The prime minister's attitude makes clear that there is no point to the old kind of relationship for either side. Knowing this, Moynihan is eager to clear the decks before his stewardship moves into full gear.

He views the transfer of the U.S. AID complex of buildings to the government of India as symbolizing an end to one era and the start of another.

The collection of white brick buildings sticks up from the desert on the south edge

of New Delhi like a sore thumb. And like a sore thumb, it has been an irritant ever since it was built.

The south block complex, as it is known to AID staff members, was living proof that the United States owned more of India's rupees than was good for either currency.

The decision to build the complex, with food for peace rupees, was made in 1969, when AID had 260 Americans working in India and the United States was spending what considered "funny money" on anything it could think of, just to get rid of some of it.

As one AID insider put it, "The way we were buying and spending in those days would make your hair curl. Anything, anybody wanted was okay."

The south block complex fit in perfectly with that kind of mentality. After all, the reasoning went, India is a hard place for Americans to live in. The weather is miserably hot at least half the year, and all year-round in some parts; You cannot drink the water without boiling it; you cannot buy a steak; outside the big cities there's no place to swim, etc., etc. In short, wouldn't it be nice to have a place where we could get away from India, even for just a little while.

The south block is just such a place. "An ostentatious American ghetto, but the best damned oasis in the Indian desert" as one AID staffer put it. The complex consists of a clustered six-story building containing 30 roomy two- and three-bedroom apartments; a hotel with 18 double rooms as well as a dining room, cocktail lounge, reception room, library, four-lane bowling alley and swimming pool. The whole thing is swathed in tinted glass, lined with wall-to-wall carpeting, cooled with central air conditioning, sweetened with piped-in stereo music and lubricated with pure drinking water right from the taps.

In addition to these living and playing facilities, the complex has a sprawling, low-slung office block, a giant warehouse and a covered garage. These buildings have already been turned over to India which has installed members of its science and technology ministry in them.

The rest of the buildings will be turned over by the end of September. Such a transfer was envisaged in 1969. The agreement signed by AID and the Indian government then said India would receive the complex "when no longer required for the support of the United States assistance program in India."

Barely a year after the construction ended, Mrs. Gandhi said India had had enough of U.S. AID and the staff was quickly run down to its present 12 Americans.

A major unknown is how the Indian government is going to cope with the huge cost and expertise needed to run the modern complex. Electricity alone costs \$67,000 a year. Total annual operating costs are \$160,000.

An American engineer who just completed an overall inspection of the plumbing and water purification plant told AID staffers he expected the whole system would cease functioning in six months after the Indians take over.

Cyril Peters, an Indian national who has been manager of the complex since its completion, says it will take even less time.

"The government won't be able to run it," said Peters. "I'd hate to see it three months after they move in. Under my management, everyone does whatever is required of him. The government will have to worry about caste. Higher caste people won't help with low-level jobs. It will be a mess."

The end of the south block complex does not mean that the American community in New Delhi will no longer have a refuge from India.

There is still the American Community Support Association, where Americans can taste such joys of home as hamburgers, hot

dogs, American beer, cokes and soft ice cream and relax in the swimming pool and on the baseball diamond.

The handful of AID staffers and their families who will remain in New Delhi to oversee outstanding loans, the large school lunch program and a few other extant projects are being transferred to rented houses or embassy compound apartments.

Ironically, just as the south block is being given up, the U.S. embassy finds itself needing at least 20 new apartments for staff members. A 12-unit building was recently completed and plans for others are on the drawing boards.

HEROIN

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. Wolff) in introducing a resolution calling upon the Turkish Government to halt its efforts at lifting the ban on opium production.

With over 200,000 heroin addicts in the United States, we cannot be complacent in combating this deadly plague. The critically serious problem of heroin addiction calls for immediate and massive attention; this crime and health problem taking its heaviest toll on our young people.

Heroin traffic is a lucrative business for drug peddlers throughout the world necessitating international cooperation if we are ever to rid ourselves of this growing scourge.

The Turkish Government has recently indicated that it is considering lifting the ban on poppy cultivation. Our Nation pressed hard for the institution of the ban, and expended over \$35 million in assistance to Turkey to provide relief to those poppy growers who were adversely affected by the ban.

Reports from our drug enforcement officials indicate that the ban was effective, drying up opium trade in Turkey, substantially diminishing heroin traffic here at home. Prior to the poppy ban, it was reported that there were over 500,000 heroin addicts in our Nation. The ban, combined with effective rehabilitation programs, reduced this figure to 200,000 over the past 2 years.

We cannot quarrel with that kind of success. We must forcefully convince the Turkish Government that we are committed to ending the drug plague in our own Nation and need their cooperation in doing so. Accordingly, our resolution calls upon our diplomatic leaders to step up negotiations with Turkey, urging that nation to subsist in any further poppy cultivation.

If we are unsuccessful in our negotiations, we must certainly take action in the form of cutting off U.S. assistance to internal Turkey. While I am reluctant to impose upon the policies of another country, opium growth in other nations threatens the lives of all Americans. Without wholehearted global cooperation we solely cannot prevent the onslaught of the drug epidemic.

Accordingly, I am pleased that so many of our Members have joined in this im-

portant effort. A bipartisan majority of House Members, including a majority of Foreign Affairs Committee members, have joined us in sponsoring this legislation. Such an impressive deluge of support from the Congress, should help our negotiators to forcefully convey to the Turkish Government that we do, indeed, mean business, and that we will not drag our feet in combating the plague of drug addiction in the United States. The seriousness of the heroin problem cries out for an exhaustive effort at containment. We must remain firm in our commitment to stamping out the deadly flow of drug traffic. Wherever it may emanate and whoever it may involve.

SCARE TACTICS ON STRIP MINE BILL

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, John C. Sawhill, Administrator of the Federal Energy Office directed a letter to Representative CRAIG HOSMER in which he has distorted the impact and the purpose of H.R. 11500, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1973. This bill, reported out of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on May 30, has been endorsed by both the United Mine Workers of America and the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. Sawhill is trying to scuttle H.R. 11500 with a completely unsubstantiated charge that "it would seriously cut existing coal production and also remove vast amounts of coal reserves from future production." I have carefully examined the various points at issue raised in Mr. Sawhill's letter, comparing them with the final report of the Bureau of Mines which analyzes the possible and probable effects of H.R. 11500 on coal production through 1980, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I can find little or no justification for such a statement. On the contrary, it would appear that Mr. Sawhill was chosen to serve—perhaps unwittingly—as a spokesman for industrial groups which have decided that strong effective Federal-State regulation of coal surface mining cannot be tolerated.

Let me review the points raised in Mr. Sawhill's letter.

First. Designation of areas unsuitable for surface coal mining—section 206.

Mr. Sawhill's notion that a nationwide ban on the surface mining of coal is implied by the bill, constitutes a complete misreading of the section which requires States to establish a planning process enabling objective decisions as to which areas of land—if any—are unsuitable for all or certain types of surface coal mining operations. It should be clear from any reasonable interpretation of the language of this section that the planning process within a State would be based on the premise that areas must be designated unsuitable for surface mining only if they are demonstrably not reclaimable. The burden of proof is upon the petitioner in each case to show that

reclamation as required in the bill, is neither physically nor economically feasible in a given area. Until such proof is provided, it is assumed that all areas may be open to surface mining for coal.

Indeed, it is quite conceivable that no State will choose to so designate areas, even after setting up the required planning process. This provision in the bill is entirely discretionary, both as to State and Federal lands. The actual designation of State areas as unsuitable for surface mining must be triggered by persons who come forward with documented evidence as to the character of the land involved and the feasibility of reclamation. Mr. Sawhill's conjuring up a "nationwide ban on new mining," with coal production losses upwards to 350 million tons per year by 1985, makes sense only to those who choose to misinterpret the whole intent of the bill.

Second. Prohibition of mining in national forests—section 209.

Mr. Sawhill's statement that the foreclosure of the surface mining of coal on national forests lands will eliminate 15 percent of the Nation's recoverable surface mineable reserves is grossly overstated. It is particularly so because he has provided no indication of what proportion of the 7 billion tons of coal reserves underlying national forest lands are recoverable by deep mining methods. The Bureau of Mines' analysis simply states that:

Prohibition of surface mining on national forests would sterilize some 7 billion tons of reserves, an amount that must be recognized as having a sizeable impact on the total near surface, easily mineable reserves.

To proceed from that general statement to the Sawhill claim that 15 percent of the Nation's recoverable surface mine reserves of coal would be precluded by this section is to strain one's credulity. In another example of his cavalier treatment of facts, the Administrator goes on to state that:

We cannot, within any reasonable degree of accuracy, at this time calculate the effect on immediate production.

This statement, while implying the effect might be severe, actually ignores the committee's excepting from the national forest lands ban all existing operations, or those having substantial legal and financial commitments as of September 1, 1973. All such operations would continue under the bill; therefore there would be no decrease in coal production from this category.

Third. Approximately original contour and steep slope provisions—section 211.

The figures presented by Mr. Sawhill for estimated coal production losses due to certain provisions restricting the placement of spoil on steep slopes and requiring return of the mine site to its approximate original contour, upon comparison with the Bureau of Mines analysis reveal a further disregard for reality. Up to 2.5 billion tons of coal would be permanently lost to mining, with an immediate annual loss in production of up to 67 million tons, according to the Federal Energy Office Administrator.

Referring to tables in the Bureau of Mines analysis on which this assertion appears to be based, it seems that the

maximum possible loss which could result from no spoil on steep slopes has been set at 16 million tons, while the maximum probable loss is set at 4 million tons, both regarding 1975. In the case of estimated losses from the return to approximate original contour provisions, the comparable figures are 26.9 million tons and 3.5 million tons respectively. Now, even if the two highest estimates are totaled—16 plus 26.9—it is difficult to comprehend how the immediate annual loss in production of 67 million tons was reached by the Federal Energy Office.

Considering that some of the assumptions underlying estimates are highly questionable, there is all the more reason to doubt the validity of these Federal Energy Office allegations.

For example, one assumption is that for maximum possible losses due the steep slope requirements, all projected coal production from slopes of 20 degrees or more would be lost. In other words, it is assumed that under the steep slope provisions of the bill, no coal surface mining would be feasible. This assumption is not supportable. As the committee report for H.R. 11500 makes clear in considerable detail (p. 102), experience with surface mine operators in both Pennsylvania and West Virginia shows conclusively that new techniques such as the "haulback" method or the "modified block cut" method are being developed successfully to restore the site to the approximate original contour on steep slopes by retaining the spoil on the bench.

A study conducted jointly by two consulting firms, Mathematica, Princeton, N.J., and Ford, Bacon & David, New York, N.Y., for the Kentucky Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection and for the Appalachian Regional Commission, and published last January, concluded that:

Complete contour restoration methods are generally desirable and feasible using existing equipment, and also that such methods are roughly comparable in profitability to existing conventional contour methods and can be practiced using existing equipment.

There is thus every reason to believe that as long as the market for coal is strong from all indications—and this is bound to be the case—the industry can and will find ways of producing coal within the limitations established in the bill for steep slopes.

Regardless of all this, Federal Energy Office has chosen to adopt the "maximum possible loss" figure predicated on a total shutdown of surface mining on steep slopes. Nor does he attempt to explain in what matter it was concluded that surface mine operators, despite the evidence to the contrary which is readily available in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, will be unable to adapt to these requirements in the bill.

Until he comes forth with data which refutes the conclusions of the mathematica study and minesite evidence in the Appalachian Mountains, Mr. Sawhill's estimates of coal production losses in these two categories will not be taken seriously by those who value truth.

Fourth. Minimize hydrologic balance disturbance—section 211.

The statement that provisions in the bill requiring minimization of disturbance to the hydrologic balance on the minesite and on surrounding areas will mean "19 million tons per year of near term production could be precluded, and 12.5 billion tons of coal could be precluded from future mining" also appears to have no foundation in fact whatsoever. The Bureau of Mines analysis confines itself to commenting that these provisions in the bill are too general but made no estimate of losses of coal production which might theoretically result. How Mr. Sawhill arrived at that horrendous loss of 12.5 billion tons of coal is a complete mystery.

Fifth. Federal lands—section 225.

Another tenuous assumption underlies the estimate of 20 million tons lost through the supposed moratorium on new surface mining starts on Federal lands and on Indian lands. Mr. Sawhill's presumed 12- to 18-month moratorium is a dubious assumption at best because of the 2-year leadtime which is generally required for starting up the large operations which are the rule on Federal and Indian lands. The existing backlog of orders for large equipment is well-known in the industry—and is, in fact, the inspiration for a provision which the committee inserted into the bill which would allow exceptions to the approximate original contour and spoil placement provisions during the interim period, in cases where there is a documented lack of appropriate equipment. There is no indication as to how either Mr. Sawhill or the Bureau of Mines arrived at their respective estimates of the outcome of this hypothetical moratorium on new surface mines on Federal and Indian lands. It is therefore difficult to know how much credence should be accorded this nebulous prediction.

Sixth. Protection of the surface owner—section 710.

According to the Sawhill letter, between 14 and 18 billion tons of federally owned coal could be precluded where the surface ownership is non-Federal. Which figure you prefer depends on whether you lean toward the Department of the Interior or toward the National Coal Association, representing as they do the full amount of coal reserves underlying non-Federal lands and in Federal ownership. Again, there appears to be no way of verifying these estimates. No discernible attempt has been made to determine what proportion of the surface mine operators who are prepared to dig coal on these highly productive lands would gain the surface owner's consent, as required by the bill, or what proportion would relinquish their Federal coal leases rather than pay what might be necessary to get that consent.

The economic priorities report published recently by the Council on Economic Priorities—a study of public and Indian coal leasing in the West—has this illuminating review of the costs involved.

247 of the 474 leases have been issued by the Department (of Interior) at competitive lease sales, but 171 of those were granted without competition since one or no bidders appeared. The average winning bid at these 171 lease sales was only \$2.87 an acre. Another 210 leases were granted by the pref-

erence right method which returns no revenue to the lessor (Federal Government) besides the \$10 filing charge.

In view of the vast tonnages of coal contained in these leases, and the miniscule payments which the Department of Interior requires, it appears highly unlikely that surface mine operators will abandon their lucrative operations simply because the bill requires that they dicker with the surface owner for his consent before stripping the coal. Certainly, if surface owners elsewhere in the Nation—with the melancholy exception of Kentucky—enjoy the right of consent prior to entry upon their land for surface mining of coal, there is no justification for withholding that same right from the owner of land acquired under a Federal patent.

Seventh. Subsidence from Underground Mining—Section 212.

The only way to characterize the Federal Energy Office estimate of 100 million tons of coal production to be lost from 1977 onward because of the bill's provisions for controlling surface subsidence from underground coal mining is that it is a complete stab in the dark. Under the bill no regulations or requirements would come into effect for 2 years after date of enactment, pending the outcome of a study to be conducted by the Secretary of Interior. It would appear that the Federal Energy Office has made no effort to assess what type of regulations might result, nor what probable impact might be had by those regulations on the productive capacity of the underground coal mining industry.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, how can we take such estimates seriously? How can we be expected to accept these specious predictions of coal production losses, or accept the unspoken implication that all over America the lights, the air-conditioners, and the TV sets will begin going off if this bill is enacted? There are scare tactics, pure and simple. They should be dismissed as being of little consequence.

Instead, I would urge my colleagues to heed the sensible and sane admonitions of Business Week magazine, which in its issue of May 25 offered the following calm appraisal of H.R. 11500:

Environmentalists oppose the strip mining bill reported last week by the House Interior Committee because they think it is too permissive. The coal companies oppose it because they think it is too tough. Actually, it is a sensible compromise between two conflicting national interests—the need to produce fuel at a reasonable price and the need to preserve the environment. The House should adopt it, and a conference committee should reconcile it with a bill already passed by the Senate to give the Nation its first effective regulation of a practice that is chewing up 12,000 acres of land a week."

WATERGATE DÉJÀ VU

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently came across an article which appeared in the April 1924 edition

of the Teamster, the official publication of the Teamsters Union. I believe it is amazingly appropriate to current events, in light of the fact that it was written half a century ago, and I call it to the attention of our colleagues. The item reads as follows:

WILL TEAPOT DOME PROBE BE BLOCKED BY ANCIENT TRICK?

The expected has happened—out from nowhere comes the news that "the people are weary of Teapot Dome."

When a probe gets "hot"; when it strikes pay dirt, then the cry is heard, "The people are tired of the mess; let us stop; this hurts government."

The rogues in high places do not think of government until they fear exposure.

The daily press quotes one well-known steel manufacturer that "Teapot Dome is hurting business."

This manufacturer, who sold defective armor plate to the government, does not explain how publicity of wrong can injure business.

The people are merely told that it does. No reason is given. They are expected to take up the cry.

They are supposed to believe that their jobs will be affected, or that the public will spend less money if a group of brave senators expose crookedness, graft, purchased influence and private exploitation of natural resources.

To be classed with the "somebodies" of the moment is to repeat, parrot-like, a weariness of congressional probes.

In the circle affected, ridicule and boredom is quite the proper attitude today.

This is carried along by the waterboys of privilege—its press, its moralists, its editorial writers, its cartoonists, its movie films, its devotees, its secret agents and its open defenders.

In time a hostile public atmosphere is created. The populace unconsciously accepts this cheap cynicism, this disloyalty to country, and the champions of the people are shoved aside while the thieves escape with the loot.

This is the psychology that privilege is now attempting to "put over" on the people. The trick has been worked time and again.

The present situation recalls this statement by a magazine writer, several years ago: "Every time I have followed the crooked politician it has led me to the back door of a respectable business man."

Organized labor insists on the widest publicity and the most complete probe where it is hinted that wrong exists.

This policy injures no honest man and it strengthens our government.

Publicity will not harm honest business, though stock jugglers, exploiters of the people's resources and "sure-thing" financiers may be affected.

No man will eat less food, or build less houses, or harvest less wheat, or manufacture less shoes because thieves in high places have been uncovered.

INTEGRATION: WE MUST CONTINUE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the 20th anniversary of Brown against Board of Education has inspired widespread awareness of just how much and how little progress we have made in the past two decades. Many Southern schools are now desegregated. Many Northern ones are

now all-black. We continue to strive toward true integration: the way is hard, and has been getting harder recently, but we cannot turn back from our goal. As the following radio editorial by New York's WWRL indicates, segregation threatens the long-run viability of this society:

AND WE KNOW WE DO

Twenty years after the famous U.S. Supreme Court decision which opened the way to desegregation of the nation's public schools, segregation is now a growing fact of life in New York and other northern cities. This sad truth is pointed up by Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, Distinguished Professor of Psychology at City College of the City University of New York. Dr. Clark said that segregation in such public schools is greater today than it was in 1954.

He writes (in an article in the New York Times) that segregation does irreparable damage to human beings. It dehumanizes black and other minority-group youngsters by making them feel rejected and stigmatized. It creates deep feelings of guilt within white children.

As Dr. Clark puts it, we cannot use the excuse of the Germans in World War II who claimed not to know about their extermination camps. We know what we're doing.

We must turn ourselves around and face up to the fact that segregation damages us all—black or white—and it must be faced up to.

TIME FOR A FRESH LOOK AT OUR SCHOOLS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, it has become fashionable in certain academic circles to disparage inner-city schools and to dismiss out of hand the education of the poor as an exercise in futility. I refer not only to such putative authorities as Coleman and Jencks but also, regrettably, to colleagues in the House who were once in the vanguard of the Federal drive for equal educational opportunity but have now raised their voices for an end to compensatory instruction for children with learning disadvantages.

It is my view that these skeptics are reacting prematurely to spurious evidence drawn from less than adequate documentation. It is one thing to find no gains in achievement after several years of injection of title I funds into a school, and quite another thing to find out why there is no improvement and what can be done.

A recent study of two New York City elementary schools by the Office of Education Performance Review, an investigative arm of the New York State Legislature, has convinced me that there are approaches to educational evaluation being overlooked which could lead to new conclusions about the educability of the children of the poor. The study results are embodied in a report entitled "School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement: A Case Study of Two Inner City Schools."

For the study, two ghetto schools were chosen, each with more than 50 percent of its students from families on AFDC

and situated in a neighborhood dominated by low-income public housing. The students of both schools are characterized by high mobility, low mastery of basic skills, and a wide range of motivational levels. In addition, both are title I schools. These two schools were selected for the study because one shows a markedly higher level of reading achievement over the other year after year despite the close parallels in student body composition and neighborhood demography.

The high achieving school, identified only as school A, has an enrollment that is 98 percent black and Hispanic, 99 percent eligible for free lunch, a pupil/teacher ratio of 33/1, and a school utilization of 103 percent. School B—with a consistent record of low reading achievement on standardized tests—is 88 percent black and Hispanic, and has 90 percent of its students receiving free lunches, a 76-percent utilization of plant, and a 28/1 student-teacher ratio.

A panel of experienced New York City educators from various universities and academic disciplines was chosen for the review. In their 2½-month study they found many additional parallels between the two schools. Techniques of teaching reading were similar, both had equal access to the same teaching resources, and teacher competency seemed fairly equivalent. Teachers in both schools had problems teaching reading, and in fact, the panel found a rather general lack of knowledge about effective reading teaching in a cross-section of the staffs of both schools.

To ascertain the relative success of one school over the other, the panel had to look further. They found that school A has a principal who has been there 12 years and who has not only selected three assistant principals with strong elementary education backgrounds for his staff, but has also assigned overall responsibility for reading improvement in the school to one of them. The panel found a stable atmosphere in the school, with low teacher turnover and only one teacher grievance filed in 12 years. Parents are welcome in the school and have a special room set aside for their use. Residents of the neighborhood studying for high school equivalency also have a separate room. Interviews in the community ascertained that parents are generally satisfied with the job the school is doing. And teachers expressed satisfaction with the teaching atmosphere and general working conditions.

School B on the other hand has a principal of short tenure and an administrative staff drawn from secondary schools. There is no parents' room and little community involvement. There is also noticeably more vandalism as evidenced by broken windows. In 1 month alone, 11 teacher grievances were filed. Unlike school A, teachers are generally unhappy teaching in school B and complain of the violence and new discipline problems which divert much of their energy.

More significantly, school A has special classes for learning problems, in-service classes in reading techniques for teachers, a schoolwide reading plan, and sequential reading materials on a daily

basis and from year to year. Regular teachers stay with their classes in reading labs, and 71 percent of the faculty are assigned to classrooms.

In school B there is no schoolwide plan for the teaching of reading and no administrative leadership to that end. Regular teachers do not stay in reading labs with their students and thus have less familiarity with their total performance. Only 59 percent of the faculty have regular classroom assignments.

Despite higher pupil/teacher ratios and similar instructional resources, school A is characterized by good staff morale, effective leadership, good community relations, almost no violence, and a minimum of discipline problems.

School B is described as having low teacher morale, more vandalism, fragile ties to the community, constant student fights and parent-teacher confrontations, and is characterized by "divisiveness, disorder, and disillusionment."

Not surprisingly, interviews with teachers revealed that those in school B are pessimistic about their impact on their students, and those in school A, while not entertaining remarkably higher expectations for their students, express less skepticism than those in school B.

At the end of the investigation period, 90 children were selected from the 2d, 4th, and 6th grades of each school for informal textbook reading tests to ascertain functional reading levels. Despite all the similarities in student backgrounds, teachers and teaching techniques, physical plant, instructional resources, and neighborhood makeup, the panel found that 40 percent of the students in school A read at or above grade level compared to 20 percent for school B. School A also has a lower percentage of its pupils reading 2 or more years below grade level. These findings bore out the results of the State's pupil evaluation program and city metropolitan achievement tests which had also placed school A consistently higher than school B and provided a major reason for the selection of the two for further analysis.

The implications of this report cannot be ignored. To quote from its own concluding summary:

This study has demonstrated that schools with comparable student populations and resources can produce students with significantly different reading skills. This finding demonstrates that although nonschool factors cannot be ignored, school factors can be much more significant than generally acknowledged. The stress on nonschool factors too often leads to a justification for failure which then leads educators to act as if the children cannot learn, which in turn produces the atmosphere in which the children in fact do not learn.

The last sentence is crucial and, in fact, describes what all too often happens in the inner-city schools in a cyclical process that foreordains so many urban children to failure in school and diminution of their potential for successful endeavor in the larger society.

I believe that the New York State Office of Education Performance Review has done a signal service with this investigation and report. It holds out special promise for those of us who are

June 7, 1974

concerned over the generally poor performance of our metropolitan school. In New York City, for example, only about one-third of all elementary and secondary students are reading at or above grade level. That would be a discouraging statistic but for the fact that the scores turned slightly upward this past year for the first time in nearly a decade of decline. Clearly, despair and retreat are not called for, as they never are when the education of our young people is the issue.

The National Center for Health Statistics recently reported that tests conducted with 6,768 youngsters from 1966 to 1970 reveal that there are 1 million Americans in the 12 to 17 age bracket who cannot read at the fourth-grade level. Minorities and children of the poor stand generally lower in achievement, but the Center found illiteracy extending through all strata of our society, including children from families with more than \$15,000 income annually.

The time has come to find out why our schools are failing, and put those lessons to work. The New York City study shows that one factor—strong administrative leadership and planning—can prove to be a major difference in the performance of students in a school comparable in every observable way with a school lacking such superintendency and establishing a record of consistently low achievement.

The U.S. Office of Education has begun evaluating its programs under a congressional mandate to do so, but its findings are tentative and incomplete to date. I am therefore turning over the New York report to USOE, with an urgent request for an assimilation of its techniques and departures for more meaningful and useful evaluation of Federal programs in the Nation's schools.

Schools can and do make a difference. Teachers' job satisfaction, parents' regard for their school, and children's willingness to participate in the school were all measures of the relative effectiveness of the two New York schools studied. Other conclusions, including the need for intensive training for the teaching of reading, deserve the scrutiny of the educational community.

No reasonable person in this country wants to see the schools fail. There is no acceptable reason that they should. Though money helps in certain ways, the emphasis must be taken off evaluating whether Federal funds have an impact by themselves. It is what happens within the classroom and emanates from the administrative policies of the school that in the end determines how much its students learn. There is a valuable lesson here if we will but put it to use.

NORTHERN IRELAND RESOLUTION

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, the recent tragedies and general unrest in Northern Ireland continue to

point up the urgent need for restoration of civil rights in that corner of the world. With this in mind, I warmly endorse a unanimous resolution of the New York City Council calling upon the United Nations to:

- (1) Request the Government of Great Britain to cease and desist its barbaric practice of force-feeding Irish political prisoners;
- (2) Of keeping them confined in institutions far removed from their homes, contrary to recognized practices and rules of civilized society;
- (3) To restore civil rights to its minorities in north-east Ireland and particularly the writ of habeas corpus;
- (4) To restore the right of its minority to be openly confronted by their accusers;
- (5) To restore trial by jury;
- (6) To inquire into the prison conditions in England and Northern Ireland and particularly the women's prisons in both countries;
- (7) To require the Government of Great Britain to immediately release all political internees and prisoners whether in Northern Ireland or Great Britain.

I further believe that the time has come for the House to act on House Resolution 766, which expresses the sense of this body that—

The Irish people ought to be permitted to exercise the right of national self-determination, thus returning the disputed six counties to the Irish Republic, unless a clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free and open plebiscite, determine to the contrary.

IN MEMORY OF CHESTER E. MERROW

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, one of my truest privileges in my years in Congress has been to serve as a friend and colleague of Chester E. Merrow.

Chet was already a well-established and respected Member of the House when I came to this body as a freshman in the 81st Congress. After I was appointed to the Foreign Affairs Committee, my association with and admiration for him grew.

Merrow brought to Congress the quiet humor of a New Englander and the close attention to facts of a good school-teacher, which he was before entering politics. As a senior Republican on the Foreign Affairs Committee, he was an outstanding practitioner of bipartisanship in foreign affairs.

His accomplishments in this field are notable. He was a delegate to the United Nations international conference on educational and cultural relations in London in 1945. He was a congressional adviser to the 1946 UNESCO conference in Paris and a member of the U.S. delegation to UNESCO from 1946 to 1949. He was a major contributor on our committee in shaping economic development assistance legislation. He is particularly well remembered for his effective support of the United Nations and peaceful solutions to international problems.

Mr. Speaker, I remember Chet Merrow

above all for what he was as a human being, as a kindly and gentle and generous friend. We miss him, and extend deepest sympathy to his wife Nellie and son Daniel.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN CRANE FOR AMA CONVENTION ANAHEIM, CALIF.

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Illinois, Congressman PHIL CRANE, on December 5, 1973, addressed the American Medical Association convention, morning session of the House of Delegates, Anaheim, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, because this address by my colleague (Mr. CRANE) was a culmination of long discussions that had occurred within the framework of the American Medical Association and has subsequently triggered other events of interest to this body, I felt that my colleagues would wish to be aware of these comments regarding the Professional Standards Review Organizations.

As a result of our colleague, Mr. CRANE's speech to the American Medical Association, the position recommended by Mr. CRANE has been sustained by the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, which has filed suit to have the PSRO law declared unconstitutional.

A substantial number of practicing physicians and other professional people from the medical field have been most interested in the general concepts developed in Mr. CRANE's remarks:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN PHILIP CRANE

Thank you very much Dr. Shields . . . I deem it a great privilege to have this opportunity to come before you today in this capacity. I am one of a number of members who were instrumental in getting Dr. Heard to come to Washington to talk to us. He gave of his time and energy at our request to present an evaluation of how we in Congress might most effectively deal with the question of the possibility of repeal of the Professional Standards Review Organizations.

PASSAGE OF PSRO

I think, to give you a brief history of the House action, it's important for you to know that the House hadn't the vaguest idea of what it voted on when the PSRO legislation went through the House. We did not introduce it in the House. It was introduced in the Senate and tacked onto a complex, lengthy social security bill. The Senate has no rules with respect to germaneness. This clearly would have been ruled a non-germane amendment to that legislation had it been introduced in the House. This was the deceptive way PSRO slipped through and I can assure you that probably 90% of the members of the United States Congress today haven't the faintest idea what a PSRO is. They don't understand the concept—they don't even know that they cast a vote on it.

SIGNATURES ON PETITION FOR REPEAL OF PSRO

I say that advisedly because I had the opportunity to talk to any number of my colleagues on the subject in attempting to recruit signatures on that letter that we sent to you. I'm confident I could have pro-

duced, as Dr. Shields indicated, easily a hundred signatures on that letter, based on the principle involved in this issue, if members had had the chance to evaluate the merits or demerits of PSROs. However, in talking to members I asked them first the question, "Do you know what a PSRO is?" If they answered in the negative, I didn't proceed any further. Secondly, those who indicated some vague understanding, but uncertainty as to where their constituents in the medical profession stood, I said, "Don't sign this until you talk to your physicians back home." One of the ways I've managed to achieve some degree of credibility with my colleagues is by attempting conscientiously to avoid getting them into a situation where they may have political problems back home. I think it's important for you to know as well that there are a number of bills that have been dropped in the hopper in the House calling for the outright repeal of PSRO by members whose names were not on the letters. Further, there are members on the other side of the aisle who have indicated their opposition to PSROs, but whose names do not appear. The only one of those whom I talked to personally as I was leaving the floor was Congressman Rarick. This was because John has been in the vanguard of this fight from the beginning, submitted the first repeal bill, and has the greatest number of co-sponsors on his bill.

MY OWN CONCERN ABOUT PSRO

Now let me briefly explain some of my reasons for concern. First of all, as Dr. Shields noted, I come from a family of physicians. I was the black sheep, having gone into the history profession, because I had too many sympathetic pains to suffer the rigors of medical school. But on the other hand, I do have an appreciation of what the American medical practice is all about and I think I have probably as great a respect for it as any member you'll find in the Congress of the United States.

MY CONCERN ABOUT OTHER PROPOSED MEDICAL LEGISLATION

As some of you know, I have not co-sponsored your particular legislative alternative to Senator Kennedy's National Health Insurance Bill. When I was approached to be a co-sponsor of that legislation, I indicated that I would not because in my judgment it did not best serve the interest of American medicine. I still hold that point of view. I have not co-sponsored the administration's approach; I have not co-sponsored the health industry's approach; I have not co-sponsored the hospital association approach. By producing an alternative, you have given away half the battle at the outset. And I can't put enough emphasis on that point. With respect to PSRO, the question is one of options available to you people in the medical profession.

NO HEALTH CARE CRISIS

In debating, the worst approach you can take is to concede your opponent's premise. In my judgment, that's what the administration has done, that's what the medical profession has done, the health insurance people have done it, hospital associations have done it. You have implicitly accepted Kennedy's analysis of the problem; viz., that there is, indeed, a health care crisis in America. Your response to this claim is you have a better approach to deal with that alleged crisis. I totally reject the premise and I would be more than happy to spend any time with you back in your home states defending my position. I think the evidence is abundantly available to one and all to prove the point, that we have the best medical care here in the United States of any comparable country or collection of countries in the world. And I don't care if you want to get into the discussion of infant mortality rates, maldistribution of doctors, doctor-patient ratios, medical costs, what-have-you. If you make a comparison because what

we have done without government intervention in medicine in this country and what they have done with varying degrees of government intrusion in the delivery of health care in countries that have gone that path, our performance is without peer. This is not to suggest that we are without problems. But we are closing the gap on those problems more effectively under our approach than are countries which have turned to government for solutions. Getting in bed with people in my profession is the most disastrous possible course you can take. As physicians, I know you are committed to providing the best possible health care, and certainly as a potential patient, I have a vested interest.

PRINCIPLES INVOLVED

But beyond that, I have a vested interest in certain overriding principles that are at stake in this great battle. Those principles don't touch physicians alone because there is virtually no business or profession today that is not under the threat of governmental intervention. We have a collective fight on our hands, gentlemen, and that fight is not confined to the battles that preoccupy your attention today. That's just a part of it. But that, too, is a part of my reason for being here. My work involves battles across the broad spectrum of all our business-professional interests in the effort to preserve a free society. And it is for that reason, perhaps far more than any other, that I am here with you today.

OBJECTIONS TO PSRO

Now it seems to me in talking to physicians that there is no one who will defend the concept of PSRO in principle. The objections to PSROs are abundantly plain to you, but there are two critical ones that strike me as overriding. One is the idea that you can have laymen impinging their judgments on the best professional judgment of physicians.

ESTEEM OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION

Do you really think that the average patient in this country is going to repose greater confidence in government or in bureaucracy than he will in his physician? I can guarantee you he won't. You're in a unique position. The recent Gallup poll, as you know, revealed the fact—out time and time again—that the physician is the most respected man in our society. By contrast, the people in my profession have just slipped below the used car salesman. The used car salesman is at least providing a service in the private sector. I would raise the question as to how much positive good people in my profession are doing for anyone. And I don't mean because we're consciously malicious. We fall into the category Justice Brandeis described in the *Olmstead* case when he said, "Americans should be most on guard against encroachments against their liberties when government's intentions are beneficent . . . when its policies are initiated by men of zeal, well-intentioned but without understanding." That's precisely the situation we're in today with respect to PSROs.

INVASION OF PRIVACY

Now in addition to this, the potentials for invasion of patients' privacy is a clear violation of the Hippocratic Oath and your professional ethics. In the *Ellsberg* case, burglars had to break into a psychiatrist's office to get files. With this law the bureaucrats can simply walk into a psychiatrist's office and review any patient's records. I can assure you that if you brought this point home to politicians, you've got a sensitive issue for getting politicians to understand the inadvisability of this legislation.

FRAGMATIC APPROACH

I can understand why you've taken some of the actions you have. I fought the battle with you in '65 on the Medicare question. I

know a lot of physicians after that decided it was hopeless to fight the Federal leviathan on principle, that "pragmatism" or "realism" dictated attempting to control and direct from within as the only chance of preserving a semblance of private practice. But one must be careful when he succumbs to this reasoning that he does not give away more than he has to. In looking over some of the recommendations that you've come up with, the first one says, "at this time—and this is substantiated by ranking members of the House Ways and Means Committee—attempts to repeal PSRO would be fruitless." Let me assure you first that the Ways and Means Committee is not the exclusive committee to talk to on this. Secondly, there is potentially a whole of a lot of support in that Congress for outright repeal. Thirdly, what support is not there is primarily the result of a lack of understanding of what's happened, and that even includes members of the Ways and Means Committee. As a Congressman, I'm telling you that this is not a lost battle. Moreover there is no reason why you cannot explore a variety of options simultaneously. They are not mutually exclusive. You don't have to give up the effort to repeal only because you think a more likely alternative is to attempt to clean up a bad law. In addition to this you can at the same time contemplate working for repeal through the courts. I would certainly be willing to stand beside any physician or any association of physicians that refuses to comply with this law on the grounds that it does violence to the ethics of the medical profession.

PRINCIPLES AT STAKE

It is important for all of us to keep in mind, as I said earlier, that there are precious principles at stake here. I was the only member who testified before the Ways and Means Committee in opposition to any governmental intrusion in the so-called health care field. I was the only member. And at the time I testified, the man chairing the committee, Mr. Burleson, observed that this was certainly a "novel" point of view, that it had never been presented to that committee. I got into all the alleged shortcomings of health care here in the United States and pointed out that when you make comparisons with other countries, you'll see we're closing the gap on the remaining problems we have faster through free medicine than any other countries that have opted in favor of socialized medicine and that any effort to suggest we have a health care "crisis" in America is pure hokum.

NOT MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE POSITIONS

But to go on here with another recommendation, it's suggested that a position of non-participation would tend to make Association efforts to seek amendments to PSRO or to modify similar regulations, similarly fruitless. That is absolutely not true. If anything, the more vigorous the opposition, the greater the willingness of politicians to seek a compromise. You can go on record as a national body, condemning on principle what you know in your hearts to be wrong and simultaneously work for other alternatives behind the scenes in the event we can't win on the question of outright repeal. This is a part of what I mean about these positions not being mutually exclusive.

EFFECT ON OTHER HEALTH LEGISLATION

Another position stated here says that "noncompliance or non-participation would also weaken Association efforts to affect other pending and future health legislation." Again, I would differ. In fact it indicates a lack of understanding of how the political process works. Each one of you has input. And if you don't think you have input on the politicians, I can guarantee you, you have input on their constituents. If Senator Kennedy attempts to ride that hobby horse of national health insurance into the White

House, he's not going to make his major thrust until 1975. It's a political issue and I don't think any one of us should be deceived about that point. In the meantime, between now and 1975, you have an opportunity collectively to talk individually to patients. Patients are voters. And if you alert them to the danger, then you can generate a massive political influence. Another statement claims that "Repeal of PSRO would leave the medical profession still subject to other legislative controls which already exist, perhaps more distasteful." Well, to be sure, that's a possibility.

COMPLIANCE DESTROYS YOUR PROFESSION

But let me just tell you one other thing. If we are going to draw the battle lines on principle—and in my judgment, that's how they should be drawn—the best way calculated to permit the government intrusion that could ultimately destroy your profession, is to get compliance. If you draw the battle lines on the basis of the professional judgment of the physician versus the gun that's being pointed at his head by government, and I can assure you beyond that, that once they identify the politicians as the enemy, the politicians will back off in a hurry. This kind of legislation cannot survive without your consent and your compliance. It's a total impossibility. This is more "foot-in-the-door" legislation as you know. The supporters of Medicare back in 1965 were candid enough to acknowledge that it was foot-in-the-door legislation ultimately for a government take-over of the medical field. And I submit to you that this is just another part of it.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I have probably exceeded my time constraints but let me, if I may, continue for just a couple more moments to pass on some recommendations. One: Don't despair. I think the most pernicious doctrine in Washington today, and I see it in business associations, I see it in the professional associations, is a certain feeling of despair over the inevitability of legislation. Well, that doctrine of inevitability is the rankest superstition that Karl Marx ever advanced. I had a student who came up to me some years ago when I was teaching, and he said, "Dr. Crane, I believe in your philosophy and your principles and your values and your ideals, but let's face it, the United States is finished. Western civilization is down the drain. We're inevitably moving on to some kind of bland socialism. So, in effect, why fight it; eat drink and be merry for tomorrow we die."

And I said, "Young man, I can appreciate your feelings because at one point in my undergraduate career I almost bought that vicious concept. But think for a moment, if you and I refuse to give in and we fight. And in turn we win two converts each tomorrow and in turn we enjoin them to win two converts each. Before long we'd be a majority. And if a majority of Americans believe as we believe then can you tell me that the United States is finished and western civilization is down the drain?" He said, "I never thought of it that way." I added, "You have been removed from the battle because you bought a false premise. And that is the doctrine of inevitability. And because you did, you have been as effectively removed from the battle as if they had put you up against the wall and blown your brains out. But they managed to do it more economically, they saved a bullet, because they did it with a false idea."

Now, gentlemen, I'm telling you there are good ideas and right principles and if you people, who are most immediately affected, will not be in the vanguard of fighting for those principles, then to be sure, we may lose the battle in Washington; it will simply be a matter of time. They'll take us salami-style—a slice today and a slice tomorrow and a slice the next day. But I think that everyone of

us believes that there are principles involved in this issue that are worth defending. And there are members down there who will go to bat for you. Even if you don't come out for repeal, I and a number of my colleagues will continue to wage the battle because patients are going to be concerned about this, even if the physicians will not lead the fight. Secondly: *Speak up to your patients.* Get the patients involved in this battle. You command their respect and they trust you. Let your impact be felt. Thirdly: *Influence your local politicians.* Don't necessarily depend upon speaking as a voice from the House of Delegates. Communicate individually with your own Representatives and Senators. Speaking to us personally does have political effect. And fourthly: As Abraham Lincoln said, "Let us have faith that right makes might." I mean, we've got to have faith in free institutions and we've got to be willing to stand up and be counted on the side that we know to be right. We must be aware of compromises with evil. As Pope said: "Vice is a creature of such frightful men, that to be hated means but to be seen; but seen too oft, familiar with her face, we first endure, then pity, then embrace." I would hope and pray, gentlemen, that you will not be guilty of that and I would hope and pray that we might join in a common effort here in behalf of private practice. We may not win all of our objectives, but if you come out forthrightly in behalf of right principles, you've got the opposition on the defensive immediately. We may have to settle for something less than what we want. But a position of principled opposition to government intervention gives us the best political leverage in terms of dealing with people who view politics as the art of compromise. You don't start with a half-way house position to begin your negotiations unless you're prepared to lose your position altogether. Finally, I would only remind you of a quotation by Woodrow Wilson, who was a student of history before being elected President. Wilson made the observation that the history of liberty is a history of limitation of governmental power—never the increase of it. "When we resist concentration of power," Wilson said, "we are resisting the powers of death. For the destruction of human liberty has ever been preceded by concentration of governmental power."

I thank you gentlemen.

THE NATURAL RESOURCES COUNCIL CASE AGAINST DICKEY-LINCOLN

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today's House vote on public works appropriations included an expenditure of \$800,000 for preconstruction planning for the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project in northern Maine. This appropriation, which includes \$150,000 for preparation of the environmental impact statement required by NEPA, represents an effort to examine the project further in light of recent arguments citing significant changes in favor of construction.

While I am not yet convinced that construction is warranted, I did support appropriating this \$800,000 in order to provide some badly needed facts, not the least of which involve the very serious environmental concerns. A good case in point is the following article prepared by

the Natural Resources Council indicating that the environmental impact will be very destructive and will destroy valuable and irreplaceable wildlife habitats while not producing a significant amount of energy—an estimated 1 percent of New England's total electricity supply. Hopefully, the environmental impact statement along with the additional study made possible by today's appropriation will set the record straight and provide a factual basis whereby we can then decide on the feasibility of constructing Dickey-Lincoln. I commend to my colleagues the Natural Resources Council's article which follows:

THE NATURAL RESOURCES COUNCIL CASE AGAINST DICKEY-LINCOLN

Since 1968 the Natural Resources Council has opposed the flooding of the Upper St. John River for the purpose of producing electricity. Once again the Dickey-Lincoln Hydro. electric project is being proposed and again we are opposed to it because our studies show that it will be environmentally very destructive, will destroy valuable and irreplaceable wildlife habitats, will not produce a significant amount of energy, will be an economic boondoggle, and will destroy a valuable renewable forest resource. In short, the NRC believes that the proposed Dickey-Lincoln project to be an ill conceived and unjustifiable waste of Maine's valuable natural resources.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

If the Dickey-Lincoln project were ever completed it would flood and permanently destroy 88,600 acres of Maine's wilderness forest lands with the Dickey dam and an additional 2,200 acres with the smaller Lincoln dam. An additional area would be destroyed by the transmission line right-of-way which would traverse at least 150 miles of this highly productive and scenic wilderness portion of our state. The total area flooded would be substantially larger than Moosehead Lake but would not even begin to approach the environmental value of Moosehead. The level of this new lake will rise and fall 40 feet every year and sometimes will drop 4 feet a day. This fluctuation would annually produce a useless set of mud flats of 33,600 acres after the lake has been drawn down for energy production. The lake would be full only during the spring shortly after the snow has melted. In 1955, the Federal Inter-Agency Committee recommended that—because of its "unique upland wilderness character, its outstanding scenic and geological features, mountain peaks, lakes, forest and marshlands"—the reach of the upper St. John River Basin should be set aside to preserve the unspoiled wilderness character of the Great Maine Woods. The construction of Dickey-Lincoln in the middle of these woods would result in a level of intrusion and ecological disturbance throughout the entire region that would forever destroy its wilderness quality.

In addition to all the flooding, the Debouille Mountain region's outstanding scenic and recreational attributes would be defaced to provide concrete aggregate and facing stone for the dams. Actually, construction would have to take place not only at the two dam sites, but also at five other sites where dikes would have to be built at the headwaters of other watersheds such as the Allagash Wilderness Waterway.

WILDLIFE HABITATS

The NRC is also opposed to the destruction of one of Maine's finest and most productive wildlife habitats. If this project were ever completed, Maine fishermen, in addition to having lost about 57 miles of the St. John, would also lose some of the best brook trout fishing streams in the eastern United States, including 23 miles of the Big Black River, 25

miles of the Little Black, 7 miles of the Pocumuck, 4 miles of the Chimenticook, and 65 miles of other less well-known streams.

Hunters would lose 17,600 acres of deer yard, supporting 2200 white-tailed deer, a population that could support up to 30,000 hunter-days each year. In addition, about 2800 acres of duck-breeding habitat and some of the best woodlands producing warblers and woodland birds would be lost. In the past, this part of the Maine woods has served as a wildlife reservoir from which other areas have been re-populated—by moose, for example. The area is also an important black bear habitat.

ENERGY

The primary justification for this proposed giant dam—340 feet high and 9,260 feet long—is that it will be an important source of cheap electric energy. The facts, however, demonstrate that this is not true. Even by Maine standards, Dickey-Lincoln will produce only an insignificant amount of energy for Maine and New England.

First of all it needs to be understood that the project will be producing mostly peaking power for only a few hours each day such as in the early evening hours when there is the greatest demand for electric power. In contrast to this is the atomic Maine Yankee plant at Wiscasset and the Central Maine Power Company's new oil-fired plant on Cousins Island in Yarmouth. Dickey would produce less than 25% of the capacity of these plants individually and both of them are capable of operating 24 hours a day.

Secondly, using the numbers game, proponents imply that Dickey-Lincoln would have made "all the difference" in the energy crisis. They cite the 1.1 billion kw-hr per year electrical output, which sounds like a lot until you realize that a small oil fired plant supplemented with some gas turbine peaking generators would produce the same electrical output as Dickey-Lincoln's two dams. Whether Dickey's peaking power is needed at all depends on other peaking facilities already built or which are planned to be built such as hydro pumped storage systems. There are alternatives to peaking power plants, such as peak demand pricing which would tend to reduce peaks, and thus eliminate the need. Boston Edison is also considering new storage systems including batteries, compressed air underground, and fuel cells for peaking.

Another important problem arises if New England peaks are materially broadened by peak demand pricing. This is likely to occur to alleviate the needs for expensive peaking units. It is a goal of both consumer and environmental groups to force rate structures to reflect the costs of supplying additional energy and demand. If as a result of revised rate schedules the demands are broadened, then Dickey-Lincoln will become less important because it can operate only 2½ hours per day (due to inadequate flow of water in the St. John River). Cycling units, operating a larger fraction of the week, will then assume a larger fraction of the generating load. At the moment of course no one knows what will happen to demand because of higher fuel costs and energy conservation measures.

Looking at the proposal generally one sees that the Dickey-Lincoln project would consist of two dams. One of 760,000 Kw capacity at Dickey; one of 70,000 Kw at Lincoln School. Thus, total capacity would be 830,000 Kw.

According to the Zinder Report on NE electricity supply: "The power from Dickey-Lincoln School will be marketed by the Department of Interior. The plan is to sell 105 MW at 50% capacity factor to preference customers, municipalities and REA cooperatives in Maine, and the remaining 725 MW at peaking power to preference customers throughout New England. Agreement has been reached by the Department of Interior to market essentially all the output of Dickey-

Lincoln School to preference customers and none will be sold to private utilities."

Thus, 33% of the 1.1 billion Kw hours generated by Dickey-Lincoln would be essentially base loaded for Maine. The remaining 66% would be peaking power for New England. All the power would be distributed to public authorities. Consumers served by the private utilities would receive no benefits.

The two Dickey-Lincoln dams would provide about 1.1 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity per year. For reference, New England's electricity consumption in 1972 was 64 billion Kw hours. In 1980, if the present trends continue, consumption will be about 100 billion Kw hours. Thus, if the project were to be completed by 1980, it would contribute about 1% of supply. By 1990, assuming the same growth rates, it would supply ½% of supply. Clearly, Dickey-Lincoln could not make any substantive contribution to New England's electricity supply.

Although Dickey-Lincoln would have a negligible effect on electricity supply, it could in fact somewhat alleviate the peak demands on New England with its power. As now proposed, 725 MW of Dickey-Lincoln would supply about 690 million Kw hours of peaking electricity per year. This means about 2½ hours of operation per day (or as they say this 725 MW would have a plant factor of 11%— $2\frac{1}{2}/24$). Typically, 20% of installed capacity has been for peaking. By 1983 it is estimated there will be 35,000 MW of installed capacity. Thus 20% of this would be about 7000 MW of peaking power. Consequently, Dickey-Lincoln could supply about 10% of needed peaking capacity. The need for this peaking capacity and alternative sources has already been discussed above.

In summary, Dickey-Lincoln would supply about 1% of New England's energy need by 1980 and only ½% by 1990. We believe that burden of destruction which Maine would bear does not justify this insignificant contribution to New England's electricity supply.

ECONOMICS

An evaluation of this project requires an examination of the complex economics of the project. How much will it cost? The trouble here is that there are today only proponents who tend to understate the costs and opponents who probably overstate them. The following have made the following estimates. Rep. T. P. O'Neill, Jr.: \$500 million; Sen. William Hathaway (D. Maine, a proponent): \$273 million; Boston Edison: \$1 billion; and the Corps of Engineers: \$356 million. The Corps estimate neglects about \$50 million in transmission lines and inflation. If costs inflate at a modest 6% per year then the project cost would double in ten years when it is possible it might be completed. Cost could then be as high as \$800 million. Currently the cost estimates appear to vary by 300%.

For the amount of money involved the amount of electricity supplied is small. This fact is the principal problem with Dickey-Lincoln: it just isn't going to make any difference in supply. As a consequence, even if the electricity were free, it couldn't reduce prices by more than about 1% (recall that peaking power electricity costs more than off-peak power). According to the Corps of Engineers annual savings to New Englanders would amount to \$11 billion. Since last year New Englanders paid about \$1.7 billion for electricity, one can see that the reduction would amount to only .6%, a very small amount.

In fact, the economics of Dickey-Lincoln, are the most commonly misrepresented and misunderstood feature of the Dickey-Lincoln project. In particular, the Benefit/Cost ratio is generally (mis) understood to somehow represent the ratio of economic return to investment. Nothing could be further from

the truth. The B/C ratio of 2.6 cited for Dickey-Lincoln has literally nothing to do with the benefits derived from it or, more surprisingly, the cost of building it.

Here is how that number (B/C) is derived. First, it is clear that the dams will generate electricity of some economic value. What is the value of that electricity (i.e. what are the benefits)? The answer, according to the Federal prescription, is found by going to the alternative private project that would be needed to exactly simulate the electrical output of Dickey-Lincoln. Thus a private project composed of gas turbines and oil fired power plants is imagined which would, 1) pay Federal and local taxes, 2) borrow at an interest rate of 8¼%, and 3) be based on plants separately located in Maine and southern New England. The current price of that power (\$44 million)—as determined by the Federal Power Commission by a formula which no one seems to know or understand—constitutes 96% of the benefits of Dickey-Lincoln. There are additional \$2.1 million worth of annual benefits derived from flood control (.1% of all benefits), redevelopment (1.7% of benefits) and recreation (a dubious 2.7% of benefits). Thus total benefits (annual) amount to \$46.5 million.

Strangely enough, the costs of Dickey-Lincoln are not in any way related to the cost of building the project. To determine the cost (for the B/C ratio only) the Corps estimates the current cost of building the project and then determines the annual income needed to pay back an imaginary 3¼% loan over 100 years for constructing it. However, the Corps deletes from the construction costs \$60 million of transmission costs (about 12% of total costs) because it thinks that the private utilities may let them use the lines from Maine to Boston. These purely imaginary pay back costs amount to \$17.7 million per year, and when divided into \$46.5 million above yield a B/C ratio of 2.6.

Now, several points need to be made. First, the Corps would actually build the dams at an interest rate of 5 and ¾%, to be paid back over 50 years. The 3¼% interest rate is a totally academic exercise, a fiction authorized by the Congress to make pork barrel projects look attractive. According to the Corps, the actual annual costs of paying back the loan would amount to \$35.6 million, including full transmission costs. This would yield a B/C ratio of only 1.3. At an interest rate of 6 and ¾% the B/C ratio drops to 1.1. And at the going market rate of 8 and ¾%, annual pay back costs rise to \$50 million and the B/C ratio drops to .95. Taking into account the lost taxes that would otherwise be paid by the utilities would drop the B/C ratio even further.

It is clearly misleading to cite Dickey-Lincoln as any kind of a yardstick against which to compare New England utilities. What does a yardstick mean in this case? Dickey-Lincoln shows a B/C greater than 1 only if money is given away at less than its true value and if the taxes paid by the utilities are used against it. (We have not yet begun to calculate the environmental costs not quantified or included in any of the B/C calculations.)

FOREST RESOURCES

Maine's forest provides the state with an economic backbone which is threatened by development pressures. The value of this continuously renewable resource will continue to increase if it is not unreasonably disturbed. The NRC believes that the Dickey-Lincoln project would be a major and unreasonable disruption of Maine's forest resources.

The forest lands to be flooded are currently owned by private land holders and several large corporations. Sixty-one percent is in private ownership and 39% is in corporate ownership. In addition, this state owns 2867.11 acres of the land through its public

lots. The Dickey-Lincoln project would forever remove from forest production at least 70,000 acres which are currently growing timber. It would adversely affect the production on thousands of additional acres. Currently, an average acre of productive forest land adds about \$200 yearly to Maine's economy. Using the conservative figures of 70,000 acres at \$200 produces a negative economic impact to Maine's economy of \$14,000,000 yearly. These figures do not include the additional acreage taken out of production by the transmission lines, roads, construction, and the generating facilities. Nor does it even begin to consider the forest area which will be lost to the development which the project would attract.

One of the most important elements of Maine's unique environment is its forest and especially its wild forest. Dickey-Lincoln would be a major set back to our forest at a time when they are explosively increasing in their economic and recreational value.

STATE CONTROL

The Dickey-Lincoln project is a federal project. Because of this the NRC wrote to Senator William D. Hathaway on March 21, 1974, posing this following issue:

"We are obviously very concerned about the environmental impact of every major industrial development within the State of Maine. You are obviously well aware that Maine has several licensing laws which are intended to reduce the impact of industrial development and to make it as compatible as possible with the environment. These state laws are considered to be of a landmark nature nationally. In particular, Maine's Site Location Law, which is administered by the Department of Environmental Protection, and the laws creating the Land Use Regulation Commission have particular relevance to the Dickey-Lincoln proposal in that the dam construction, generating facilities and flooded areas, if permitted to be built, will be in LURC's jurisdiction as will also be some of the transmission facilities. In the organized areas of the state the transmission facilities will be covered by the Site Location Law. We would like to know if your office and other Congressional members plan to provide for Maine's right to review the Dickey-Lincoln proposals at the proper time in terms of our state laws or do you propose to have the project completely pre-empted from state review through the federal preemption clause of the U.S. Constitution. It would appear that since Maine will be bearing the major impact of this project if it is ever completed then we should have a major say in how extensive that impact is."

On April 1, 1974 Senator Hathaway answered our inquiry by stating:

"I would like to assure you that the project will be subject to all of the provisions of State law that apply to the project. In addition the Corps of Engineers will have to prepare an acceptable environmental impact statement."

It is, therefore, not clear as to whether the residents of Maine and their state government agencies would have any control over the project.

It also needs to be noted that there have been any public hearings concerning this project in the state which would have to absorb the negative impact and resulting costs.

SOURCES

This paper was prepared by NRC's staff attorney and executive director, Clifford H. Goodall. The NRC is Maine's largest private environmental organization. Sources of information for this paper include the NRC's library; *A Study of the Dickey-Lincoln Hydroelectric Project* by Rosemary H. Manning for the Sierra Club, New England Chapter; and material supplied by "The Friends of the St. John", 14 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

Additional sources include individuals who were interviewed by the author.

The Natural Resources Council offices are located at 20 Willow Street in Augusta, Maine. The NRC has a special committee which will continue to study the Dickey-Lincoln project.

THE 250TH BIRTHDAY OF ADAM SMITH: THE TRUE LIBERTARIAN

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the true lover of liberty loves freedom for its own sake, whereas he who supports freedom only because it will have consequences of which he approves is not so committed. Adam Smith was the "true libertarian."

To Adam Smith, political liberty was as important as economic liberty; in fact, he believed they were indivisible. It is no coincidence that the world's two greatest "libertarian" documents were published in 1776—Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence and Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the birthdate—June 5, 1974—of that great champion of economic truths.

In an age—like ours—when the fundamentals of economic laws are being subsumed to apparent political expediences, it is important to note both the life of this great Scottish economist and moral philosopher and the profound teachings which he gave to the world. It is indeed ironic that the principles he espoused and which led to such great progress for so many are today held in such low esteem. It behooves us to better understand those principles of freedom.

It would be in error to call Adam Smith the "father of free market economics." Quite to the contrary, Smith never held himself out as a theorizer of a new school of economics. He was—and with great force of intellect—simply revealing economic truths which emerged from his extensive studies of the histories of nations and civilizations.

That the market economy—allocating resources by the free play of supply and demand—is the single economic system compatible with the requirements of personal freedom is not a theory. It is a fact.

That the market economy is at the same time the most productive supplier of human needs is not a theory. It is a fact that the only real way to raise the standard of living of the people is to increase the amount of capital invested per capita, thus leading to better tools and more productivity and the result—higher real wages. It is a fact.

That when government interferes with the work of the free market economy, it tends to reduce the moral and physical strength of the Nation, is not theory. It is a fact.

That when monopolistic, unfair restraints on trade go unchecked by consumer choice, it leads to destructive economic concentration, is not a theory. It is a fact.

That when government takes—by taxation or erosion of purchasing power—one man to bestow upon another, it diminishes the incentive of the first, the integrity of the second, and the autonomy of both, is not a theory. It too, is a fact.

Adam Smith's teachings contributed much to the thought of the framers of our own system of government. Smith shared the constitutionally limited government instincts reflected in 1776. He argued strongly for liberty. He campaigned hard for freedom to trade. And his voice was heard. Constitutional government in its modern sense was born as a concomitant of the free market economy.

Would he not be distressed, if he knew what course this Nation of ours is following today in its economic, fiscal, and monetary policies—policies designed and executed for the moment, not for the strength of our future?

We should—we must—heed Adam Smith's teachings, for it is an adage as old as man's study of history that the quickest way to destroy a free society is to destroy its money first.

Mr. Speaker, Adam Smith was also a professor of moral philosophy at the University of Glasgow in Scotland.

The world remembers him as the author of "The Wealth of Nations." Because of the fame justly accorded that classic, few remember that Smith was also the author of an earlier book, "The Theory of Moral Sentiments."

In his biography of Adam Smith, Dr. E. G. West writes that:

If *The Wealth of Nations* had never been written, this previous work would have earned for him a prominent place in intellectual history.

West explains that:

In *The Wealth of Nations* (Smith) deals primarily with the strong motives; in *The Moral Sentiments* with the higher ones. What is it, he asks in the latter work, that prompts ordinary people to be benevolent as well as self-interested? To be virtuous as well as mundane? To be humane as well as human?

West also explains why Karl Marx's interpretations of Adam Smith were a "serious misrepresentation." And, "whereas Karl Marx was later to admonish Smithian capitalism for causing people to lose their identities in the pursuit of wealth, it was Smith's claim that it was only within its province that men could successfully discover themselves."

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will heed the lessons of history and advance forward on the principles of liberty, economic and political, as taught to us by both Adam Smith and Thomas Jefferson.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am today placing in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* the results of a questionnaire which was

mailed to my 11th District constituents in late March of this year. The results are based on approximately 20,000 replies from every community in the 11th Congressional District of New Jersey.

Details of the returns follow:

	[In percent]		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Extending the President's authority to impose wage and price controls beyond their April 30, 1974, expiration date?	43.3	42.1	14.6
2. A constitutional amendment to prohibit abortion?	23.5	68.6	7.9
3. The President's impeachment (i.e., to bring to trial before the Senate) by the House of Representatives?	57.7	32.0	10.3
4. Increasing the \$750 tax exemption rate?	86.8	7.7	5.5
5. Termination of tax benefits to the oil industry such as the depletion allowance?	75.7	14.2	10.1
6. Imposition of export controls on scarce agricultural commodities such as wheat in order to hold down prices for Americans?	87.2	7.9	4.9
7. Stricter antitrust laws to limit ownership of multiple energy resources (for example, oil companies owning coal, oil shale, and geothermal power sources)?	81.6	11.7	6.7
8. A Government corporation to develop and produce energy resources in competition with the private oil companies?	53.0	36.0	11.0
9. Federal operating subsidies for the Nation's mass transit systems?	69.1	21.1	9.8
10. Relaxing auto emission standards and pollution controls in view of the present energy situation?	42.0	48.0	10.0
11. A national health insurance system financed in a manner similar to social security and covering virtually all medical bills?	68.9	21.5	9.6
12. Financing Federal political campaigns with public tax funds rather than private contributors?	52.1	33.7	14.2
13. Continuation of year round daylight saving time?	51.5	34.7	13.8

The 11th Congressional District includes the following municipalities.

Belleville, Bloomfield, Caldwell, Cedar Grove, Essex Fells, Fairfield, Irvington, Maplewood, Montclair.

North Caldwell, Nutley, Orange, Roseland, South Orange, Upper Montclair, Verona, West Caldwell, West Orange.

North Arlington, Little Falls, West Paterson, and Hillside.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN AND MRS. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, while I have serious concerns about protection of the individual against invasion of privacy, the times in which we live dictate that those who seek election to public office must disclose information about their personal finances or be subject to criticism, if not mistrust.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, further implementing the action taken by the House in requiring its Members to report sources of income to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, I include the following additional information on the finances of my wife and myself:

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN AND MRS. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

A. TAX INFORMATION

Congressional salary	\$42,500
Adjusted gross income including salary, law practice, interest and dividends	51,461
Federal income taxes	10,681
State income taxes	1,242

B. UNSECURED INDEBTEDNESS

None.

C. SECURITIES—VALUE JUNE 1, 1974

Burlington Industries (132 shares)	2,904
Carrier Corporation (114 shares)	1,254
Commonwealth Edison Co. (bonds)	25,000
First National Bank of Joliet (955 shares)	53,480
Illinois Securities Co. (350 shares)	17,500
Keystone Fund (128 shares)	384
Marcor (20 shares)	500
Niagara Mohawk Power Co. (30 shares)	300
Pan American World Airways (40 shares)	160

D. OTHER BUSINESS ENTITIES WITH SERVICE AS MANAGER, DIRECTOR OR PARTNER

Partner in law firm of O'Brien, Garrison, Berard & Kusta, Joliet, Ill. with no practice in Federal courts or before Federal agencies).

E. REIMBURSEMENT FOR EXPENDITURES (OTHER THAN FROM U.S. GOVERNMENT) EXCEEDING \$1,000

Republican National Congressional Committee (contribution made to all Republican first-term Congressmen for public relations expenses) \$3,000

F. OTHER FINANCIAL REPORTS

Report of financial interests filed with Clerk of the House pursuant to rule XLIV for the House of Representatives for each year.

TRIBUTE TO DR. HENRY PAOLUCCI, "MAN OF THE YEAR"

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, an esteemed friend and colleague, Dr. Henry Paolucci, vice chairman of the New York State Conservative Party, will be awarded the distinguished "Man of the Year Award" by the Flushing Conservative Club. It is a fitting honor to this great man, and I will have the distinct honor of being the honorary chairman of this event. At this time, I would like to pay a special tribute to the distinguished career and work of Dr. Henry Paolucci.

When we speak of Henry Paolucci, we are referring to one of the foremost spokesmen for the ideals of conservatism in this Nation. Henry Paolucci has dedicated much of his life to the New York State Conservative Party, and his most significant contribution came in 1964 when he ran under the Conservative banner for the U.S. Senate. His articulate manner and wealth of knowledge on issues made him one of the most memorable candidates for public office in the history of New York State.

Yet, Henry Paolucci's work has extended far beyond the campaign arena. He has ably served the Conservative cause as a lecturer, teacher, and author.

His most outstanding literary contribution was "War, Peace, and the Presidency," which was published in 1968.

Since then, Henry Paolucci has been expressing his timely views through his monthly newsletter, entitled "State of the Nation." It has been through his work on this publication that Henry Paolucci has gained national prominence and acclaim for his uncanny prophecies about the great issues which confront this Nation today. One prime example has been Dr. Paolucci's views on our present pursuit of détente with the Soviet. The concern and caution he raised back in 1969 represented a mere voice in the wilderness, yet today his views are shared by many responsible Americans who have grown apprehensive and alarmed at the problems which have ensued with détente.

Professor Paolucci, as he is also known, is actively involved in the Walter Bagehot Council on National Sovereignty, an organization which he founded and is dedicated to scholarly research, lecturing, and publishing to the end of securing our Nation's sovereign values.

Personally, I have known Henry Paolucci to be a warm and loyal friend. He is a man both knowledgeable in his views and steadfast in his convictions. He is not afraid to articulate unpopular views, and throughout his career he has been able to command the highest levels of respect and acclaim from all those who deal with him, whether they agree with him or not. He is a true intellectual, who has never lost grips with the views of the common man.

The Flushing Conservative Club in awarding Henry Paolucci their prestigious Man of the Year award described Henry Paolucci as all should know him:

An inspiring lecturer, teacher, and writer, author of hundreds of articles and books on every subject from ancient history, to the history of science, philosophy, government and political affairs—a self effacing helper to all who call upon him. Professor Paolucci serves as a constant model to us all. But especially as a truly dedicated American. He readily deserves our friendship and affectionate respect.

Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to that tribute except to say that it is indeed a high privilege for me to have a man the caliber of Dr. Paolucci as a friend. I wish him continued success in the coming years.

ELECTION REFORM AND THE POST CARD REGISTRATION BILL

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in a recent newsletter to his constituents, our colleague from New York (Mr. HORTON) was precisely on target when he referred to the post card registration bill as having been "developed with the best of intentions, but not rooted in reason or fact." Congressman HORTON goes on to recite in very concise

and convincing terms the reasons that many of us felt strongly compelled to oppose that measure; it would have resulted in an administrative nightmare; it would have encouraged an increase in election fraud at a time when we are desperately trying to clean up the election process; and it may well have led to a decline rather than an increase in voter turnout—thus undermining the very goal purported by the bill.

Mr. Speaker, especially at this time when the siren call of "reform" fills these Chambers, it is important that our actions be tempered with a firm sense of realism and a prudent ability to distinguish between the "rappings of reform" and the substance of constructive change. Our colleague from New York has displayed this ability time and again in the past, most recently in his approach to the post card bill. I therefore include the full text of his newsletter at this point in the RECORD:

POST CARD REGISTRATION: A FAULTY ANSWER TO ELECTION REFORM

(By Congressman FRANK HORTON)

The figures are disquieting. Barely half of the voting age population participated in the 1972 Presidential Election, down from 64 percent in 1960. The drop has been a steady one, and worry over the trend has prompted several of my House colleagues to push for adoption of a new plan—voter registration by mail—in an attempt to beef up the number of Americans who go to the polls every four years to select a President.

On its face, efforts to increase the numbers of people voting for President would seem an "apple pie" issue—assuring the bill of easy passage. But the House of Representatives voted 197 to 204 to defeat the bill. Having voted against the measure, I support that decision.

The bill may have been developed with the best of intentions, but it is not rooted in reason and fact.

Succinctly stated, the plan would have established a Voter Registration Administration within the General Accounting Office (GAO) to direct a massive effort to register qualified voters for Federal elections. The potential voter could register in any state to vote simply by filling out and returning a post card to the appropriate State official. He would then be entitled to vote in Federal election contests but not necessarily in State and local contests unless the State system was coordinated with the Federal system.

Because of the strong opposition to the postcard plan by many elections officials around the country, it is unlikely that many states could be persuaded to revamp their systems along the lines of the new Federal program. Therefore, in some states one would be required to register twice in order to vote in both Federal and State elections.

This would create an administrator's nightmare. States which do not adapt their systems to the new plan would have a dual system, one for Federal and one for state and local and would be required to maintain dual records and ballots, causing unnecessary confusion among elections officials and voters. Thus, each citizen in those states would have to understand (1) whether he is, in fact, already registered for Federal and State elections and no card return is necessary, (2) whether the card he fills out and mails to his State official entitles him to vote in Federal and State elections, and (3) whether the card he fills out entitles him to vote in Federal elections only and he must still go to the polling place to register to vote in State elections. Experts fear that the complications may result in a decrease in par-

ticipation in State and local elections because some voters believe themselves to be registered for both elections.

There is also ample evidence that election fraud will be made easier under a postcard system because there are not adequate checks within the system to determine if a voter has registered in another area. In fact with millions of postcards circulating through the mails, it is easy to see how election fraud could be accomplished.

A brief check of the handful of areas around the country which have already embraced the postcard registration system reveals little evidence that the money and effort spent in organizing the system has had any discernible effect on increasing the percentage of voters. In fact, it can do just the opposite. The experience with postcard registration in Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Washington, Hawaii, Montana and Minnesota reveals that as many as one-third of the postcards returned are illegible or incomplete.

There is reason to be concerned that only 55 percent of those old enough to vote did, in fact, do so in 1972. There is simply no evidence, however, that this costly, confusing, and disorganized plan is the way to increase voter participation. We do want to make voter registration as simple as possible. Many states, including New York, have made great progress in this direction through such devices as permanent personal registration, extended registration hours and dates, convenient locations for voter registration booths. However, the answer to voter apathy does not lie in postcard registration systems, but in a deeper examination of our political processes.

MISSING IN ACTION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, June 4, the House of Representatives resoundingly reflected its support for a solution of the MIA problem when it voted 273 to 0 for House Concurrent Resolution 271.

The tragic failure to obtain from North Vietnam and the Vietcong a full and accurate accounting of more than 1,000 Americans who remain missing in Southeast Asia is certainly one of the bitterest aftermaths of the Vietnam conflict. To their families and loved ones it remains a deep and hurting agony.

The stubborn insensitiveness of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong in failing to live up to the pledges it made in signing the Paris cease-fire agreement amply reflect their inhumane attitude. As my distinguished colleague from Iowa, the Honorable H. R. Gross, noted on the floor Monday, they have now suspended further talks of the four party joint military team.

That fact and other pertinent observations were noted in a statement issued by the U.S. Mission in Saigon on June 4, a copy of which I am placing in the RECORD and recommend to the careful reading of my colleagues.

As chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on National Security Policy which considered House Concurrent Resolution 271, I sincerely hope the North Vietnamese and Vietcong will note

its provisions carefully. I hope, too, that they recognize the firm determination of the Congress in fully implementing the provisions of the resolution.

The statement follows:

SAIGON, June 4.—The US Mission spokesman issued the following statement today.

The delegations of the United States and the Republic of Vietnam to the Four Party Joint Military Team (FPJMT) met today at the FPJMT's regularly scheduled plenary session. The DRV and PRG delegations were not at the meeting. We have no indication when they plan to return, but we earnestly hope it will be very soon.

The sole function of the FPJMT is to provide a forum for the Four Parties to help each other get information on the missing in action and to locate, care for, and assist in the return of the remains of the dead. These responsibilities provided for in Article 8(b) of the Paris Accords are humanitarian and not political. The obligation to carry them out is unconditional and is in no way linked to any of the other provisions of the Accords.

The United States and the Republic of Vietnam feel compelled to continue their efforts to resolve all cases of those still missing in action. They will continue to meet at the regularly scheduled times each week to carry forward that portion of the FPJMT's task which concerns only the Republic of Vietnam and the United States. Until the other side return to their places at the conference table, which we strongly hope they will soon do.

The absence of the communist delegations is the latest in a series of similar interruptions of the work of the FPJMT since its formation over one year ago. Their obvious intent has been to turn the clearly humanitarian tasks defined in Article 8(b) and the uncertainty of over 1400 American MIA families to their own political purposes. The United States can only regard such cynicism with deep regret. The dead are past the cares of the world. There is no honor in bartering with their bones.

The largest portion of the crash and grave sites about which we have information are in North Vietnam or in remote areas of South Vietnam where control is disputed by the Vietnamese parties. In the implementation of Article 8(b), the primary aim of the United States since the signing of the Paris Accords has been to obtain information on these sites and to obtain the return of the remains of the Americans who died in communist captivity. The names of these Americans were contained in lists provided us by the other parties in Paris at the time of the signing of the Accords. To date, after more than one year's effort, we have received the remains of only 23 Americans from the DRV. The DRV refused to return the remains of a twenty-fourth American buried along side his comrades in Hanoi because he allegedly died before he could be captured and became thereby technically "missing in action" rather than "died in captivity."

Since the signing of the Paris Accords the United States and the Republic of Vietnam have been cooperating in attempting to resolve the cases of the MIA's of concern only to them. The ambush and murder of Captain Rees and his comrades at Binh Chanh on December 15, 1973 and subsequent statements by the other side, made clear that this portion of the work of the FPJMT would have to be given even greater emphasis if we were to keep faith with the families of our missing in action.

Since that time, we have undertaken a variety of efforts involving all categories of Vietnamese society, official and unofficial. From all these elements, including also RVNAF units, government agencies and private individuals, we have always received full and effective cooperation. The Vietnamese people know so well the anguish and

heartbreak arising from lack of knowledge of the fate of their missing husbands, brothers and sons. They have determined to do whatever they possibly can to help alleviate the anguish of the families of their American allies who still confront the same uncertainties."

TOCKS ISLAND DAM

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, today I voted with the majority of my colleagues in favor of H.R. 15155, the Public Works/AEC appropriations bill, which contained a provisional appropriation for the Tocks Island Dam in New Jersey.

I say provisional because while the bill provides funds for construction, the money is not to be obligated until the various governmental parties involved can resolve the matter and bring it before the House and Senate for a final decision.

This provision is a direct result of the expressions of concern that were forthcoming from New Jersey Governor Byrne and others, indicating that further environmental impact studies need to be made.

I share this deep concern that every reasonable effort must be made to assure that this project, sweeping in nature as it is, will be a sound one from an environmental point of view.

But, Mr. Speaker, I represent a constituency which lives along the Delaware River in south central New Jersey. I feel a profound obligation to work in their behalf, and to support projects which I believe are in their best interests.

I have concluded that the Tocks Island project—the dam—is of extreme importance to my constituency for two reasons: First, water supply; and second, flood protection.

Some of the waterfront communities draw their water from the river and many, like Camden, collect their supplies from groundwater wells. Like the supply of our neighbor across the river, the city of Philadelphia, the intrusion of high concentrations of saltwater from the ocean, in event of another drought of the 1960's or worst, would threaten to make our fresh water brackish and therefore unusable, including well water and also future use of the wells. The guaranteed minimum flow of fresh water into the estuary at Trenton from Tocks Island would keep the saltwater front down below the mouth of the Schuylkill River, thus protecting these supplies from contamination.

As for floods, my district fortunately is not threatened like the areas upstream. I know that great advances have been made in terms of progressive thinking for activities on control of future development of flood plains and that Tocks Island is not a necessity for protecting those sections still in their virgin state. However, only an impoundment on the river can succeed in protecting those who

already have residential, farm, business, or industrial property on the land that does get flooded. Tocks Island also would protect Delaware River bridges upstream and many publicly owned facilities along the river that stand to be damaged or destroyed if we have another flood like 1955 or worse.

As I said in the beginning, I fully recognize the need for a complete environmental review. I am hopeful that this will be completed forthwith, and that the various governmental entities can once and for all resolve this very important matter.

THE RUSSIAN OIL DEAL

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while most of the world still smarts from the reaction to the Russian wheat deal and then the Russian butter deal, we now learn that the Soviets reaped nearly \$1 billion in windfall profits from their world oil deal.

Interestingly enough, while the Arab oil states were boycotting the Netherlands, their Soviet friends used the boycott by increasing their oil exports to the Dutch by one-third and increasing the charge by 3½ times over the price in 1972.

Apparently, the profit motive at the exploitation of the "industrialized nations" is no longer considered criminal.

I ask that a related newsclipping follow.

[From the Washington Star-News, June 5, 1974]

RUSSIA HAS WINDFALL PROFIT ON INCREASED OIL PRICES

(By Christopher S. Wren)

Moscow.—The jump in world oil prices enabled the Soviet Union last year to reap nearly a billion dollars more in oil revenue with only a modest increase in exports.

Windfall profits were taken at the expense of a number of countries in the west hit hard by the Arab oil boycott, according to newly released Soviet foreign trade statistics.

By contrast, the Communist countries were generally confronted with a negligible rise in Soviet oil prices.

The figures in the 1973 Soviet foreign trade handbook indicated that the Soviet Union has prospered from the higher world market prices spurred by the Arab oil embargo which Moscow consistently supported.

Last year, the Soviet Union increased its exports of oil and oil products slightly more than 10 percent but boosted their overall earnings more than 44 percent.

The export revenue rose from nearly 1.7 billion rubles in 1972 to just over 2.4 billion rubles last year. This is a dollar increase of more than \$900 million, based upon the prevailing 1973 exchange rate of \$1.34 to the ruble.

In the same period, oil exports went from 107 million metric tons to 118.3 million metric tons. The majority of the increase went to the socialist countries at well below the spiraling market price, meaning that the profits came entirely from non-Communist customers. A metric ton is roughly equivalent to seven barrels.

While the Soviet trade statistics spanned all of 1973 without further breakdown, they

clearly reflected the price rises that accompanied the Arab oil embargo.

Soviet oil prices were not increased for the Communist countries because the five-year plans allow for only minor fluctuation in the current contracts.

The Soviet Union has been encouraging its allies to look elsewhere to meet their growing oil needs, and it is believed likely that Soviet oil prices for the socialist bloc will be adjusted upwards when the new five-year plans for 1976-1980 are negotiated.

The Soviet Union was not hesitant to peg its Western orders to the new market prices. Last year for example, while Denmark bought 41 million fewer tons of Soviet oil, it paid out two and a half times what it had in 1972. West Germany and Belgium were confronted with increases approximately as steep. Austria, Britain, Sweden and Italy paid slightly lesser increases for Soviet oil.

Last fall, the Soviet press denounced as a "canard" Swedish radio reports that Soviet tankers were carrying oil to the Netherlands during the oil embargo. The Soviet press agency Tass, alleged that the reports were launched to "poison the atmosphere of trust" between Moscow and the Arab countries that had made the Netherlands a specific target of the embargo.

But the current figures show that the Soviet Union last year boosted oil exports to the Dutch by a third, to over 3.2 million tons, and charged them nearly three and a half times what they had paid in 1972.

Western economic observers here point out that Moscow was honoring export commitments made with the West before the embargo, but they do not dispute that the Soviets moved swiftly to take advantage of the prime oil prices.

PRESIDENTIAL HOMES

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion about the expenditure of public funds on Presidential homes, particularly with reference to President Nixon. The Subcommittee on Government Activities of the Government Operations Committee recently published a report on this matter, and it should be noted that it received a unanimous vote of 36 to 0. In that report the committee agrees on the sum expended on Presidential homes, not only on President Nixon but on President Johnson.

Some of the critics have contended that our colleague Jack Brooks might have been a bit partisan because of his close friendship with President Johnson. The report does show that the Federal Government spent less than one-third the amount spent on President Nixon's home but it is good to know that the entire committee has agreed unanimously on this report, and points out the good job performed by Congressman Brooks. I think an editorial from the Beaumont Enterprise is of particular interest and I insert it in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Beaumont (Texas) Enterprise, May 28, 1974]

PRESIDENTIAL HOMES

Critics of U.S. Rep. Jack Brooks' probe of government spending on President Nixon's private homes have wondered aloud why a

similar investigation hasn't been done into expenditures on the late President Johnson's private property.

There now has been such a study.

In compiling its report on the \$17.1 million in public funds spent in connection with Nixon's retreats at San Clemente and Key Biscayne, Brooks' House government activities subcommittee also looked into how much the government spent on LBJ's private property.

The subcommittee found that about \$5.9 million was spent in connection with two of his ranches near Johnson City and an office he maintained in the Federal Office Building in Austin.

The total spent on or in support of LBJ's properties is nearly one-third the amount spent in connection with Nixon's retreats.

Some will contend, of course, that since Brooks was very close to the late President Johnson, the subcommittee's finding may not be the whole story.

It should be noted, however, that the report containing both the Nixon and Johnson investigations was approved by a 36-0 vote of the entire House Government Operations Committee. Two of the 16 Republicans abstained.

After release of the report, Brooks said that the "taxpayers deserve greater consideration when public funds are being used to finance new heating systems, a sewer line, a shuffleboard, den furniture and lawn and shrub maintenance in the name of providing security."

The investigation found public funds had been spent on those items at Nixon's residences.

The study accused the Secret Service of abusing the discretion Congress has traditionally given it concerning the use of government funds and personnel, and also criticized the General Services Administration for letting non-government personnel—such as Nixon's personal lawyer, Herbert Kalmbach—initiate government expenditures and then soliciting after-the-fact requests from the Secret Service in an effort to legitimize such expenditures.

We agree with the committee recommendation that future expenditures of public money should be limited to no more than one principal privately-owned residence at a time, but that the Secret Service be free to seek whatever aid might be needed in an emergency or temporary situation.

As Brooks has noted in the past, if some multimillionaire—like Nelson Rockefeller—were to become president, the taxpayers could end up footing the bills for improvements at dozens of private homes around the world.

A TIME FOR TUNA

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, ship launchings are an increasingly familiar sight in my congressional district. Vessels produced there range from tuna boats to big oil tankers.

A San Diego ship launching is a sight to behold. Earlier this year the Maritime Administrator, the Honorable Robert J. Blackwell, said he never had seen a larger crowd for a launching than when National Steel & Shipbuilding Corp. sent the 38,300-ton tanker *Cherry Valley* down the ways. The company had made a "family day" of the occasion, and nearly 15,000 happy people were on hand.

Last Saturday afternoon, a smaller but equally appreciative gathering of wives and children of workers turned out at San Diego Marine Construction, Inc., for launching of the third in a series of four modern fishing craft built for Trident Industries. This was the *Katherine Lisa*, which, like those before her, will fish for the Del Monte Corp.

Del Monte's president, R. G. Landis, used the occasion to relate some of the things the tuna industry has been doing to help meet the dilemma of most housewives—how to get the best food bargain in the face of runaway prices.

Mr. Landis' remarks contained good news not only for the bargain shopper, but for workers dependent on continuing a healthy fishing industry.

His address follows:

LAUNCHING OF THE "KATHERINE LISA"

(Address by R. G. Landis, President and Chief Operations Officer, Del Monte Corporation)

For the second time in only seven months, Del Monte Corporation has had the pleasure of having a part in the launching of a tuna boat in this yard. Last October, two of our executives were here to witness the launching of the "Patricia Lee" and the "Theresa Ann"—the first of four seiners being built for Trident Industries. When the "Katherine Lisa" slides down the ways in a few minutes, it'll be three down and one to go.

I'm pleased to say that the "Katherine Lisa"—like the other two before her—will be fishing for Del Monte. She'll bring to nine the number of tuna seiners fishing for my company. That's a far cry from the fleet size of only a few years ago.

A lot has happened in the marketplace over the past few years, and tuna has "caught on" with consumers like never before. Of the 45 per cent increase in domestic tuna consumption recorded in the 12 years beginning in 1960, a little more than half occurred in 1972 alone. Then, in 1973, demand for tuna reached record levels in this country. U.S. tuna retail sales last year totaled 670 million dollars—up 20 per cent from 1972, and 63 per cent from 1971. Last year's sales made tuna one of the leaders in supermarket sales in this, the world's largest tuna-consuming country.

Why the rising popularity of this fish? We'd like to think promotion by the industry and its individual members has had a favorable impact on the consumer's awareness of tuna. . . . through recipes and other communications to home economists, school teachers, food editors, and consumers. These efforts have been supported by advertising and other promotional techniques. Industry-wide promotional efforts are conducted through the Tuna Research Foundation.

But the inflationary squeeze on consumer pocketbooks also played an important role in the rising consumption of tuna. I refer specifically to the relatively higher price of beef and pork that caused consumers to look for alternate sources of meat protein. Budget-stretching dishes are in vogue—and what works better in a casserole than tuna?

And when the average consumer comes to fully appreciate the nutritional value of tuna, we could see an even greater rise in consumption. Nutritional labels on canned products initiated last year, tell quite a story for tuna.

A 6½ ounce can of tuna provides 100 per cent of the U.S. recommended daily allowance of protein. It contains 110 per cent of the R.D.A. for niacin, 80 percent for vitamin B12, 35 percent for phosphorus, 15 percent for magnesium, 10 percent for iron, and 6 percent for vitamin B2. Think about it!

1974 is shaping up as a good fishing year, and we can expect to see continued growth of

the market if tuna remains economically attractive to the housewife. Maintaining the competitive edge over other meat proteins will require vigilant efforts to improve efficiency at all levels of production and distribution.

Catching more tuna won't be easy in the years ahead. The U.S. tuna industry can't sustain itself in the long term solely on the catches of our historic fishing grounds off North and South America. We must find new fishing grounds, and this will require greater scientific knowledge of fish populations and sustainable catch levels.

The U.S. tuna industry must have assurances that our boats will have access to waters within a reasonable distance of foreign shores. Quotas on catches must be kept at acceptable levels. And we'll have to develop new fishing techniques and gear to allow us to operate in new fishing grounds.

These challenges can be met. We can do so by demonstrating the aggressiveness and imagination which has made tuna people the innovators and modernizers of the U.S. fishing industry. Tuna is a growth business with bright prospects for the future.

In closing, I want to wish a happy and successful future for the "Katherine Lisa," Captain Joseph and his crew. Bon voyage!

TRIBUTE TO AMOS LYNCH

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the long and distinguished career of Mr. Amos Lynch, general manager of the Columbus Call & Post, and the tribute which will soon highlight his most outstanding achievements.

The Call & Post has performed a vital service to the black community, as well as the community-at-large, and its success and fine service is due in large measure to the efforts of Mr. Amos Lynch.

An Appreciation Day banquet will be held Wednesday, June 12, 1974, in Columbus, Ohio, to honor Amos Lynch for more than 30 years of journalistic contributions to the community.

The sentiments of the Lynch Appreciation Committee expresses, I am certain, the feelings of many citizens of the community that has so greatly benefited from Amos Lynch's many years of meritorious service:

We in Columbus feel that Amos Lynch has consistently demonstrated a rare sensitivity to vital community issues and has worked diligently to bring about solutions to the difficult problems this community has faced. He stands out prominently in the state of Ohio for the high editorial benchmarks he has established. He has clearly demonstrated that a newspaper has the responsibility to go beyond educating, informing, and entertaining, but most often be out in front, representing the interests of its readers and working for a better quality of life.

Accordingly I am submitting to the RECORD a brief biographical sketch which gives only a few of Amos Lynch's contributions and achievements throughout his outstanding journalistic and civic career. I urge my colleagues to join me and the citizens of Columbus in this tribute to Amos Lynch:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

The son of Mrs. Beadie A. Lynch and the late Dr. Herston H. Lynch, Amos Lynch was born in Columbus, Ohio, July 5, 1925.

He began his professional career as a sports writer with the Ohio State News in 1943. When World War II began, Amos Lynch entered the United States Navy where he served as a medical corpsman. After the War, he returned to his former position and within a few years became the Managing Editor of the Ohio Sentinel. Subsequently, he held a variety of challenging positions that included work in public relations, advertising, and marketing. In 1962, he joined the staff of the Columbus Call and Post where he is still General Manager.

His civic career is as distinguished as his professional service. He was among the organizers of the Mt. Vernon Avenue District Improvement Association and currently holds offices in or is director of the following organizations:

Mt. Vernon Avenue District Improvement Association.

Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce.

Columbus Business League.

Merry Makers Club, Inc.

Columbus Town Meeting.

Junior Achievement.

His past activities include work with the Spring Street YMCA and many other social agencies serving the Near Eastside. He has coordinated recreational and community activities for many civic organizations, and has held offices in the South Side Settlement House and the Isabelle Ridgeway Home for the Aged.

Amos Lynch has been actively involved in the field of civil rights, having served as chairman of the Columbus Urban League from 1966 to 1973. He has consistently demonstrated a concern for those in need, and has served as chairman of many charitable activities, including once serving as the director of the United Appeal. Currently, he is the director of the Columbus Business League which he helped organize in the mid-Sixties.

His many achievements have earned him a great number of honors and awards. He has been named "Man of the Year" for 1974 by the Columbus Metropolitan Area Community Action Organization, as well as by the East High School Students and Faculty.

The following are but a few of the awards he has received for outstanding community service:

HONORS FROM TRADE ASSOCIATIONS

Merit Awards for "Best Examples of Promoting The Negro Newspaper," 1952, 1953, and 1957-59 from the National Newspaper Publishers Association (NNPA).

Merit Awards for "Public Service," 1956, 1959, and 1971 from the NNPA.

Meritorious Service Awards, 1957 and 1968, from the Mt. Vernon Avenue District Improvement Association.

OTHER HONORS

"Young Man Of The Year," Spring Street YMCA, 1947.

Jaycee nominee "Young Man Of The Year, 1957.

Special Award for "Helping Ohio Sentinel Readers Live Better Electrically," Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Company, 1957.

Outstanding Service Awards, 1965-69, East High School Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECCA).

Outstanding Service Award, 1966, Ohio DECCA.

Honorary Life Membership, 1968, East High School DECCA.

One of "Ten Men Of The Year," 1968, by the Columbus Citizen-Journal.

"Outstanding Achievement in Journalism," 1967, Second Community Church.

"Man Of The Year," 1974, Columbus Metro-

politan Area Community Action Organization.

"Man Of The Year," 1974, East High School Student and Faculty Community Award.

"Oscar Gill Community Service Award," 1974, Sideliners, Incorporated.

SERVICE AWARDS

Columbus Recreation Department.

Neighborhood House.

National Foundation (March of Dimes).

Franklin County Society for Crippled Children.

Boy Scouts of America.

Tuberculosis Society of Franklin County.

Big Brother's Association of Columbus.

Central Ohio Heart Association.

United Negro College Fund Columbus Campaign.

Columbus Urban League.

Columbus Branch NAACP.

Modroes Club of Columbus.

U.S. Navy Recruiting Command.

Eta Phi Beta Sorority.

Asbury Methodist Church.

Ohio School for the Blind.

Linden Eagles' Athletic Association.

Sigma Tau Lambda Sorority.

Columbus Golden Gloves Tournament Committee.

Douglas House Management Group.

A graduate of South High School in Columbus, he attended Ohio State University. He is an active member of the Shiloh Baptist Church, and he and his wife, Gerri, are the parents of two sons, David and Amos, Jr.

A MESSAGE FOR GRADUATES

HON. J. KENNETH ROBINSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1974, a distinguished Member of the other body, the Honorable HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania, was the commencement speaker at Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va., in my congressional district.

Although Virginia has a fully accredited Senator SCOTT of its own, we continue to claim a share of the achievements and affections of Senator SCOTT of Pennsylvania, because of his family associations in Virginia, his earned degrees from Randolph-Macon College and, in law, from the University of Virginia, and his valued service as a member of the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia.

As a matter of interest to the Members of the House, I include, under leave to extend my remarks, the text of the address of the distinguished minority leader of the other body on the occasion of the commencement exercises of Randolph-Macon College, as follows:

SPEECH BY U.S. SENATOR HUGH SCOTT

I understand that the graduating class asked that I speak this year. As we know this is a break with graduations of the recent past when the ceremonies were kept short and to the point.

No greater honor can be extended to a graduate.

I hope my remarks will get a passing grade and that I will not exhaust your attentive faculties.

Fifty-five years ago I wore the traditional cap and gown for the first time at my graduation. And since leaving this beautiful campus pursuing a career in law and then in

public service, I have many times over observed that the foundation received at Randolph-Macon was broad and sustaining. This foundation was built on strong principles, grounded on the life experiences of those who had gone before.

This is a good country.

Yes, we are going through some troubled times; but, of the more than 90 countries I have visited, I haven't found one where I would like to take up permanent residency.

Mr. Jefferson said it best when he offered the thought that democracy can only survive if the people have faith in their government.

There is something in the ancient precepts. There are verities, truly eternal. There are things for which one must stand and fight and deliver in unpopular times and during the occasions where one is caught up in dealing with unpopular causes.

Some of you, in your own life's progress have found yourselves veterans of lost causes—like myself, a son of Confederate veterans: My grandfather and my great-grandfather Confederates. I have fought in lost causes all my life.

Look at who I am and where I am. But I plead—as one who is a veteran of lost causes—for adherence to the eternal verities and I hope that that's what will be taught above everything else: that there are certain fundamental rights which endure and which are inherent in the concept of humanity which one must forever and forever believe in and fight for—for the dignity of humankind and for the right of every human being to be judged equally and fairly by his peers, and for the obligation of every human being to respect those judgments founded upon our sacred traditions and our sacred doctrines.

Never before has the wisdom of our forefathers been put to such a test as today.

"Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves, therefore, are its only safe depositories," Mr. Jefferson also said.

Not too long ago, on a hillside in Pennsylvania prior to speaking to several hundreds of people, I was asked by a college student: "Senator, how can I have confidence in our government?" He, obviously, was anguished because of the drumbeat of events which have since become known as "Watergate."

I hope my answer was not received as a simplistic solution to a heavy and burdensome problem. I said: "The system is working. We will be justified in placing our faith in the system."

That was nearly a year ago. And I stand on that statement today. The system is working. And it will continue to work.

Other countries have fallen for less.

Over the last six months the governments of at least eight nations have been overturned. Some of our warmest allies are among them: Great Britain and Canada . . . France and Iceland . . . Portugal and Denmark . . . West Germany . . . even Luxembourg.

Those governments did not possess the built-in protectiveness of our system.

It is this balance which makes it all work. The Congress is facing up to its responsibilities.

The Judicial system has found some to be guilty, has discharged some from indictments and has freed others.

The Executive continues to run the nation, despite the pressing problems caused by the wrongful acts of employees who never were elected to public office.

These wrongs hurt all who are charged with helping our political system to work. Because each of us who holds in trust the public's faith has been stung by the venom of zealots and amateurs and by persons who don't know what it is to run as a candidate for public office . . . to experience the exaltation of winning and have the grace of losing—in fair contests.

Three weeks ago I challenged law school

graduates of the University of Virginia to remember always that a presumption of innocence exists in this country.

If this cherished liberty is to be lost, my friends, then we will have become a banana republic. And, as one who has read the law for more than 50 years, I don't see this happening.

An orderly process is underway. A House Committee—38 members, including two women, and everyone of them a lawyer, each elected by the constituencies of 22 states—is sifting the evidence to determine whether the President should be impeached, which is to say, charged with offenses against the Constitution.

This is our system.

If this committee votes on articles of impeachment, 435 men and women will hear the evidence and debate what's at issue. If the Senate becomes the forum for trial, it will do its duty in full consciousness of the special oath each Senator will take.

This is the way it will work.

This chain of events was ordained nearly 200 years ago. It has built-in checks and balances to ensure the innocence of the innocent and find the guilt of the guilty.

Again I say this is a good country; in fact, it's a great country.

When the seas become rough we should reflect on the accomplishments.

Many can remember the difficult times of this nation. We have lived through them all—and have become stronger for it.

In this year of 1974, the nation is at peace.

Not an American soldier is being drafted to raise his weapon in defense of liberty and of this country, and we thank God for that.

We are talking to the Russians.

We are talking to the Chinese.

We have negotiated a peace settlement in the Middle East, a vital disengagement signed only this week.

We are negotiating trade agreements throughout the world.

Over the five years Richard Nixon has been President the focus of federal spending has been turned completely around: forty-nine cents of every dollar for human services in comparison with twenty-nine cents of every dollar for defense.

We have the lowest peacetime unemployment.

While inflation continues upward, the rate of climb and prices at the consumer level is not as high as in other countries. While not that comforting, economists predict an improvement this year.

But the significance is we are at peace.

Campuses are quiet.

Schools have been integrated.

More people than ever before are working. And the country is strong enough to stand the functioning of its own Constitution.

To get involved is a privilege and a challenge. Work within the system. Make changes to improve it; but don't run away from full involvement in our working system in this, the greatest country in this world.

I leave you with a verse which has remained with me since I listened to our Commencement speaker in 1919:

"Four things a man must learn to do
If he would keep his record true:
To think, without confusion, clearly
To love his fellow man sincerely
To act from honest motives purely
To trust in God and heaven securely."

ESCH AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69

HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted in favor of a motion to in-

struct the House conferees to uphold the Esch amendment to H.R. 69, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This action was intended to reaffirm the commitment of the House of Representatives to strictly limit cross-district school busing. It is my hope that the overwhelming vote by which this measure passed will convince our colleagues in the Senate that our opposition to busing is firm and resolute. As the newest Member of the House, I want to make clear my position of this issue.

Let me state at the outset that the commitment to save the neighborhood school must be matched by an equally strong commitment to educationally productive schools. If we seek to guarantee the right of the student to attend the school nearest his or her home, should we not seek to guarantee that the neighborhood school will provide a sound, quality education? Many schools do not provide a quality education. Indeed, there would be no discussion of busing had we done a better job of providing each neighborhood school with the necessary tools to educate effectively.

The evidence points further to the fact that black neighborhoods, ethnic neighborhoods, and poor neighborhoods—the neighborhoods with the greatest need for a quality education—are the same areas that suffer most from discrimination in educational facilities. This House, therefore, must move to erase this discrimination. This House must carry its commitment to the neighborhood school further. This House must act to insure that all of our children are provided with the basic educational tools necessary for a happy and productive life.

Additionally, we must move to erase the discrimination that has led to this problem. I support the elimination of discrimination in any form. I believe that the elected leaders of our Nation have an obligation to see that laws are enacted and enforced to erase the last vestiges of legal and illegal discrimination, as well as the economic and social scars that past discrimination has produced.

We must work to promote racial harmony. My record has always been one of supporting and fighting for civil rights legislation. I will continue to work toward those goals. But cross-district busing does nothing to promote racial harmony and understanding.

Cross-district busing in pursuit of racial balance is a bad policy. Such schemes are shortsighted, highly divisive, and generally lacking in educational, legal, and political good sense.

When black students were, in many parts of the country, bused past schools near their homes to predominantly black schools, that was wrong. To now bus whites and blacks past the schools nearest their homes to various more distant schools, on the basis of race, is a mistake.

Widescale busing will not, in my judgment, improve the quality of education. Indeed, such busing, if it is for the purpose of pursuing racial quotas, is certain to arouse antagonism and divert public attention from the essentials of good education: Good teachers, good facilities, and financial support by Federal, State, and local governments.

Equitable distribution of public re-

sources, not an investment in fleets of buses, is the way to improve education for all, black and white.

What is wrong with the schools so many poor blacks are forced to attend is not the absence of white children. What is wrong is official unconcern, inadequate expenditures of public money, and pervading ignorance as to how best to teach children who come to school profoundly disadvantaged in almost every way.

If we are to achieve quality education for all, it is essential that the precarious amity and good will between the races not be further eroded. It is essential that a higher priority be given to education on our national list of priorities.

We must not allow this issue to erode public support for better education. Support for improved educational facilities is a fragile commodity, depending on the personal and political commitment of parents, teachers, students, and legislators. Busing for racial balance would tear apart this support, causing irreparable damage to education in America.

A policy of massive busing, based on a misplaced emphasis on race, would simply exacerbate the growing attitude that says, "What in the world is going on?" We would wind up with a net loss, rather than a net gain, in our school systems. Federal financial aid to schools would be bogged down in controversy, resistance to school millages would increase, and racial antagonisms would be accentuated.

If it were only a question of political risk, that risk might be taken. But the concept of widespread busing to pursue racial balance rests on a faulty, race conscious premise. It is presumptuous and patronizing to suppose that black children, in whose interest the concept is advanced, can only be educated if a certain percentage of white faces is produced in the same school, by transport if necessary.

Moreover, many of the proposed busing plans that some courts are now considering, with their preoccupation with social engineering, would make blacks a permanent minority in each and every school, even in predominantly black neighborhoods. The unfairness of such a design, and the loss of community voice in school matters, should be obvious. Black parents want more say, not less, in how their schools are operated and how their children are educated. This cannot be accomplished by creating "super school districts" and sending off our children in all directions.

It must be recognized that the developing controversy involves at least two essential elements: Education and race relations. The element of race relations is many-faceted and is intertwined with such problems as job opportunities, crime and the fear of crime, economic disadvantage, housing, and family environment and motivation. Extensive busing will not solve any of these problems.

Sound public policy should seek to maximize good will and public support for quality schools. It should avoid the creation of questionable formulas and dogmas which would wrench apart the delicate fabric of our American society and which might convulse, year after year, the emotions and the politics of our beloved land. I trust that our Nation will

choose wisely and act wisely in the times ahead.

NATIONAL REALTY COMMITTEE DISPUTES "NO GROWTH" UNDER THE LAND USE PLANNING ACT

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, allegations that the Land Use Planning Act, H.R. 10294, will lend to "no growth" have been raised recently by opponents of this legislation. I think it is a totally false argument and have said so repeatedly. I am now joined in that analysis by the National Realty Committee, Inc. In the letter that follows, this organization—not known for supporting legislation that would be detrimental to their economic interests—endorses H.R. 10294 and very explicitly poo-poo's the "no growth" myth as "more emotion than substance." As the letter makes clear, those areas where "no growth" moratoriums and the like have occurred are examples of the kind of frustrations that results from the lack of rational planning.

I include the letter and urge all Members to give this responsible and rational analysis their close attention:

NATIONAL REALTY COMMITTEE, Inc.,
New York, N.Y., June 5, 1974.

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Environment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN UDALL: The National Realty Committee, Inc., which has long been interested in comprehensive land use legislation, has considered the claim made by critics of the Land Use Planning Act of 1974 (H.R. 10294) that the legislation will create a "no-growth" atmosphere. It is our firm conviction that this criticism is groundless, and we anticipate the real effect of the bill will be just the opposite. That is, it will offer both a cure and a preventative for the kinds of problems that give rise to a "no-growth" atmosphere. These problems can be viewed from two perspectives, from the point of view of the states and localities and from the point of view of the real estate industry.

STATES AND LOCALITIES

States and localities develop no-growth attitudes because of an inability to cope with the complexities of the diverse pressures on their land resource and because of the resulting adverse impact on environmental amenities and on the economic and social structure of the community. The sole intent of H.R. 10294 is to provide grant monies to encourage the states and localities to develop planning processes that will enable them to deal effectively with the complexities of land use decision making. To the extent that they accept the challenge, and develop effective planning processes, the basis for state and local no-growth attitudes should be mitigated.

In a recent speech, David E. Stahl, Executive Vice President of the Urban Land Institute, stressed the importance of federal financial assistance to states and localities and the beneficial impact that this could have in countering the tendency to develop no-growth policies:

"Federal grant assistance to the states, to be made possible under a national land use bill, will enable the states and their constituent regional and local jurisdictions to prepare and implement badly needed land use plans which provide for a balance between environmental protection and the attainment of economic and social objectives. Without adequate financial assistance these agencies will be hard pressed to deal effectively with the disturbing trend of no-growth policies that have been emerging in many communities across the country."

THE REAL ESTATE INDUSTRY

Undue burdens on the real estate industry due to unreasonable regulations or inconsistent public policy can also lead to a no-growth atmosphere because developers will hesitate to sponsor and finance new projects. H.R. 10294 should be a strong aid in reducing these burdens.

The focus of H.R. 10294 is on a comprehensive approach to land use planning. The bill provides for consideration and balancing of a full range of environmental, economic and social needs. Some have criticized the bill because it contains a detailed listing of the elements of the planning process. This criticism is unjust for two reasons: first, a comprehensive approach to land use planning is just that, comprehensive, and a failure to address any of the elements of the planning process will not make them any less necessary; second, states may use the bill as a guide in enacting state land use enabling legislation, and the listing of elements of the planning process will help alert the state legislatures to the broad range of responsibilities that should properly be assigned to the state and local planning agencies.

Others have criticized the bill for inclusion of environmental considerations as part of the planning process. In response to that, we can only point out that development of all kinds is subject to a growing host of environmental regulations. Such regulations inevitably impose restrictions on development, but to expect that one can engage in meaningful land use planning without considering environmental constraints is folly.

The National Realty Committee has consistently advocated a comprehensive land use planning approach through which, in a single process, environmental factors are considered along with economic and social factors. There are four reasons for advocating this approach. First, it allows policy makers to find a balance between environmental, economic and social needs. Second, it encourages consistency in the land use programs. Third, it brings regulations and standards together in one place and makes it easier for developers to assess, in advance, the prospects for approval of proposed developments which are subject to regulation. Fourth, it allows for a simplification of pre-construction review processes.

We feel that these four aspects of a comprehensive approach favor rather than impede the real estate industry. Both the detailing of the elements of the planning process and the inclusion of environmental considerations in H.R. 10294 will encourage the states to establish land use planning processes that exhibit these favorable aspects.

Much of the criticism of H.R. 10294 seems to be more emotion than substance, and the "no-growth" criticism is an example. In our judgment, the principal benefit of H.R. 10294 is that it provides states and localities with both opportunity and resources for comprehensive land use planning. The responsibility for action rests with the states and the localities. Therefore, whether one tends to oppose or support the goals of H.R. 10294 is a reflection of some degree of one's confidence that the states and localities will use the opportunity and the resources in a responsible and effective manner. We feel,

as you must, that the majority of the states will act responsibly, and it is up to the Congress to give them that opportunity. Failure to do so either will result in an increase in the trend toward no-growth, as more and more communities reach the limits of their ability to cope with land use decision making or, as Senator Jackson has often pointed out, will inevitably lead to increasing federal usurpation of land use planning functions. Neither appears to be a very attractive alternative.

Very truly yours,

ALBERT A. WALSH,
President.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: SOUTH VIETNAM'S POLITICAL PRISONERS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the administration claims that "only a handful" of prisoners in South Vietnam are being held because of their opposition to the Thieu regime. Those who challenge this claim are accused of getting their information from Hanoi. On the contrary, respected individuals and organizations all over the world have described in vivid detail the detainment of thousands of Thieu's opponents, and the barbaric conditions under which they are confined and often tortured. I would like to insert in the RECORD a partial list of sources from which my colleagues can obtain further information:

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. "A New Phoenix Program," by Deputy Ho Ngor Nhuan, *American Report*, Jan. 29, 1973, p. 5.
2. "Thieu's Campaign of Terror," Chris Jenkins, *American Report*, Jan. 29, 1973, p. 5.
3. Message from the Central Executive Council (Vien Hoa Dao) of the Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam, on the occasion of the Proclamation of the Cease-fire, Saigon, Jan. 30, 1972.
4. "U.S.-Thieu Prisons", *News From Vietnam*, Feb. 1, 1973, p. 5.
5. "Tet in Paulo-Condo" Le Trac, *News from Vietnam*, Feb. 1, 1973, p. 12.
6. Statement by 31 groups and individuals demanding release from prison, Saigon, Feb. 2, 1972.
7. "Two French advisors feat the 'Liquidation' of Saigon political Prisoners", *Le Monde*, Feb. 3, 1973.
8. "The Life and Death of Nguyen Ngor Buong" Dispatch News Service International, Feb. 5, 1973.
9. "Repression and Torture by the Saigon Penitentiary Regime", *Vietnam News and Reports*, Feb. 4-Mar. 4, 1973, p. 10.
10. "Saigon bypasses Accord in Freeing Many Prisoners", Sylvia Fox, *New York Times*, Feb. 6, 1973, p. A-30.
11. "Saigon Frees 10,600 Vietcong Prisoners", Thomas W. Lippman, *Washington Post*, 2/8/73 p. A 30
12. "Memorandum to the International Conference on Vietnam and Indochina", Amnesty International, International Secretariat, 53 Theobald Road, London, England, 2/9/73
13. "South Vietnam Threatens to Stop Freeing Reds", *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, 2/15/73, p. 16-A
14. "The Treatment of Political Prisoners by Saigon Does not Seem to Conform with the Jan. 27 Accords", Letter from 8000 Polit-

ical Prisoners in Con Son Prison to the ICCS and JMC Feb. 17, 1973

15. "Some Flaws in the Cease-Fire", Joseph B. Treaster, *N.Y. Times*, 2/18/73

16. A Letter from 124 Disabled Political Prisoners from Con Son to the ICCS & JMC Feb. 20, 1973

17. "Thieu Must be Pressured to Free Political Prisoners", *The Ann Arbor News*, 2/22/73

18. "On the Question of Civilian Prisoners in South Vietnam", A Press Release, Saigon Embassy, London, 2/23/73

19. "Political Prisoners in South Vietnam", NBC Nightly News, Interview by Dennis Trout with David and Jane Barton in Saigon, Washington Report, 2/28/73 (6:30 PM)

20. "Terror in Thieu's Prisons", J.P. Delvis and Andre Menvas, *American Report*, Feb. 1973

21. "Prison Witnesses", *News From Vietnam*, 3/1/73 (Montreal, Canada), p. 4,5

22. "U.S. Thieu's Terror Against Political Prisoners", Tran Phu, *News From Vietnam*, 3/1/73 (Montreal) p. 6

23. "Many New Tiger Cages" John Champ-
lin, *Washington Post*, 3/3/73

24. "South Vietnamese Describe Torture in Prison's Tiger Cages" Sylvia Fox, *N.Y. Times*, 3/3/73

25. "Saigon's Political Prisoners Tell of Torture", Jacques Leslie, *L.A. Times*, 3/4/73 P 1, 10-A

26. "Saigon to Trade Off Chan", Henry S. Bradsher, *Washington Star-News*, 3/5/73

27. "Tiger Cages and Our Foreign Policies", Rep. Augustus Hawkins, *Congressional Record*, 3/7/73 ("Tiger Cage" Victims cite South Vietnamese Torture by Jacques Leslie)

28. "Skeleton-Like Men Tell of Torture in Saigon's Tiger Cages", Roland Pierre Parin-
gaux, *Toronto Star*, March 7, 1973, p. 69

29. "Shackled in the Tiger Cages of Con Son", Anthony Lewis, *The Irish Times*, Dub-
lin, March 7, 1973

30. "Released from Tiger Cages, Ex-Prison-
ers Give Details", Roland Pierre Parin-
gaux, *Des Moines Register*, March 7, 1973

31. "Prisoners Tell About Torture", Jacques
Leslie, *L.A. Times*, March 8, 1973, p. 1, 2-A

32. Letter from Students and Pupils Im-
prisoned in South Vietnam to the President
of Four Delegations of the ICCS & the Presi-
dents of the Military of the Four Parties,
Saigon, March 10, 1973

33. "The Other Prisoners", Tom Wicker,
N.Y. Times, March 11, 1973, PE-15

34. "Saigon's Instant Criminals" (Peri-
scope) *Newsweek*, March 12, 1973, p. 17

35. "Saigon May Release Thieu Foe to
Victory", Charles Mohr, *N.Y. Times*, March
12, 1973

36. "The Italian Committee to Save the
Political Prisoners in South Vietnam", Press
Bulletin, March 12, 1973

37. "South Viets Violate Pact on POW's",
Tom Wicker, *N.Y. Times*, March 13, 1973

38. *Le Monde*, March 16, 1973

39. Patricia De Beer, *Le Monde*, March 16,
1973

40. "The Other Prisoners", *Time*, March 19,
1973

41. "Con Son Prisoners", David De Voss,
Time, March 19, 1973

42. "Vietnam- the Other Prisoners", *Time*,
March 19, 1973

43. "Silence Greets POW's Tale", Mary
McCrory, *N.Y. Post*, March 20, 1973

44. "Who Will Ask Thieu", Mary McCrory,
Time, March 19, 1973

45. Statement by The International Red
Cross Committee (ICRC), March 21, 1973

46. "Tiger Cages Restrict Peace Possibility",
Rep. Charles Rangel, *Congressional Record*,
March 22, 1973, H2104

47. "A Young Frenchman Accuses Thieu
of Destroying the Opposition", Clement
Trudel, *Le Devoir*, 23, 24, & 27 March, 1973

48. "Peace Candidates Freed by Saigon" AP
N.Y. Times, March 27, 1973

49. "Beyond Dzu's Release," *N.Y. Post*.

50. "Heroes and Victims," Robert Jay
Tifton, *N.Y. Times* (Op. Ed.), 3/28/73

51. "Unfinished Crusade," James A.
Wechsler, *N.Y. Post*

52. Debates of the Senate, Honorable Mr.
Cameron (Canadian Senate), March 29, 1973

53. "Why Canada Should Care About Con
Son," Sean Rossiter, *The Vancouver Sun*,
3/29/73, p. 6, 7

54. "The Terrible Truth," Harriet Van
Horn, *N.Y. Post*, 3/30/73

55. "Whom We Welcome," Anthony Lewis,
N.Y. Times, 3/31/73

56. "What's Left Behind," *N.Y. Times*,
4/1/73

57. "President Thieu, the Panhandler and
the Private," Rep. Robert Drinan, *Congres-
sional Record*, April 2, 1973, pp. 10549-10558

58. "South Vietnamese Political Prison-
ers," Rep. Harrington, *Congressional Record*
April 2, 1973, pp. 10562-10563

59. Interview with President Thieu, *Le
Nouvel Observateur*, 4/2/73

60. "Judge Not," James Wechsler, *N.Y.
Post*, 4/3/73

61. "POW's and Thieu," Harriet Van Horne,
N.Y. Post, 4/4/73

62. Letter of 8,000 Political Prisoners in
Con Son, *Win*, 4/5/73, p. 3

63. Official Telegram, Text No. 7167/N2/B,
April 5, 1973, on behalf of the National Po-
lice Command, General Secretary of the Na-
tional Council of Operation Phoenix, Chief
of the Office, Colonel Nguyen Van Giau

64. "The PW Show," Pete Hammill, *New
York Post*, 4/6/73

65. "The Readaptation Camps", in Phong
Din Province (Delta) Conradin Prison Red
Cross Report VII, April 7, 1973

66. "Our Honor in Cages", Don Lure, *News-
day*, April 8, 1973

67. "The POW's Story", *NY Times*—Editorial,
April 8, 1973

68. "Riot Police Hold Off Protestors as
Thieu Confers with Pope", Odette Mengin
AP, *NY Post*, April 9, 1973

69. "A Different Protest", Toby Marko-
witz—Letters to the Editor, *NY Post*, April 9,
1973

70. "Thieu Triumph", James Wechsler, *NY
Post*, April 10, 1973

71. "Thieu Visits Pope, Who Bids Him Free
Political Prisoners", *NY Times*, April 10,
1973

72. "Of prisoners, Torture and the Antiwar
Movement", Letters to the Editor, *NY Times*,
April 12, 1973

73. "Thieu Visit", Orion Mehus, Letters to
the Editor, *NY Times*, April 14, 1973

74. "Prisoners—Forever Amber", Francis
Starnier, *Far Eastern Economic Review*, April
16, 1973, p. 15-20

75. "Face the Nation", CBS News, Guest
Nguyen Van Thieu, Reporters George Her-
man (CBS News), Peter Arnett (AP) and
Marvin Kalb (CBS News), April 18, 1973,
11:30 AM-12 Noon Washington, D.C.

76. "1500 Held on Island, Saigon Deputy
Says", *NY Times*, April 19, 1973

77. "Visit to South Vietnam", Thelma
Baker Report, April 19-26, 1973

78. "Civilian Release Due in South", *NY
Times*, April 25, 1973

79. "Saigon Uses Torture", Michal Cleroux,
Voice of Women, (Toronto), April, 1973, p. 1

80. "General Mish Proposes Political Pro-
gram", *NY Times*, May 2, 1973

81. "Report on Con Son Prison", The Com-
mittee to Reform the Prison System of
South Vietnam, May 5, 1973

82. "South Vietnam: A Question of Tor-
ture", Broadcast 5/7/73 in London, England,
World in Action Series, Granada Television
(British Independent Broadcasting Author-
ity)

83. Letter from Nguyen Van Trung, Chair-
person, to Senator J. W. Fulbright, Chair-
person for the Improvement of the Prison
Regime in South Vietnam May 6, 1971

84. "Canadians Urge Check of Vietnam Ci-
vilian Campus," James Anderson, *Toronto
Globe and Mail* 5/19/73

85. Report of Mission Team from Quebec
Section of the International Committee for
the Liberation of South Vietnamese Political
Prisoners to South Vietnam in April, 1973,
Montreal (52 Elgin Ave., Toronto, Ontario
M5R166), 5/9/73

86. "The Forgotten Civilians in South Viet-
namese Jails," Charles Taylor, *Toronto Globe
and Mail*

87. "Jails Hold Political Prisoners," Bishop
Thomas J. Crumbleton, *National Catholic
Reporter*, May 11, 1973

88. "Saigon Strongly Denies the Allegation
of the Two Quebec Visitors" *Le Devoir*,
5/14/73

89. "Study of Terror," Committee for the
Release of the Political prisoners in South
Vietnam, Stockholm, 1973

90. "Investigation Report based on Trip
to South Vietnam on May 16-30, 1973 on
Behalf of the Canadian Branch of the Inter-
national Committee to Free South Viet-
namese Political Prisoners," S. J. Noumoff
professor of Political Science, McGill Uni-
versity

91. Official Telegram sent by Colonel Ngu-
yen Van Crau, Bureau Chief of National
Phoenix Committee to all Provincial Chiefs
and Security Committees, dated April 5,
1973 published in *La Monde*, May 17, 1973

92. The Forgotten Prisoners of Nguyen Van
Thieu, by a group of French University Pro-
fessors, Paris, May, 1973

93. "Thieu's Political Prisoners," A Re-
port by Hans Goöran Frank, Secretary Gen-
eral International Commission of Inquiry
into US Crimes in Indochina, June 1, 1973

94. "Senator Kennedy Charges Adminis-
tration Cover-up and Deception on Prisons
and Political Prisoners in South Vietnam and
Urges President to Withdraw Funding for
Public Safety Purposes", Senator Edward
Kennedy, Press Release, June 4, 1973

95. "Prisons and Political Prisoners in
South Vietnam, speech by Senator Edward
Kennedy, reprinted in the *Congressional Re-
cord*, June 4, 1973, pp. 17839-17849

96. "Prisons and Political Prisoners in
South Vietnam", Press Release from Senator
Edward Kennedy, 6/4/73

97. "Prisons and Political Prisoners in
South Vietnam", Senator Edward Kennedy,
Congressional Record, June 4, 1973 119, #84

98. UAW Council of Canada Urges the Re-
lease of Political Prisoners, Fort Elgin, On-
tario June 8-10, 1973

99. "Minh Bids Saigon End Curb on Crit-
ics", AP, *N.Y. Times*, 6/5/73

100. The Canadian United Auto Workers'
Resolution from the National Council Meet-
ing in Port Elgin, June 9, 1973 "Rapes
Thieu", Resolution #7. Political Prisoners in
South Vietnam

101. Letter to Don Luce from Huynh-Tan-
Mam, Former President of Vietnam National
Student Union, Chis Hoa Prison, Saigon,
June 11, 1973

102. Testimony of John Champlin, MD. to
House Foreign Affairs Committee, 6/11/73

103. "Misuse of Tax Fund for Saigon's Po-
lice and Prison Systems", Women Strike for
Peace, Press Statement, June 11, 1973

104. "Thieu Refuses to Discuss Prisoner
Situation", Ngo Vinh Tong, *Boston Phoenix*,
June 26, 1973

105. "Statement of Senator James Abour-
ezk before the Senate Foreign Relations
Committee on SVN Political Prisoners", Sen-
ator James Abourezk

106. Committee letter from Father Chan
Tin on behalf of the Committee to reform
the prison system to ICCS, Heads of Buddhist
and Catholic Religions and Chairperson of
the Senate, June 30, 1973

107. "Union Leader dies in Vietnam Pris-
on", Fox Butterfield, *NY Times*, July 4, 1973

108. "Torture Charges Denied by Saigon",
AP, *NY Times*, 7/10/73

109. "Release for the Prisoners", *Issue*, June 1973

110. Interview with Thieu, *Vietnam Report*, 7/15/73

111. "Report on Quang Ngai Province since the January Ceasefire", Jane and David Barton, 7/18/73

112. "South Vietnam: School of Hard Knocks", *Newsweek*, July 23, 1973

113. "Clandestine Document Assails South Vietnam on Prisoners", Thomas Lippman, *Washington Post*, 7/27/73

114. "Thieu's Ex-friend Spurns Amnesty Offer", Joseph B. Treaster, *NY Times*, 7/28/73

115. "Peace with Honor", Anthony Lewis, *NY Times*, July 1973

116. Open letter to all groups and individuals concerned about the problem of political prisoners in South Vietnam from students and intellectuals now being held as political prisoners in South Vietnam, August 8, 1973

117. "The Role of the Security Commissions in South Vietnam", by Dr. Nguyen Duc Guy, Senator South Vietnam, January 1973

118. "Torture by Saigon in Jails Reported" Sidney H. Schanberg, *NY Times*, 8/13/73

119. "Australia Protests on Political Prisoners" *Washington Post*, 8/14/73, p.A-8

120. "Deceiving the American People", Don Luce (A response to State Department and Saigon Allegations about Political Prisoners in South Vietnam), American Friends Service Committee Indochina Program, August, 1973

121. "Saigon Imprisons Heads of 3 Unions", Fox Butterfield, *NY Times*, 9/4/73

122. Testimony on Political Prisoners in South Vietnam to the Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, by David and Jane Barton, 9/9/73

123. "Thieu tightens his Grip", *American Report*, 9/10/73, p. 1, 6

124. Testimony of John Champlin, MD to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee, 9/13/73, "Regarding the Prison System in Southern Vietnam"

125. "Dear Colleague", Letter by Representative Augustus F. Hawkins, 9/13/73

126. "Senate Liberals Will Oppose Aid to Saigon Police", Seymour M. Hersh, *NY Times*, 9/16/73

127. "Paying for Thieu's Police", *Time*, 9/17/73

128. "Foreign Aid and the Plight of Political Prisoners" Mary McCrory, *Washington Star-News*, 9/18/73, p. A-5

129. "Statement of Fred Branfman", *Congressional Record*,

130. "Aiding Foreign Police", *Minneapolis Tribune*, 9/20/73

131. *Washington Post*, Thomas Lippman, 9/25/73

132. "Caged by Saigon", Fred Branfman, *NY Times*, 9/27/73

133. "Political Prisoners in South Vietnam", Report of the Italian Mission of Inquiry, Pastor Tullio Vinay and Son Enrico Chiavacci, September, 1973

134. "Saigon Opposition Regroups, Makes a Cautious Comeback", Mathew Seiden, *Baltimore Sun*, 11/2/73

135. "A Soft Touch", Hai An, *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 11/5/73

136. "White Mice? Not Any More," *US News and World Report*, 11/5/73

137. "Fight over the Dismissal of Union Leader", *London Times*, 11/6/73

138. "Tenacious Ba Thank vs. Thieu", Daniel Rodill, *Chicago Tribune*, 11/18/73

139. "South Vietnam Unions Boycott Oil Company Goods", *London Times*, 11/21/73

140. "Reports 60 Nations are Using Torture", UPI, *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, 12/3/73

141. "Plea for Prisoners", Agence France-Presse, *Washington Post*, 12/5/73

142. Document of the Vietnamese Community on Torture in South Vietnam, AFP, Paris, 12/10/73

143. "War is not Peace", Bronson P. Clarke, *NY Times*, 12/10/73

144. "Indochina Aid", Senator George McGovern, *Congressional Record*, 12/11/73

145. "Profiles of Vietnamese Who Are Now Political Prisoners", *American Report*, 12/24/73

146. "Saigon Reports Accord on POW's", Reuters, *NY Times*, 12/28/73

147. "The POW's We Left Behind", Fred Branfman, *Ramparts*, 12/73

148. "Political Prisoners in South Vietnam" Amnesty Report, Amnesty International Publications (53 Theobald Road, London, England)

149. "The Situation to Date", Amnesty International Report, London, 1/9/74

150. "Breaking Faith in Vietnam", Richard A. Falk, *The Nation*, 1/12/74

151. "What of the Missing?", *The New Republic*, 1/19/74

152. "Political Prisoners in South Vietnam", Rep. William Archer, *Congressional Record*, 1/22/74

153. "American Group Charges 'Police State', Starvation in Vietnam", Stephen Werniel, *Boston Globe*, 1/22/74

154. "Special on South Vietnam Torture Indictment of Thieu Regime", *Boston Globe*, 1/22/74

155. "Critic of Saigon Regime under House Arrest", AP, *Washington Star-News*, 1/27/74

156. "NY Man Visits South Vietnam, Concludes his Son Died in Vain", Stephen Werniel, *Boston Globe*, 1/27/74

157. "The 'Cease-fire War' Goes on", Richard Dudman, *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, 1/27/74

158. "Dissident's Son Released", *NY Times*, 1/28/74

159. "Saigon and Vietcong to Resume Prisoner Exchange Next Week, Breaking Deadlock", David Shieler, *NY Times*, 2/2/74

160. "The Indochina Peace Pledge Legislation: An analysis", Hon. Ronald Dellums, *Congressional Record*, Extensions of Remarks, 2/4/74

161. "Ying Kelly: US Ambassador Claims No Political Prisoners", *Congressional Record*, Extension of Remarks, (Inserted by Hon. Ronald Dellums) 2/5/74

162. "South Frees 200 Viet Cong Captives", Tammy Arbuckle, *Washington Star-News*, 2/8/74

163. "State Department Bars Viet Jail Probe", Jeremiah O'Leary, *Washington Star-News*, 2/9/74

164. "Four Silent Men in a Saigon Cell", Victor Brittain, *London Times*, 2/11/74

165. "Law and Injustice", Robert Ransom, *American Report*, 2/14/74

166. "Nguyen Tong Released from Prison", *Washington Post*, 2/24/74

167. "US Supports Saigon Prisons?", Jonathan Gray, *Christian Science Monitor*, 3/6/74

168. "Man Who Remains a Captive in Saigon", Victor Brittain, *London Times*, 3/7/74

169. "Vietnamese Complete POW Exchange", David Shysler, *NY Times*, 3/9/74

170. "Big Minh Issues Open letter", *Dien Tin*, (Saigon Newspaper), 3/10/74

171. "Indigenous Aliens", *Phi Bong Far Eastern Economic Review*, 3/11/74

172. "Buddist Delegation Halted in Effort to Visit Saigon Jail", *NY Times* 3/12/74

173. "Viet Protesters Ask Release of Student", Phillip A. McCombs, *Washington Post*, 3/17/74

174. "Draft Dodging Vietnam Style", Phillip A. McCombs, *Washington Post*, 3/23/74

175. "A Document Presented by the Vietnamese Community on Political Prisoners in South Vietnam", Agence France Presse, Paris, 3/24/74

I have spoken on this subject many times and inserted documents in the Record, as follows:

1. "Terror in Thieu's Prisons", from *American Report*, *Congressional Record*, Extension of Remarks, 3/15/73, p. 8326.

2. *Floor Speech*, 4/2/73.

3. "Thieu's Policies", Editorial from *N.Y. Times*, *The Nation*, *The War Resisters League*, 4/3/73, p. 10874.

4. The Pope and Thieu's Prisoners", Speech and *N.Y. Times* article of April 10, 4/10/73, p. 11711.

5. "Political Prisoners in South Viet Nam: An Appeal from Leading Lawyers and Clergy in Japan", *Congressional Record*, Extension of Remarks, 5/9/73, p. 15115.

6. Documents on South Vietnamese Prisoners, 9/13/73, p. 29747.

7. Remarks on DOD appropriations, 12/20/73, p. 42895.

8. "More Millions for South Viet Nam", Extension of Remarks, 3/20/74, p. 7546.

9. "Political Prisoners in South Viet Nam", Extension of Remarks, 3/21/74, p. 7829.

10. Remarks during debate opposing aid to Viet Nam 4/4/74, p. 9853, further remarks p. 9825.

11. Letters from Saigon legislators, 4/4/74, p. 9875.

12. "Political Prisoners in South Viet Nam", 4/9/74, p. 9373.

13. Open letter to Ambassador to South Viet Nam, Graham Martin, Extension of Remarks, 5/1/74, p. 12756.

ASSESSING THE WAR ON POVERTY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, 1974 is a year for recording milestones of progress toward racial equality in this country. The 20th anniversary of Brown against Board of Education has inspired analysis of and comment on the efficacy of desegregation in equalizing public education for all schoolchildren. Another important anniversary has virtually escaped notice: 1974 marks OEO's 10th birthday and its death.

To become full-fledged, equal participants in all levels and aspects of American life, blacks need education and economic power. Brown confronted the former requirement. Ten years ago, President Johnson declared a war on poverty to achieve the latter. The recently abolished Office of Economic Opportunity won several skirmishes in spite of the complexity of the problems it faced. In addition to substantive programs, OEO achieved an intangible but important psychological change in the attitudes of and toward poor people. As Roger Wilkins indicates in the following article from June 4 *New York Times*, the poor are no longer invisible, and they are no longer powerless:

THE WAR ON POVERTY: 10 YEARS LATER
(By Roger Wilkins)

The House of Representatives voted the other day to repeal the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and to let the Office of Economic Opportunity die next month. The Senate is likely to follow suit. The *Times* reported that "few members . . . rose to mourn the end of the agency," which had been intended by President Johnson to bring "total victory" in the war against poverty.

The mind ran back ten years to the spring of 1964 when Bill Moyers turned from a visitor in his White House office, punched his telephone console with the heel of his shoe and took a call from a Congressman who

wasn't sure what he thought about the poverty proposals. There was Texas oil in Mr. Moyers' voice but steel in the political turkey he was talking. When he was through, the man's vote was firm.

The White House heat was on. Though incubated under John F. Kennedy, the poverty program was to be Lyndon B. Johnson's first major legislative effort. He wanted a win badly, and he got it.

The field was brand new, and idealists, visionaries, politicians, hustlers—bureaucratic and otherwise—and, ultimately, the poor all rushed in. Sargent Shriver donned a new hat and soon his intense driving brand of structured chaos turned O.E.O. into the hottest shop in Washington. In the countryside, the booklet of community action guidelines became, for a time, a new Bible. An instant body of Talmudic scholarship sprang up around the words "maximum feasible participation of the poor."

Congressmen and mayors quickly became leery. The voiceless poor were becoming a loud unmanageable rabble—containing, incidentally, the seedbeds of viable new power rivalries—with which they had to contend. Horror stories about mismanagement, discourtesy, radicalism and thievery were soon being fed back to gleeful conservatives in Congress. Beneath all the clamor, however, real change began to occur. New programs were developed out of community action. Among them: Headstart, Legal Services, innovative manpower efforts and new health-delivery programs. But the main development was that groups of hitherto powerless people had, for the first time, the opportunity to handle sufficient amounts of money to generate for themselves the beginnings of some power. They also developed government management skills and new community services opportunities for people who needed jobs.

It was not a neat and tidy process, and hostility grew. President Johnson became disenchanted and left office without fully comprehending the real accomplishments of the program. Over time, Richard M. Nixon became a determined foe of O.E.O. He succeeded in dismantling it and in scattering the programs all over the domestic side of the Government. The idea of a focal point for poverty in the Government—a place where advocacy, evaluation planning and governmental oversight could come together—is dead.

But the legacy is real. Legal Services—thought by many to be the most effective and economical tool in the effort to empower the poor—seems fairly sure to win its perilous two-year fight for survival. Headstart appears to be a permanent \$500-million Federal effort. Community action—supported by a broad coalition of governors and mayors, including George C. Wallace—seems destined to continue in some form or another as a kind of ombudsman for those who need governmental services. The House bill would send it to Health, Education and Welfare. Senator Jacob K. Javits intends to try to set up a new independent Community Action—Community Development Administration. Whichever form finally emerges, barring a veto, Mr. Nixon seems to have lost his fight to destroy the heart of the anti-poverty effort.

The principal legacy is that the poor are a little stronger, considerably more self-aware and somewhat more self-sufficient. In many instances, their vision of their own potential has been enlarged. There is around the country a network of poor people and their advocates who know something about manipulating the system in order to alleviate poverty. That network did not exist in 1964. Citizen participation has become a part of our legislative landscape. The "invisible poor" have become visible and have entered the nation's consciousness. A foundation has

been laid to await the next cycle of legislative creativity.

It wasn't "total victory" but it was a good beginning. And it was far from the total failure and the unmitigated mess its detractors claimed it to be.

REMARKS BY DR. BETSY ANCKER-JOHNSON

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 20, I had the pleasure of addressing the annual convention of the National Fire Protection Association in Miami, Fla. Adding to that pleasure was the fact that the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, which had already passed the Senate by a vote of 62 to 7, had just passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 352 to 12.

Appearing on the same program was my good friend and the much admired Dr. Betsy Ancker-Johnson, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology. I was so impressed with her remarks that I wanted to share the following comments with my colleagues:

REMARKS BY DR. BETSY ANCKER-JOHNSON

I am delighted to be here today to discuss the role of the Federal government in reducing our nation's appalling losses from fire.

The distinguished Congressman from Georgia, Mr. Davis, has described the legislation he has done so much to bring into being—legislation whose purpose is to make a concerted attack on our dreadful fire problem. He has articulated horrifying statistics, and I shall not repeat them. Nevertheless, I cannot begin without re-emphasizing the human dimension of this national tragedy.

Fatalities are our primary concern. But those who survive injury by fire endure indescribable pain. Severe burns cause damage to vital organs, necessitating prolonged and complex medical treatment. Victims and their families are drained financially and psychologically and society pays indirectly through loss of productive working time.

Those who fight fires work in the most dangerous occupation in the country. Many pay with their lives, sacrifices that must be swiftly reduced.

Clearly, America's losses from fire, the worst in the industrial world, must be radically reduced. Our commitment is to see that a national fire prevention program is established as quickly and effectively as is humanly possible.

In August 1973, I testified before the Science, Research and Commerce Subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics (Mr. Davis' subcommittee) on the pressing need for fire legislation. During testimony, I especially stressed the need for a systems management approach to a national fire prevention program.

I told the Committee, and the Senate Commerce Committee a month later, that a three-pronged attack is an essential base for fire legislation. This attack must include an education and training program, a fire data system, and a research and development program, united by a single, integrated systems management approach.

Both Houses of Congress and the Executive Branch have used "America Burning," the report of the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, as a starting

point, and both Houses have passed legislation calling for the crucial base I just outlined in the battle to reduce our fire losses.

Each bill calls for a national fire training and education system—a fire academy system—a national fire data system, research and development on fire problems, and programs to help burn victims. Each bill places responsibility for a new Federal agency in the Department of Commerce. Since these elements are common to both bills, we can expect them to be included in the final Act.

Although some aspects of the final version of the legislation are as yet undetermined, I would like to describe how the Department of Commerce regards its forthcoming assignment of the steps we are taking toward the formation of the new Bureau.

First: we will form a fire Advisory Committee composed of representatives from all parts of the fire community. This Committee will include persons representing the following interest and expertise:

Fire Prevention Experts.

Fire Fighting and Training Experts.

Fire Data Specialists.

Public Information and Media Professionals.

Building Code and Design Officials.

Experts in Insurance Matters.

Consumer Representatives.

Physicians.

Manufacturers.

Consumer Representatives.

And Others as Appropriate.

Members of the Joint Council of Fire Service Organizations will be central on the Committee. Our goal is to have not only these stalwarts on the Committee, but to have representatives from every facet of the complex "fire community" as well. The Committee must be carefully composed of advisers who are informed on every aspect of this issue that touches upon the life of every American. The importance of this Advisory Committee cannot be overemphasized. It will be helping to establish a government agency to accomplish our national goal of cutting in half our fire losses in one generation.

Steps have been taken already to draw up a charter and select the sorts of members I'm describing. We are looking not only for highly experienced, qualified people, but for people who are dedicated, who will donate at least two days per month for a year for Committee meetings, and who will serve on associated subcommittees. It will be a very demanding term of public service to assist in what I believe to be a very important task.

The Committee will offer advice regarding the organizational framework of the new Bureau. The Committee will carefully monitor the early development of the new Bureau including its practices and policies. We expect it to make major contributions to the new Bureau's long term strength.

The Director, in keeping with the legislation, will be selected and appointed by the President. Secretary Dent and I have been giving consideration to the advice which we may suggest to the President regarding the qualifications of the new Director for Presidential consideration. These qualifications may include:

Should be a prominent figure in the fire community;

Should have experience with firefighting and prevention;

Should be familiar with the national fire problem;

Philosophically, should have the view that the national fire program is to supplement local programs, and not supplant them;

Should be skillful in working with people who hold different views, with the ability to bring them to consensus;

Should have demonstrated management skills;

Another priority of the Committee will be to advise us on the detailed organization of

the new Bureau. We now see the Bureau as being composed of the following units:

National Fire Data System.
National Academy System.
Research and Development Program.
Public Awareness Program.

Let me emphasize again the goal proposed by the National Commission, namely the reduction by 50 percent of the Nation's fire losses in one generation. We believe this is a difficult but attainable objective. We shall focus on saving lives but expect economic losses to be reduced dramatically; also. The fire problem is complex. Attacking it successfully necessitates marshaling a host of different talents and integrating them into a team able to work together toward our common objective.

Now I'd like to describe briefly this team, namely the four units of the new Bureau as we see them at this time.

NATIONAL FIRE DATA SYSTEM

We must collect more and better data on fire incidents to gain a more detailed understanding of what we are up against. The ongoing systems such as your Uniform Fire Incident Reporting System (UFIRS), the Consumer Product Safety Commission's National Electronic Injury Surveillance System, the various state reporting systems from coroners and fire marshals, the National Bureau of Standards' Flammable Fabrics Accident Cases Testing System (FFACTS) and their National Fire Loss Survey being done in conjunction with the Bureau of Census—all these and others must be fed into a central data bank within an integrated system.

The central data bank will become the heart of the National Fire Data System. It is already being pilot-tested at the National Bureau of Standards. We plan to transfer it to the new fire Bureau as soon as the Bureau is formed. Data specialists will be recruited to implement the program.

PUBLIC AWARENESS

The collection of data is essential to all aspects of the formation of a fire prevention bureau—with one exception. We don't need to gather data in order to recognize one job which has been long ignored. This is the task of educating the public. We must increase public awareness of fire prevention. This will require specialists in psychology, public opinion, and public education through the media.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

One of the most important tasks we face is the elimination of unreasonable fire hazards in our environment. A fire hazard typically arises not from the presence of a particular material, but from the combination of a particular material used in a specific way, exposed to a certain probability of ignition. Consider the total system. It is not very helpful to condemn wholesale, say, the use of cellular plastics. It may be very much to the point, however, to consider controlling the use of certain such plastics as insulation in living areas.

Each situation must be viewed in its broadest context. To do so effectively requires combining the talents of many—manufacturers of materials, ranging from plastics to wood furniture; fire prevention experts; fire-fighting and training experts; fire data specialists; educators and public information experts; building code and design officials; insurance experts; consumer representatives; medical doctors, and others. Through everyday experience, firefighters contribute to the vast amount of knowledge that must be accumulated and organized effectively. They notice, for example, the color of smoke, a transient phenomenon, which aids in the analysis of fire. The experiences and impressions of those who risk their lives to fight fire must be gathered systematically and utilized to prevent future fires.

If all these experts work together we can effectively control fire hazards. We'll need the expertise of architects, construction engineers, applied technologists, and scientists. We'll need the help of building code officials and the voluntary standards groups such as NFPA. As the Nation's fire services turn more and more to prevention activities—inspections, public education, and the like—they will add a new dimension to the effort to remove unreasonable fire risks from our surroundings.

There will always be unexpected carelessness and accidents that start fires. Protection from these requires an ever-vigilant well-equipped fire service. The firefighter's job is dangerous, demanding work; we all know that. Some two hundred firemen die in the line of duty each year, making theirs the most hazardous job in the country. We owe the firefighters a great deal. Certainly there must be a major effort to improve the technology they use, such as protective equipment. The fire services need the most modern procedures and facilities. The technology necessary for the firefighter will be the responsibility of the new Bureau. Its development will require a close partnership between fire technologists and experienced firefighters.

NATIONAL FIRE ACADEMY SYSTEM

The Fire Academy System, headed by a superintendent, will provide training for firefighters across the Nation. A major effort to provide better training must be provided.

The U.S. already has many existing training establishments. Large urban fire departments typically have their own training divisions which handle recruits and specialist training. Smaller and volunteer departments are often served by State vocational training offices, or by State university or community colleges. This informal system is not uniform in quality and varies from region to region. The education and training program we propose would help improve the existing State and local fire education and training capability.

Several existing state training schools will be upgraded to provide regional centers for training middle-level firemen in techniques of strategy and tactics not available locally.

Certain of these centers will undoubtedly specialize in areas of interest to a certain region. For example, wildfires might be a top priority in western regions. In Texas and Oklahoma, fires at the oil well-head are a special problem. In densely populated areas, high-rise fires must be addressed, and so on.

Prevention programs will be emphasized as well as inspection programs and public education. Among other things the Academy System would provide course material for specialized and advanced training programs. Such courses might cover prevention of tank car fires, chemical, and other special hazards. There is also a need to develop advanced training materials and new types of courses at the management or command level in cooperation with State universities. For example, areas such as examination structure and promotion policy, resource deployment, use of computers, and municipal budgeting and finance should be strengthened.

The training program will have a function broader than firefighter training. There will be courses for other persons needing fire safety information, such as code officials, building inspectors, equipment manufacturers, and industrial fire safety managers. Moreover, the program will develop material for public educators. Here the approach will be to develop specific information for specific audiences. Statistical data will be used to identify problem areas and appropriate audiences.

A central program will be established for command courses and courses in public administration for senior officers. This will be

the Headquarters, the hub of the National Academy System.

The participation of the fire services themselves will be essential to the success of the Fire Academy. By both advising us on how to proceed and in providing capable, experienced personnel to help staff the Academy, the fire services will prove integral to a smooth-working system. We'll also need specialists in education for the development of education and training materials, and people experienced in operating training institutions.

In summary, the formation of a National Bureau of Fire Prevention is the central focus of both the Legislative and Executive Branches' effort to fight fire. It is clear we need a multi-disciplinary approach. Our challenge is to assemble all these talents and forge them into a solid front. We must find a balanced leadership capable of doing this with a minimum of delay. I am confident it can be done, with the advice and participation of those with expertise to offer. Your help and the help of the entire fire community will be essential if we are indeed to reduce our Nation's terrible losses from fire.

CLARKE-McNARY ACT OF 1924

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, June 7, 1974, is the 50th anniversary of an extremely significant piece of forestry legislation—the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924. This legislation set the stage for Federal-State cooperation over the years in carrying out key activities to help insure the protection and perpetuation of our Nation's forestry resources. Congress, in passing the Clarke-McNary Act, recognized the need for a new approach in meeting the tremendous problems then existing on the Nation's privately owned forest lands.

For several years forest fires had been rampant throughout the land. Much of the Nation's forest resource was going up in smoke. In addition, millions of acres were badly in need of reforestation to both reclaim and protect the land devastated by fire, and to restock depleted lands.

The Clarke-McNary Act established the concept of a Federal-State partnership in meeting the needs of private forestry in fire protection, procurement, production and distribution of trees, and improved forest management. The act recognized the importance of establishing strong forestry organizations at the State level. It recognized that such State forestry organizations would play the key role in bringing adequate protection and improved management to privately-owned forest land.

These were the concerns, and the hopes, when President Coolidge signed the act on June 7, 1924. Following enactment of the Clarke-McNary Act, forestry within the United States took on a new life. The 25 participating States representing close to half of the privately owned forest lands in America moved quickly to set up State forestry organiza-

tions to work cooperatively with forestry agencies at the Federal level, and with individuals and associations at the State and local level.

Under one provision of the act the Federal Government set up a fund, to be matched by the States, to assist in the critical area of fire protection. In 1925, when the first \$200,000 was appropriated for this effort it seemed like a great deal of money, but the funds allocated by the States not only matched, but exceeded the Federal contribution.

Today, 73 percent of our Nation's commercial forest lands, approximately 363 million acres, are in private ownership. The protection and management of these and other forest and related rural lands is vital to our Nation's economic, social, and environmental health.

As a result of Federal-State cooperation authorized under Clarke-McNary, fire protection is now provided on more than 626 million acres of privately owned forested and related lands. The tremendous significance of this effort is reflected in the great reduction in acres devastated by fires and in the number of fires. In 1924 92,000 fires were reported in 25 States, burning over 29 million acres of private forest lands. Last year, with all 50 States reporting, the area of privately owned forest land burned was under 2 million acres, the number of fires reported was 118,000. Considering that the number of fires reported represents all 50 States, and that the population and use of these areas has dramatically increased the possibility of man-caused fires, it is apparent that both prevention and control efforts have been exceedingly effective.

The success of these efforts in limiting massive destruction of our Nation's timber, water, wildlife, and other critical forest resources is due in large part to efficient, progressive, and modern State forestry organizations. Their efforts in this area have been directed at working toward a fully coordinated, unified fire control system, with effective protection organizations set up at major fire hazard areas throughout the country. Additional protection by these organizations have the potential in the future to reduce fire damage to farm properties and rural communities throughout the Nation. These activities in fire control, coupled with a massive program of education in fire prevention, are a credit to the concept of Federal-State cooperative efforts in meeting the needs of our Nation.

Another major aspect of the act was cooperation in the procurement, production, and distribution of forest planting stock and tree seeds to be used for establishing forest, windbreaks, shelterbelts and, woodlots on denuded or non-forested lands.

Over the past 50 years, 14½ billion trees have been distributed under this authority. When this act was passed, approximately 80 million acres were in need of planting. During the past 50 years, this has been reduced to approximately 40 million acres. Such efforts have helped to avert potential timber shortages, reclaimed thousands of acres of land, and provided new income-producing opportunities in rural America.

Other sections of the act dealt with enlargement of the National Forest System. They provided for the addition of suitable lands in public ownership to the national forests, and for enlargement by purchase, gift or exchange of certain private owned land. Over the years, 580,000 acres have been added through purchase for the production of timber, protection of navigable streams, or irrigation, and 355,000 acres have been acquired through donation. Another 17 million acres of cutover of denuded forest lands have been added to the national forests within authorities granted under the act.

The foresight of our colleagues, Representative Clarke of New York, and Senator McNary of Oregon, deserves to be brought to the attention of this body and to all Americans on this 50th anniversary of the act. It is an outstanding example of successful congressional and executive responsiveness to the needs of the people, and to our Nation's natural heritage. It is of special significance since it also stands as an outstanding example of successful Federal-State partnership in getting a job done.

PERSPECTIVE ON U.S. AID TO ISRAEL

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I reproduce here an excellent letter entitled "Perspective on U.S. Aid to Israel" from the Washington Post on Thursday, June 6, 1974. This letter is written by the extraordinarily well informed Mr. I. L. Kenen, the chairman of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee of Washington, D.C.

The basic facts in this letter should be kept in mind by all of us during the forthcoming debate concerning proposals to give assistance to the nations of the Middle East.

Mr. Kenen's letter follows:

PERSPECTIVE ON U.S. AID TO ISRAEL

There has always been a tendency to exaggerate the amount of American assistance which has been extended to Israel by the United States government because most articles fail to distinguish between grants and loans.

Typical of this distortion was the UPI report published in The Washington Post a week ago and, we assume, in many other papers around the world. In that story the author not only indiscriminately lumped grants with loans but also confused yearly allocations.

The record of U.S. aid to Israel shows that the largest part of this assistance was in the form of loans rather than grants and that these loans have been repaid as they fell due. Between 1946 and 1973 the United States gave \$58 billion in military grants to many countries, but Israel never received any grant military assistance from the United States until last October, when she was confronted by overwhelming Soviet-supplied firepower on her northern and southern frontiers.

The administration then recommended an emergency assistance program of \$2.2 billion for Israel, but of this amount only \$1

billion was in the form of grants to pay for the arms that were rushed to Israel last October; the balance is to be in loans, spanning a three-year period. As a result, the Israel taxpayer has carried a huge foreign currency debt burden for many years, by far the largest in the world.

It is largely for this reason that the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, speaking for many major American Jewish organizations, has proposed that the foreign assistance program now pending before Congress be revised in order to increase the amount of grant assistance for Israel from \$50 million, the figure proposed by the administration, to \$250 million. In addition, our Committee has urged that \$100 million of the \$300 million in military credits for Israel be transformed into a grant.

We urge this not solely because the administration has proposed to send \$427.5 million in grant military and support assistance to Egypt and Jordan, and possibly an additional \$100 million to Syria. We submit the case for a more equitable program for Israel partly because her people are the highest taxed in the world, partly because the Arab attack last October dealt a severe blow to Israel's economy, and partly because the arms balance may now be shifting dangerously against Israel because of the reckless proliferation of sophisticated weapons, both by the Soviet bloc and by Western countries, to the Arab states in Israel's immediate neighborhood and to the Persian Gulf.

I. L. KENEN,

Chairman,

American Israel Public Affairs Committee.
WASHINGTON.

B-1 BOMBER IS AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS GONE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Akron, Ohio, Beacon Journal on June 4, 1974, succinctly outlines the case for a careful examination of the B-1 program. Members of this body who have followed the progress of this enormously expensive project know very well that many questions remain unanswered, but the B-1 charges on. It is time to slow down what is more an ornament inspired by Air Force traditions than a proven strategic need.

What the editorial says is what the distinguished gentlemen from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) and South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN) have so well detailed in their recent study on the B-1 issued by Members of Congress for peace through law.

The editorial follows:

B-1 BOMBER IS AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS GONE

Look, up in the defense budget: more expensive than six new B-52s but no more capable of penetrating Soviet air defenses, with a price tag that grows like cancer. It's a bomber; it's a bomb; it's a fiscal nightmare: It's a B-1!

The B-1, pushed by the Air Force as the "only answer" to updating the aging B-52 manned bomber fleet, is buzzing Congress right now. It hopes to grab another \$499 million so a fourth prototype can be built and the B-1 program can press on.

Akron Rep. John Seiberling and South Dakota Sen. George McGovern have been leading efforts to shoot down the B-1, so far to no avail. The plane survived its budget fight through House flak, but we hope for

better aim in the Senate, which still has to consider the military budget.

In an era of nuclear warheads and multi-headed missiles, and of small tactical wars which require high-performance fighter-bombers, the B-1 doesn't fit. This military program makes about as much sense as sinking billions into battleships when the real muscle now belongs to aircraft carriers and missile cruisers.

So far, all this rather humdrum machine has shown is the ability to soak up tax money. In 1970, the Air Force said the B-1 would cost \$30 million a plane. Now it is at \$61.5 million, and one critic, Rep. Atis Pike of New York, insists the cost is really closer to \$75 million a plane. That's without armaments and sophisticated electronics equipment.

Now the General Accounting Office reveals that in the last year alone, the B-1 fiasco has ballooned into a \$1.67 billion cost overrun, draining tax dollars from important national needs.

Rep. Seiberling is right that the B-1 is "marginal" and offers only "slight advantages" over the existing B-52. Not only that, the earlier estimated \$9.4 billion price tag for the fleet will hit \$15 billion, and Seiberling and McGovern estimate that an \$8.5 billion air refueling fleet would have to be built to give the bombers long range capability.

And long range capability for what? To head for Moscow to be blasted to shredded aluminum and titanium before crossing the Soviet border? Why put men in a cumbersome airborne target to do what a submarine with Poseidon missiles can accomplish with greater efficiency?

Somehow, the entire B-1 project smacks of one more chrome-plated gadget for the Air Force to use to employ its swollen officer ranks, rather than the result of cool, analytical study of current technology and weaponry, and U.S. policy directions.

It is time to look objectively at the argument that we must have long-range manned heavy bombers because "we've always had them."

A heavy bomber, built primarily to deliver nuclear payloads, has only limited use in brushfire wars. B-52s were used in Vietnam, but it is debatable how effective they were and whether they would be as effective now, with recent developments in surface-to-air missiles.

And in a full-blown nuclear war, it is hard to imagine relying on the relatively slow manned bomber to deliver the U.S. strike force.

We have nearly 8,000 strategic nuclear warheads in our arsenal, compared to only 2,600 for the Soviet Union. Each can destroy a city, Sanford Gottlieb, executive director of SANE, notes that we will soon have 36 warheads for each of the Soviet Union's 219 major cities, plus thousands of tactical nuclear weapons, and the missiles to deliver them.

Where does the B-1 fit in this picture of modern warfare? As a constant deterrent to a sneak attack? Not likely. Mr. Gottlieb points out that even if the Russians destroyed every American ICBM in every silo, "A single hard-to-locate Poseidon submarine could devastate 160 separate major targets in the Soviet Union. Instead of emulating the Soviets in meaningless buildups, the United States should try to negotiate reductions in overkill capacity."

Rep. Seiberling made a ringing indictment of the B-1 when he said: "If nuclear war occurred . . . there could be eight successive nuclear missile salvos—four on each side and answering the one before—before the B-1 would be in a position to do any damage. The war would be over before it could get into action."

At a time when military spending tops \$100 billion, there is no sense in shoveling billions of dollars into a modernized flying dinosaur like the B-1.

MICHAEL ZONE, CHAMPION OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of regret I announce Cleveland's loss by death of Michael Zone, veteran of 14 years as a city councilman and of nearly 25 years in service to the community for the public good.

Michael Zone worked hard for his city and was respected and admired by all those who knew him. Even before his appointment to the city council he served his community in other ways, most notably by helping immigrants to establish themselves in the city. Those of us who knew him will sorely miss him.

At this time I would like to insert into the RECORD these newspaper articles from the Cleveland Plain Dealer which describe the type of man that Michael Zone was:

MICHAEL ZONE

The cause of good government for Cleveland has suffered a setback with the death of Councilman Michael Zone at the age of 54. Zone was more than a trusted and conscientious representative of the West Side constituency he served for nearly a quarter century. His field of interest in civic matters, and his vision, extended well beyond his Ward 3 base.

Zone made himself knowledgeable of city-wide problems and worked toward their solution. He was a vigorous champion of the public's interest in transit service, urban renewal, parks and lakefront uses. In recent years he earned especially high marks for vigilance as chairman of council's Finance Committee, the overseer of city spending.

In sum, Zone was diligent in his duty in his city as well as to his ward, which is what good councilmanic service is all about.

FUNERAL THURSDAY FOR CITY COUNCIL'S MICHAEL ZONE, 54

Cleveland City Council paid its respects yesterday to Councilman Michael Zone, D-3, who had been one of council's most powerful and popular members.

Zone, a councilman 14 years and chairman of the finance committee, died early yesterday morning, apparently of a heart attack. He was 54.

Several councilmen helped draft a resolution passed at last night's meeting saluting Zone as "one of the city's finest legislators . . . whose sage advice was sought by the politician and treasured by the newest immigrant."

But the most telling tribute was Zone's own legacy: Of the 27 pieces of legislation passed by council committees yesterday, 25 bore Zone's name as sponsor or cosponsor.

Council President George L. Forbes said he relied more on Zone than any other council member.

"He was an expert on finance," Forbes said. "If Mike said we were oversold on bonds, I took his word for it."

Mary Rose Oakar, D-8, a freshman councilman, said Zone had been tolerant of the new councilmen's demand to be heard and spent time helping educate them.

Mayor Ralph J. Perk, who had served in council with Zone, recalled he and Zone had met last Thursday to talk about cooperation between the executive and legislative branches. He said Zone should be remembered as a councilman who put the good of Cleveland first.

Zone's wife, Mary, had been his secretary when he was selling life insurance and his

partner in a neighborhood grocery store and, later, a travel agency. The travel agency grew out of Zone's helping immigrants to establish themselves.

When Zone was appointed to council in 1960, he handled City Hall matters while Mrs. Zone fielded complaints from the ward.

Mrs. Zone or one of his two oldest daughters is expected to succeed him in council.

Zone suffered a heart attack in 1958 and has had heart problems since then. Despite doctors' warnings to take it easy, Zone kept up a rigorous schedule. This year's budget hearings sometimes lasted 12 hours a day. After coming home, Zone would stay up late preparing for the next day.

"I was always after him to slow down," Mrs. Zone said. "He would say, 'OK, but first I have some things to do. Then I'll take it easy.' But there were always new things he wanted to get done."

All day yesterday, W. 61st St., a short, shady street lined with big double houses with manicured lawns was clogged with cars as judges, councilmen and plain people stopped to visit the Zone family.

Zone was born, raised, married and went into business within a few blocks of the house at 1367 W. 61st St., where the family has lived for 14 years.

The Zones were married in 1944, two weeks before he went overseas during World War II. He was captured after the Battle of the Bulge and spent more than three months in a German prison camp.

After the war, he worked in a factory and as a juvenile probation officer while attending John Carroll University and Fenn College.

He awoke early yesterday complaining of chest pains. Then he collapsed. A fire emergency squad rushed him to St. John Hospital, where he was pronounced dead at 2:55 a.m.

Zone was active in many political, civic and church organizations.

In 1961, the Italian government awarded him the Star of Solidarity for his work in Italian-American relations. Last year, he was named man of the year by the Cleveland Holy Name Society.

Besides his wife, he is survived by his mother, Elizabeth Barone Zone, and seven children; Mary Beth, 25; Michael, 23, Margaret Rose, 21; Martin, 16; Madelyn, 14; Matthew, 10, and Melissa, 8. Another son, Mark is deceased.

The family will receive friends at the Craciun funeral home, 6204 Detroit Ave. NW, from 2 to 5 p.m. and 7 to 10 p.m. today and tomorrow.

DR. DONALD B. RICE, JR.

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, recently, Dr. Donald B. Rice, Jr., of Frederick, Md., was installed as president of the Rand Corp. in Santa Monica, Calif. I want to congratulate Dr. Rice on his latest achievement following a distinguished career in Government.

Dr. Rice is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Donald B. Rice of Frederick. Don Rice is a local businessman and former alderman and mayor of the city of Frederick. I share their pride in their son's achievement.

Dr. Donald B. Rice, Jr., graduated from St. John's High School in Frederick, received a degree in chemical engineering from Notre Dame University, and served in the U.S. Army. Following his Army service, he worked in the Defense De-

partment as director of cost analysis. After that he became assistant director of the Office of Management and Budget. At the age of 32 he was named president of the Rand Corp.

DEMOCRATIC RESPONSE TO PRESIDENT'S MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on June 3, our distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. JONATHAN BINGHAM, responded to the Memorial Day address delivered by President Nixon. Mr. BINGHAM's remarks were carried on WCBS radio in New York, and I am sure they will be of interest to all of us. Charging the President with making misleading, highly political, and inappropriate remarks on Memorial Day, Mr. BINGHAM explained in some detail the recent congressional debate on military spending and Democratic attempts to cut it. The text of his remarks follows:

SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, RESPONDING ON BEHALF OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY TO PRESIDENT NIXON'S MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

President Nixon began his Memorial Day address to the nation with appropriate comments on the need to remember and to honor those Americans who gave their lives in America's wars.

He said nothing, however, about the need to remember, and to treat decently, those Americans who served in, and survived, America's wars. The fact is that our veterans are not being properly remembered. Those who are on veterans' pensions find their benefits reduced when Social Security payments go up, so that in fact they are discriminated against as compared with other Social Security recipients. And the veterans of our most recent and unpopular war, the tragic struggle in Vietnam, are not receiving the same kind of educational benefits their World War II and Korean War predecessors did. The necessity of correcting these injustices should have been recognized on Memorial Day.

Most of Mr. Nixon's address was concerned with America's military expenditures, and as such was most unfortunate. It was unfortunate, not so much for what Mr. Nixon actually said, as for its innuendoes and, most of all, its omissions. The net effect of these innuendoes and omissions was a misleading and highly political speech, inappropriate for Memorial Day.

Mr. Nixon praised as patriotic Americans those members of the Congress who have supported his demands for a sharply increased military budget, and he implied that those members who want to see the military budget cut are not for a strong America.

This is nonsense. The issue is not whether America should be strong—every Member of Congress believes that—rather the issue is whether America must also be threatening, provocative, and wasteful. I think not, yet the military budget proposed by President Nixon is all of these things.

Let's get down to specifics, especially about those omissions I spoke of in Mr. Nixon's address.

Mr. Nixon spoke disparagingly of an amendment proposed in the House by Congressman Les Aspin of Wisconsin who serves on the Armed Services Committee. Mr. Nixon

described the amendment as an effort "to slash \$700 million across the board from necessary defense spending."

What the President failed to say was that this amendment was an effort to keep the upcoming military budget from going any higher than this year's budget, after making allowances for pay increases and inflation.

In fact, Mr. Nixon never mentioned in his speech the total amount of his military budget for the fiscal year starting July 1st: the figure is a staggering \$98 billion, taking account of related items such as the A.E.C.'s weapons program. This is \$13 billion more than the comparable budget for the current year. That's an increase of 15.4%. Even after deducting the amount of the increase that is accounted for by pay increases and inflation, the increase is \$8 billion or 9.4%.

No where in his Memorial Day address did Mr. Nixon even mention these increases, much less did he explain why they were necessary in a time of peace and improved relationships with the great communist powers. Mr. Nixon did say "in 1974 our hopes for a lasting peace are brighter than at any time in living memory", and he also said "We have developed a new relationship with the leaders of the Soviet Union, after a long and costly period of confrontation that began more than a quarter of a century ago."

If these things are true, and I believe they are, why then do we have to increase our military spending? Why do we have a military budget far larger than ever before in peacetime?

At this time in our national history, our military expenditures should be going down, not up. By 1948, three years after the end of World War II, our defense budget was less than 10% of the wartime high. Two years after the Korean war, defense spending fell to less than half of the 1952 peak. Yet today, two years after the end of American involvement in the Vietnam war, the military budget Mr. Nixon is asking for is substantially higher than it was at any time during that tragic war.

Congressman Aspin's proposal for a cut of \$700 million to keep the military budget from rising was actually a very modest proposal. In a report to the Congress, a distinguished group of former Defense Department and other government officials has recommended that \$11-billion be cut from the defense budget without in any way impairing our national security.

That such a large cut is not outlandish can be seen from the fact that the Secretary of Defense admitted to a Congressional Committee last February that the proposed military budget includes \$6-billion for the purpose of stimulating the economy.

Why, you may well ask, do we need to stimulate the economy with additional government spending? As Mr. Nixon pointed out in his most recent economic message, inflation is the gravest problem we face, and extra government spending is generally regarded as inflationary.

But let's assume that, because of rising unemployment, some additional government spending is a good idea. The fact remains that upping defense outlays is the poorest way to spend the money, for several reasons: first, its impact is slow; second, defense spending cannot be targeted to particular geographic depressed areas; third, military spending goes largely to industries employing skilled, well-paid workers, whereas unemployment is most severe among unskilled, low-income people; fourth, military spending as a stimulus to the economy is particularly wasteful, because, instead of providing services vitally needed to our states, cities, and rural communities, it creates only superfluous military hardware.

It is shocking to compare this \$6 billion item injected into the military budget for non-military reasons with the level of fed-

eral funding for some of our most vital programs: for example, \$34 of a billion for drug abuse enforcement and prevention programs, \$2 billion for energy research, \$700 million for pollution control; and \$7.5 billion for all the federal education programs.

Or consider that the Administration has impounded nearly twice that \$6 billion figure from programs in such critical areas as housing, health, education, water treatment and mass transportation. Is it not outrageous to pump money into an already bloated defense budget to help stimulate the economy while refusing to spend funds authorized by Congress for essential domestic programs?

In his Memorial Day address, President Nixon also spoke disparagingly of an effort made in the House of Representatives to eliminate funds for the further development of a new generation of bomber, the so-called B-1 bomber. This amendment was offered by my colleague from New York, Congressman Pike, who has had many years of experience as a member of the Armed Services Committee.

We already have a strategic bomber fleet composed of 496 aircraft. This is four times larger than the Soviet bomber fleet, and the Soviet bombers have such limited capabilities that they are hardly considered a factor so far as the relative strategic nuclear capabilities of the two superpowers are concerned.

The proposed B-1 is supposed to have capabilities superior to those of the B-52, but even so there is serious question as to whether even the B-1 would be able to reach targets in the Soviet Union in view of the Soviets' highly sophisticated ground-to-air defensive missiles.

And the cost of this B-1 bomber program is astronomical. In the last four years the estimated cost of the B-1 program has gone up from \$9.4 billion to \$15 billion. When such costs as armaments, avionics, decoy missiles, a compatible fleet of new tankers and operation and maintenance are added, the estimated cost rises to \$35.5 billion, making this marginal weapons system the most costly in our history.

And why do we need a new bomber fleet anyway?

Without bombers, even without our force of land-based intercontinental missiles, we have in our nuclear-armed submarine fleet more than enough capability to destroy the Soviet Union even after a nuclear attack upon us. It is this capability which provides us with an effective deterrent to any Soviet attack, because the Russians know that, if they were to start a nuclear war, they would be destroyed. And there is nothing to be gained, in terms of our national security, by developing the capability of destroying the Soviet Union's cities three or four or ten times over. This is what is known as "overkill." For us to develop this capability is not only wasteful of our resources, but it is bound to be regarded by the Soviets as threatening.

In spite of the alarmist statements that emerge from the Pentagon about the danger of our becoming a second-rate power, the fact is that we are already far ahead of the Soviets in terms of deliverable strategic weapons. According to the Center for Defense Information, an organization headed by a retired Admiral with a fine record in the Navy, the U.S. has three times as many strategic nuclear warheads as the Soviet, 7940 as against 2600, and is continuing to produce them at a rate of four a day, as against one a day for the Soviets.

It is true that the Soviet Union has more land-based intercontinental missiles than we do, but ours are equipped with multiple warheads which can be independently targeted, so-called MIRVs, which greatly increases their capabilities. The Soviets have only recently begun to test such weapons and hence are years behind the United States in the

deployment of these fearsome MIRV-ed missiles.

Another area where the U.S. is almost out-of-sight ahead of the Soviets is in large attack aircraft carriers. The U.S. has 18, including those under construction. The Soviet Union has exactly zero. It is building one or two relatively small carriers with very limited capabilities. And yet the Navy is constantly trying to tell us that the U.S. is in danger of becoming a second-rate naval power. Even the office of the Secretary of Defense recently characterized some of these Navy press releases as unduly alarmist.

In his Memorial Day address, President Nixon also attacked an amendment that would have called for the withdrawal of 100,000 American troops from overseas within eighteen months, an amendment proposed by the Democratic Majority Leader, Representative Thomas O'Neill of Boston.

Mr. Nixon made it sound as if this amendment would have required a unilateral cut in our forces in Western Europe. While such a step is favored by some distinguished members of Congress, notably Senator Mansfield, there are many others in both parties who believe that force reductions in Western Europe should if possible be achieved through negotiation and agreement with our NATO allies and the members of the Soviet bloc.

But the amendment proposed by Congressman O'Neill would have left open the question of where the troop reductions would be made. If some could be made in Europe through the process of negotiation and agreement, fine. If not, then the entire 100,000 could be withdrawn from the Far East where they are no longer needed. The group of former Defense Department officials I mentioned earlier has concluded that the withdrawal of 125,000 of our military personnel from Asia would be "a minimal first step Congress could take this year."

President Nixon has vetoed many bills for essential home-front purposes—bills for veterans, for schoolchildren, for older people—but he has never vetoed a bill for a military purpose, no matter how wasteful or how dangerous. He seems to have the same priorities as the Pentagon brass-hats.

Isn't it time the American people demanded those priorities be turned around?

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION ESTABLISHES THE ANNUAL SAMUEL ROSE AWARDS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I am personally pleased to announce that the Veterans' Administration has established awards to honor the late Samuel Rose, known to many in Congress, the press, and veterans groups as "Mister VA."

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I was privileged to work with Sam Rose during many of his 27 years as chief of the contact division in VA's central office. He was highly respected by his colleagues and, more importantly, by the people he served—veterans and their families. With compassion and understanding, he individualized the daily work of a huge Government agency, setting an example for all and bringing meaning to VA's motto—

CXX—1157—Part 14

"To care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

Two Sam Rose Awards will be given annually—one for a specific accomplishment and one for general accomplishments in helping veterans and their beneficiaries to obtain benefits.

The specific accomplishment award will be given for an achievement resulting in material improvement in service to veterans and their dependents. The award for general accomplishments will recognize consistent high standards of performance to give compassionate timely and beneficial service.

Sam Rose joined VA's predecessor agency, the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, as an insurance expert in October 1917. He returned to VA in 1919 following World War I military service.

In 1938 he was named chief of the contact division at central office and served in that position until his retirement from VA in 1965. He then joined the Washington headquarters staff of the Fleet Reserve Association where he served until his death on May 13, 1973.

The idea to perpetuate the memory of Mr. Rose through creation of the new service awards was proposed by Washington correspondent Sarah McClendon who had frequently sought information and assistance for veterans through Mr. Rose. It was quickly endorsed by his colleagues in VA.

VA officials who served with Sam Rose agree that his near half-century career with the agency was one of uninterrupted outstanding performance.

STOP NEW SPENDING PROGRAMS

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, all of us share a desire for peace in the Middle East and it is our sincere hope that peace will come soon to this troubled area.

We must look at the proposals for the Middle East very carefully. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the United States is considering providing \$100 million in aid funds for rebuilding the Quneitra area of the Syrian Golan Heights if the cease-fire is maintained. This aid would be in addition to the \$250 million which the United States plans to grant to Egypt.

I have very serious reservations on these aid proposals. Our foreign policy mistakes in the past should have taught us the lesson that we cannot "buy" friends and that we cannot "buy" peace. This aid proposal comes at a time when the Federal Government is running a deficit and the American people are suffering from the problems of inflation. It is time for us to realize that large new spending programs—abroad and at home—strike at the very foundation on which we must depend—the strength of the U.S. dollar. We must get back to a balanced budget if we are to stop inflation.

THE WAR ON POVERTY: 10 YEARS LATER

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Roger Wilkins' perceptive piece "The War on Poverty: 10 Years Later" puts in perspective the most controversial piece of legislation of the 1960's. May "the next cycle of legislative creativity" come soon and do more and better faster for the poor.

I include the following article from the New York Times, June 4, 1974:

THE WAR ON POVERTY: 10 YEARS LATER

(By Roger Wilkins)

The House of Representatives voted the other day to repeal the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and to let the Office of Economic Opportunity die next month. The Senate is likely to follow suit. The Times reported that "few members . . . rose to mourn the end of the agency," which had been intended by President Johnson to bring "total victory" in the war against poverty.

The mind ran back ten years to the spring of 1964 when Bill Moyers turned from a visitor in his White House office, punched his telephone console with the heel of his shoe and took a call from a Congressman who wasn't sure what he thought about the poverty proposals. There was Texas oil in Mr. Moyers' voice but steel in the political turkey he was talking. When he was through, the man's vote was firm.

The White House heat was on. Though incubated under John F. Kennedy, the poverty program was to be Lyndon B. Johnson's first major legislative effort. He wanted a win badly and he got it.

The field was brand new, and idealists, visionaries, politicians, hustlers—bureaucratic and otherwise—and, ultimately, the poor all rushed in. Sargent Shriver donned a new hat and soon his intense driving brand of structured chaos turned O.E.O. into the hottest shop in Washington. In the countryside, the booklet of community action guidelines became, for a time, a new Bible. An instant body of Talmudic scholarship sprang up around the words "maximum feasible participation of the poor."

Congressmen and mayors quickly became leery. The voiceless poor were becoming a loud unmanageable rabble—containing, incidentally, the seedbeds of viable new power rivalries—with which they had to contend. Horror stories about mismanagement, discourtesy, radicalism and thievery were soon being fed back to gleeful conservatives in Congress. Beneath all the clamor, however, real change began to occur. New programs were developed out of community action. Among them: Headstart, Legal Services, innovative manpower efforts and new health-delivery programs. But the main development was that groups of hitherto powerless people had, for the first time, the opportunity to handle sufficient amounts of money to generate for themselves the beginnings of some power. They also developed government management skills and new community services opportunities for people who needed jobs.

It was not a neat and tidy process, and hostility grew. President Johnson became disenchanted and left office without fully comprehending the real accomplishments of the program. Over time, Richard M. Nixon became a determined foe of O.E.O. He succeeded in dismantling it and in scattering the programs all over the domestic side of the Government. The idea of a focal point

for poverty in the Government—a place where advocacy, evaluation, planning and governmental oversight could come together—is dead.

But the legacy is real. Legal Services—thought by many to be the most effective and economical tool in the effort to empower the poor—seems fairly sure to win its perilous two-year fight for survival. Headstart appears to be a permanent \$500 million Federal effort. Community action—supported by a broad coalition of governors and mayors, including George C. Wallace—seems destined to continue in some form or another as a kind of ombudsman for those who need governmental services. The House bill would send it to Health, Education and Welfare. Senator Jacob K. Javits intends to try to set up a new independent Community Action—Community Development Administration. Whichever form finally emerges, barring a veto, Mr. Nixon seems to have lost his fight to destroy the heart of the anti-poverty effort.

The principal legacy is that the poor are a little stronger, considerably more self-aware and somewhat more self-sufficient. In many instances, their vision of their own potential has been enlarged. There is around the country a network of poor people and their advocates who know something about manipulating the system in order to alleviate poverty. That network did not exist in 1964. Citizen participation has become a part of our legislative landscape. The "invisible poor" have become visible and have entered the nation's consciousness. A foundation has been laid to await the next cycle of legislative creativity.

It wasn't "total victory" but it was a good beginning. And it was far from the total failure and the unmitigated mess its detractors claimed it to be.

FREEDOM OF EMIGRATION

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, as an ardent cosponsor of House Resolution 791, I was dismayed to learn upon my return to my duties some days ago that the Committee on Banking and Currency had ordered an identical bill, House Resolution 774, reported with the recommendation that it not be adopted. This legislation expresses the sense of the House that the Export-Import Bank and other Government agencies take no action on applications of ineligible nonmarket economy countries until the Senate acts on the Trade Reform Act. That act, of course, contains the Vanik amendment, which I also cosponsored, and strikes a powerful blow for freedom which is sure to be heard in the Kremlin and other capitals of repressive countries throughout the world.

The Vanik amendment precludes credits to such countries which deny their citizens the right to freely emigrate. Although it is aimed primarily at the Soviet Union for its repressive treatment of its Jews, the legislation has a broader ethical application not restricted to any one country or any one persecuted minority. For the Export-Import Bank to extend such credits at this time would be an insult to the House and a move to

undercut the careful deliberation which the other body must give to this far-reaching legislation.

House Resolution 774, therefore, is necessary to put the Export-Import Bank on notice that we will not back down in our support for persecuted religious and ethnic groups who demand their right to emigrate. Had I been able to be present, I would have voted in committee to report the resolution out favorably, but I am gratified at least that it has been allowed to come to the floor, even in this back-handed manner. I urge its adoption at the earliest possible date.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE FAILS TO KEEP PACE WITH INCREASED COSTS OF ELDERLY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, thousands of elderly citizens in New York City did not receive any benefits from the 7 percent increase in social security benefits which went into effect on April 1. As a result of Congress' failure to pass legislation which would have enabled senior citizens receiving SSI payments to receive the social security increase without a corresponding reduction of their SSI benefits, a great many of our elderly poor are being denied the financial assistance they require in order to cope with the ever-increasing rise in the cost of living.

I am taking the liberty of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which was recently aired on WINS radio in New York regarding the failure of Congress to act on this important matter:

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASES FOR THE ELDERLY POOR

(By Robert W. Dickey)

The social security increase which went into effect on April 1st represents no increase at all for more than 100,000 elderly New Yorkers in the new supplemental security income program.

They will have their S.S.I. payments reduced by the amount of the 7% increase in social security benefits, which adds up to a net gain of zero. That's because when Congress voted the social security increase last December, it did not provide any provision that would permit people to receive their full S.S.I. benefits and the full amount of the cost of living increase as well.

Thus any increase in social security benefits must be offset by a corresponding cut in S.S.I. payments. And, as a result, the people who most need help wind up getting no help at all. This is completely unfair.

The cost of living, which is going up everywhere is particularly high in New York and presents a severe hardship for the elderly poor. The purpose of the new supplemental security income program was to replace Welfare as a means of providing needed financial aid to the elderly poor, the blind and handicapped.

The fact that people receive such assistance does not cancel out the need to provide cost of living increases to help them cope with unchecked inflation.

We think that extending aid with one

hand and taking it away with the other is an injustice which Congress should correct promptly. The elderly poor need both the S.S.I. increase and the social security increase.

MAINLAND CHINA'S REAL INTENTIONS

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, recently some interesting information came to my attention regarding the real motives of mainland China's détente policy with the United States and Japan. The source of the information is the China Letter and I recommend this report to my colleagues:

THE CHINA LETTER

Don't pooh-poo all those reports that the Nationalist Chinese on Taiwan publish from time to time about developments in China.

The Nationalists do have some excellent intelligence sources and increasingly have a proven track record of being right on the mark about major developments in the mainland.

The first detailed report, for example, on the late Defense Minister LIN PIAO's plot to stage a coup d'état against MAO TSE-TUNG came from the Nationalists.

Only much later did Peking reveal a document outlining the plot, a document identical to the one issued months earlier by Taipei.

Now the Nationalists have come up with another extraordinary set of Chinese Communist documents that spell out in candid detail the reasons for Peking's efforts to expand relations with the U.S., Japan and other nations.

The set of three documents was prepared about a year ago by the Kunming Military Region for use in lectures on China's current foreign policy.

Because the documents provide a useful insight into Chinese foreign policy thinking, we are summarizing for you the main points contained in them.

In the first document, three things stand out:

1. China considers the Soviet Union its most dangerous and important enemy. It sees Moscow as by far the most aggressive nation in the world and the one that is most actively seeking to expand its influence over other nations, especially in Asia.

2. Because of the trauma of Vietnam, the Chinese now consider the United States less dangerous. But while China views the U.S. as being weaker, it considers it necessary to maintain attacks on certain American policies.

3. One of the primary objects of denouncing the Soviet Union and the United States is to improve China's image in the eyes of the so-called Third World countries.

The second document consists of a detailed analysis of why China considers the Soviet Union its greatest danger.

But the third document, which explains with surprising frankness the Chinese leadership's thinking on the reasons for seeking rapprochement with the U.S. and Japan, is most telling.

For one thing, it reflects continuing problems within the Chinese leadership over the move to improve relations with the United States and to invite RICHARD NIXON to Peking.

More important, it spells out the objectives China is pursuing in establishing closer ties with the U.S. Those objectives are:

1. To create problems between the United States and the Soviet Union to slow down their detente. This has long been assumed by outsiders to have been one of Peking's primary objectives.

2. To drive a wedge between the U.S. and the Nationalist Chinese on Taiwan as part of the preparation for the eventual return of Taiwan to Peking's control.

3. To open the way for an improvement of relations between China and America's allies and friends throughout the world but especially in Southeast Asia.

4. To provide an opening for China to begin exerting an influence on the people of the United States. Gleeefully, the documents refer to the China-mania that hit the U.S. in the wake of Nixon's visit.

These same four objectives are cited with reference to the establishment of diplomatic ties between Peking and Tokyo.

And there also is a significant revelation that one reason Peking is giving Japan a much harder time than the U.S. on the Taiwan question is that a deteriorating relationship between Japan and Taiwan will influence other Asian nations in their attitude towards China.

All in all the documents reveal a well-conceived foreign policy strategy and one that adds a slightly sinister note to the "smiles diplomacy" the Chinese recently have been pursuing.

DUKE ELLINGTON

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to join with many of my colleagues in this special order paying tribute to the memory of the great Duke Ellington.

Last week, the Nation and the world mourned the announcement of Ellington's death. Tributes flowed in from all corners of the world, and from people of all walks of life. From President Nixon, to the schoolchildren of the Soviet Union who were treated to his music, fond reflections and high praises for this great man were received.

Duke Ellington was unquestionably the most dominant force in the field of jazz. For more than a half a century, Ellington's work in jazz had gained him unparalleled international acclaim. Such classics as "Sophisticated Lady," "Mood Indigo," and "Take the 'A' Train" catapulted Ellington into his paramount position, and in turn brought jazz from its infant stages to the point today where it ranks as one of the paramount aspects of the American cultural scene.

Equal to his contributions to the world of jazz were his contributions to the world at large. Duke Ellington was fondly referred to as America's "Ambassador of Good Will." He brought his array of talents to as far away as the Soviet Union, yet no matter where he visited, he brought with him excitement and enjoyment, and served to enhance this Nation's image around the world.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has lost a giant of a man, a man who reigned at the top of his profession through several generations. His loss leaves the music world without one of its most powerful

influences, and deprives the world of one of her foremost statesmen. Yet, it is because of his works, that his memory will linger on for years. This is the sign of a great man we honor today, a great man, Duke Ellington.

IMPEACHMENT PERSPECTIVE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have recently shared with my colleagues in the House several noteworthy commentaries by Mr. O. R. Strackbein and am pleased to include an additional brief essay as a portion of my remarks:

IMPEACHMENT PERSPECTIVE: LOOKING IN THE MIRROR OF HISTORY

(By O. R. Strackbein)

From time to time statistics on crimes committed throughout the country, sometimes classified by cities, States or regions, are given to the public. The trend seems unfortunately to be upward.

However else crime may be classified there seem to be no statistics that classify crimes on a political basis or a religious basis. To be sure, we do have classifications according to race and color. That fact, however, is irrelevant to the question of criminality according to political partisanship. Do Democrats, Republicans or Independents commit more crimes per a hundred thousand people? It seems safe to say, we have no idea; and no allegation in any such direction would be tenable.

Why ask the question? What difference does it make?

That the question is not wholly irrelevant may be deduced from the historical fact that so-called political crimes have borne a close correlation to the accidents of political power (the word "accident" being used in the sense of something not being caused by the element under consideration).

Burnings at the stake, committals to dungeons, beheadings, have seemingly always been associated with political or religious accidents of power. Whoever was in power dispensed the sentences.

When an overthrow occurred the victims also changed. The question of justice, even though it was the subject of much pious profession, was, as we see it today, a colossal, transparent hypocrisy. Otherwise why was it that it was always the "ins" who meted out "justice", and the "outs" who suffered the punishment?

The two daughters of Henry VIII, Mary and Elizabeth, were caught in a web spun of the strands of religious differences (Catholic and Protestant). It was to be a question of time and the turn of political fortunes that was to determine who was to have whom beheaded. Elizabeth had greatly feared for her own life from her sister. When she (Elizabeth) became queen, however, it was the Catholic head of Mary that was severed by the axe in the Tower. The two sisters had professed much love of each other. Elizabeth wept when Mary lost her head; but, "politics is politics"! It (politics) is still the source of a not inconsiderable degree of bitterness.

In France it was not Bourbons or Capetians who guillotined Bourbons or Capetians. It was the Jacobins (during the Revolution). They also took off the head of Marie Antoinette rather than eat cake. It was not to a Stuart rival that Charles I of England lost his head, but to Parliament over which he had lost control. He could not very well be-

head Parliament even while he was still in power.

Napoleon did not hate the Duke d'Enghien in person or as such. He feared his political rivalry. Napoleon was in power. The Duke was not. It was the Duke who was executed.

Exceptions to this rule are, of course, found in assassinations; but these do not proceed under the color of administration of justice. The practice of self-righteous justification exhibited by man in his dispensation of "justice" from a seat of power has always been a shuttlecock batted back and forth. Not only church history, including in particular the post-Reformation era, but the history of the British monarchy, with which as Americans we have some acquaintance, runs over with the shuttlecock of political "justice", alternating with who it was that wielded power. It goes without saying that the outs alternately were justified by outrage over the "inhuman" and cruel acts and atrocities of the ins. To us of today it is quite clear that there was little to choose on this score between this side or that. It was the cruelty of the times that was inflicted indifferently, whether this side or that was in power. Justice was a word to which homage must be rendered.

Unquestionably some progress has been made; but let us not be too self-congratulatory! Our own history, as we read it a century or two or three after the facts, is not without its flaws, for, we after all, were the heirs of our progenitors, and we, too, were products, in our conflicts, in our harmonies and our interests, of emotions and passions. In our earlier history as a nation our conflicts and our alignments, were no less than today in response to what we at that time perceived as our interests. How different is it today?

Why were Hamilton and Jefferson at odds? Did not each believe himself right and the other one wrong? They came from diverse backgrounds, but they would hardly have explained their differences on that basis. It would have seemed too shallow! When it came to a very close personal question, Hamilton threw his influence behind Jefferson to give him the presidency when the choice fell to the House of Representatives because of a tie vote in the election of 1800. Why? Hamilton hated Jefferson from partisan motives, but he hated Aaron Burr yet more. The latter in turn had his revenge when he killed Hamilton in a duel.

Burr himself was tried for treason during the Jefferson Administration. John Marshall, Chief Justice of the United States, presided at the trial. He bore a deep hatred, reportedly, of Jefferson. Burr was acquitted. Did Marshall's hatred of Jefferson have a bearing on the outcome?

Andrew Johnson was impeached in 1868. He had been badly beaten at the polls in the Congressional election. The Radical Republicans were overwhelmingly victorious. Had his party prevailed in the house would he have been impeached?

Do Democrats impeach Democrats? Do Republicans impeach Republicans? Had the 1972 victory of Nixon also swept a majority of Republicans into the House and Senate, would he face impeachment today?

History seems to answer that question unmistakably, the exceptions being assassinations; and, of course, many of these were also politically motivated. They represented direct action rather than self-styled judicial processes.

Is impartiality humanly possible, and therefore justice itself, when the political victor brings the vanquished to trial before the bar of justice controlled by the victor? Political impartiality as a repository of the cause of justice is probably a contradiction in terms.

The duel has been abolished. As an arbiter, it became too obvious to our growing sensibilities, that it was superior marksmanship

rather than justice that prevailed. How much better is the accident of the political upper-hand? Political rivalry, partisan vehemence and intemperance, popular emotions, centered in a political majority exercising the upper hand, are not the constituents of justice. Quite the opposite.

Is there not a better way of dispensing justice? Will history simply write: In the year 1974 a heavily Democratic Congress impeached a Republican President who had been re-elected in 1972 with all the electoral votes except those of one State and the District of Columbia, as in 1868 a heavily Radical Republican Congress impeached a President who had lost control of the House (much as Charles I had lost control of the House of Commons) as a result of a Congressional election?

Can we move from beheading as a remedy for settling political conflicts, on to impeachment by a partisanly divided body, on to something a little closer to the classical demands of justice, as the centuries pass?

How is progress to be achieved in the refinement of justice if it is not made when the occasion for it arises?

Partisan judgments spit against the very face of justice. Is the fiber of our sense of justice yet so gross that we cannot perceive the mockery of a partisan proceeding (so roundly condemned by history as injudicious) in which the party in power sits in judgment on those in a minority position? No doubt we shall see.

Did our Constitution-makers contemplate that a President might be tried by a Congress of a different political complexion from his? We have had only one experience of the kind and it was very nearly disastrous!

FLORIDA LEGISLATURE ASKS PSRO REPEAL

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on May 23 the Florida Legislature enacted House Memorial 2792, requesting the Congress to approve H.R. 11394, which would repeal the professional standards review portion of title XI of the Social Security Act.

For the information of my colleagues, the text of the memorial is herewith appended:

Whereas, the Legislature of the State of Florida is concerned about the standard of medical care given to citizens of the state who are recipients of social security, and

Whereas, HR 11394 which is now pending in the Congress of the United States would repeal Part B of Title XI of the Social Security Act, and

Whereas, Part B of Title XI of the Social Security Act creates Professional Standard Review Organizations, and

Whereas, the system created therein removes a physician's individual professional judgment as to the best care for a patient by the imposition upon such physician of regional standards of care, and

Whereas, this system provides for a withholding of payment by the Social Security Administration if the method of treatment used has not been authorized by a Professional Standards Review Organization, and

Whereas, this system provides little reasonable recourse for a physician or patient in disagreement with a ruling by a Professional Standard Review Organization, and

Whereas, this system advocates that a physician give the last expensive care to a patient rather than that of the best quality, and

Whereas, this system creates situations in which the confidentiality of a patient-physician relationship may be compromised, and

Whereas, this system places hospital administrative staff in the position of determining admissions on the basis of whether the care to be given meets regional standards, and

Whereas, this system, in general, dehumanizes the practice of medicine, and

Whereas, this system creates another expensive bureaucracy without adding any new or improved health services to recipients of social security, now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida: That the Congress of the United States is requested to adopt HR 11394 which would repeal Part B of Title XI of the Social Security Act and appearing as 42 U.S.C. § 1320c-§ 1320c-19, relating to Professional Standards Review, be it further

Resolved that copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress.

INDIA'S DECEITFUL NUCLEAR SUCCESS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my voice to those of others in Congress who have condemned the duplicity of India in accepting our handouts while secretly spending her money and efforts on perfecting and exploding a nuclear device.

Despite Prime Minister India Gandhi's assurances that the Indian accomplishments will be used only for peaceful purposes, the fact remains that her country has added immeasurably to the world problem of keeping the nuclear menace under control.

The Gandhi arguments that India, being a nation of great population, deserves to be a nuclear power, that China's possession of the bomb makes it mandatory for India to have it in order to remain competitive, and that membership in the "Nuclear Club" is essential to India's status in the world, all fail to hold water.

India obtained the nuclear power by deceit. While hunger stalked the land, India took aid funds from abroad and then, in secret, spent her scientific efforts and resources on nuclear research. It is as simple as that. And as reprehensible. What might India have accomplished for her people if this effort and money had been used, say, on agricultural development?

No other nuclear power achieved the dubious status of having "the bomb" while being sustained by handouts from abroad. Certainly, we did not. Neither did the Soviet Union or China. Britain became such a power as a part of our own accomplishment. The French achievement came after France left our aid list.

Thus, the unique case of India raises

the question of how much her nuclear breakthrough cost us and the other countries which have poured funds into her economy, supposedly to keep it from going through a condition of constant crisis. Certainly, without outside help, India could not have afforded the money and the effort demanded for nuclear research. So the conclusion is plain enough. India accepted aid while spending her own resources on a hidden project, deplorable to the extreme in judgment of this country and others which furnished the aid.

Now we learn from a Time magazine report that India is planning to spend \$316 million over the next 5 years on atomic energy development while 25 percent of her people subsist on subpoverty incomes. Meanwhile, the World Bank reports that India will need some \$12 billion in aid over the next decade. Right now a proposed \$75 million Indian aid project is awaiting approval here. Are we going to continue giving our funds away in circumstances such as these?

There is nothing that India can gain in a peaceful and progressive way from her nuclear achievement that was not already available to her through the cooperation of this country, the Soviet Union, Britain, and the other nuclear powers, except, perhaps, China. Yet India, in a sense of pride which seems strange in the light of the handouts and the nuclear secrecy, elected to go it alone. She should be given this option in other matters too. I, for one, have had enough of this kind of doubledealing at the expense of the American taxpayers and in defiance of this country's purposes in the world.

BISHOP WELSH TO HEAD NEW ARLINGTON DIOCESE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the northern Virginia area in which many of our Government employees live has been established as a new Roman Catholic diocese by Pope Paul VI. It is an honor for us to have the new diocese of Arlington, Va., in our ever-growing metropolitan area.

The Most Reverend Thomas J. Welsh has been appointed as the first bishop of the Arlington diocese. His assignment to the new diocese will meet a real spiritual need of northern Virginia Catholics.

Bishop Welsh was born in Weatherly, Pa., on December 20, 1921. He attended St. Nicholas Parochial School, Weatherly; the Weatherly High School; and St. Charles Seminary, Philadelphia. Father Welsh was ordained to the priesthood on May 30, 1946. After his ordination he continued his studies at the Catholic University, Washington, D.C.

During his priestly career he served as teacher at Bishop Newman High School and associate pastor at Holy Child Parish, both in Philadelphia. He also served in the Archdiocesan Curia, and

became rector of his Alma Mater, St. Charles Seminary. On April 2, 1970, he was ordained as auxiliary bishop of Philadelphia.

Bishop Thomas J. Welsh has also been active over the years, in the Washington area; primarily at the National Catholic Conference where he served as a member of the priestly formation committee and the education committee.

I extend a welcome on behalf of northern Virginia residents to Bishop Welsh.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues and all who are interested, the results of my 1974 congressional questionnaire. It should be emphasized that I mailed my questionnaire to my constituents, First District, Oregon, in late February of this year and as volunteers were used for the tabulation the results have just been completed. Therefore, the results are not actually current; 226,000 questionnaires were mailed and approximately 31,000 were returned.

1974 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FOR CONGRESSMAN WENDELL WYATT, FIRST DISTRICT, OREGON

[By percentage]

1. Do you think that President Nixon:
 - a. Should be impeached by the House of Representatives? (12.7).
 - b. If impeached by the House, should be convicted by the Senate (and thus removed from office)? (30.1).
 - c. Resign from office? (16.2).
 - d. Remain in office and complete his elected term? (37.5).
 - e. No opinion (3.5).
2. Should the Congress enact legislation to provide for public (i.e., tax-supported) financing of federal election campaigns?
 - a. Yes, but only Presidential campaigns, (13.5).
 - b. Yes, for both presidential and congressional campaigns. (39.8).
 - c. No. (39.6).
 - d. No opinion. (7.1).
3. Should newsmen (radio, TV, newspapers, magazines) be protected by law from being forced to disclose confidential sources of information to courts, congressional committees, and other investigatory bodies?
 - a. Yes, in all cases. (30.4).
 - b. Yes, except in cases involving national security. (31.4).
 - c. Yes, except in response to a specific court order. (20.0).
 - d. No. (15.4).
 - e. No opinion. (2.8).
4. Should the Congress require that each of the States establish a "no-fault" automobile insurance program?
 - a. Yes. (50.0).
 - b. No, the matter should be left to the individual states. (39.7).
 - c. No opinion. (10.3).
5. Should the Congress establish a Federal Consumer Protection Agency empowered to represent consumer interests before federal agencies and in the courts and to enforce federal consumer protection programs?
 - a. Yes. (61.7).
 - b. No. (27.6).
 - c. No opinion. (10.7).

6. Should the Congress propose a constitutional amendment to prohibit the busing of public school students in order to achieve racial balance?

- a. Yes. (59.3).
 - b. No. (31.5).
 - c. No opinion. (9.2).
7. Should various policies designed to upgrade the environment (e.g., controls of automobile exhaust emissions, restrictions on industrial use of so-called "dirty" fuels, etc.) be modified in order to combat the current energy crisis?
- a. Yes. (50.1).
 - b. No. (45.5).
 - c. No opinion. (4.4).
8. Should the Congress enact a national health insurance program (which would, in effect, be an extension of the Medicare Program to cover the entire population)?

- a. Yes. (49.9).
 - b. No. (41.0).
 - c. No opinion. (9.1).
- If yes, how should it be financed?
- a. Increased Social Security taxes? (25.1).
 - b. General tax revenues? (51.7).
 - c. Otherwise? (23.2).
9. Should access to and use of marijuana be treated in the law much the same as alcohol is now?

- a. Yes. (42.7).
 - b. No. (49.9).
 - c. No opinion. (7.4).
10. Should those persons who deserted from the armed forces or evaded the draft during the Vietnam War be granted some form of amnesty?
- a. Yes, now. (21.3).
 - b. Yes, but at some time in the future. (17.7).
 - c. Yes, but only upon completion of some form of equivalent service. (39.7).
 - d. No. (36.0).
 - e. No opinion. (1.3).

11. In what areas of domestic concern do the most important problems now facing the United States lie? (In order of importance.)

1. Inflation. (44.9).
2. Honesty, credibility in government. (29.2).
3. Energy resources. (10.8).
4. Law and order. (4.4).
5. Responsiveness of the political system. (3.8).
6. Environmental pollution. (3.2).
7. Unemployment. (2.1).
8. Welfare programs. (0.7).
9. Drug abuse. (0.4).
10. Civil rights. (0.3).
11. Housing. (0.2).
12. Should all candidates for Federal Office (President and Congress) be required to make public the details of their financial status. (i.e., disclose their sources of income, investment holdings and other relevant personal information?)

- a. Yes. (79.1).
 - b. No. (15.9).
 - c. No opinion. (5.0).
13. Would you favor Government ownership and operation of the oil industry?

- a. Yes. (26.9).
- b. No. (65.6).
- c. No opinion. (7.5).

14. Would you favor legislation requiring oil companies on a regular and continuing basis to disclose their profits, reserves, and supplies?

- a. Yes. (87.2).
- b. No. (9.9).
- c. No opinion. (2.9).

15. Would you favor tax on excess profits of oil companies?

- a. Yes. (78.4).
- b. No. (15.8).
- c. No opinion. (5.8).

THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, at the March 6, 1974, discussions of the United Nations Human Rights Commission which considered the Report on Genocide of the Subcommittee on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, the Representative of the United States, Mr. Philip Hoffman, spoke in support of a move by the Turkish Permanent Representative, Mr. Osman Olcay, to remove from the report a brief reference to the 1915 genocide of the Armenians by the Turks.

This acquiescence of our U.N. Representative to delete reference to the first genocide in the 20th century is an affront to civilized people everywhere.

Archives and libraries around the world abound with the history of the horrible slaughter of 2 million Armenians by barbaric Ottoman Turks. Lengthy and innumerable accounts concerning this genocide were written by our Ambassador to Turkey, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., other diplomats, missionaries, journalists, travelers, and eyewitnesses, and carried by newspapers around the world. Speeches were delivered in the U.S. Congress at the time, and resolutions introduced condemning the Turks for their official policy of genocide. President Woodrow Wilson, as well as other heads of state, reported on this sordid episode, and proclaimed a policy of seeking an independent homeland for Armenians. The American military mission's report to the U.S. Congress revealed the massacre of Armenians as the "most colossal crime of all ages."

Minister of War, Enver Pasha, leader of the young Turk movement which came to power in 1909, along with co-dictators Djemal Pasha, minister for marine, and Talaat Bay, Turkish minister of the interior, authorized the plan to exterminate the Armenians. This was the first time in modern history that such high officials of a legally constituted government planned the systematic destruction of an entire people on ethnic and religious grounds. The leaders of Nazi Germany came later.

The plan of genocide was conveyed to the internal authorities by a series of telegrams from Interior Minister Talaat beginning in February 1915 and continuing for about a half year thereafter. On the nights of April 24-25, the leaders of the Armenian community were rounded up with such completeness that there was not even internal leadership to plead for the defenseless Armenians scattered throughout Turkey and concentrated in the east. Thus began the wholesale slaughter of 2 million innocent Armenians.

Ambassador Morgenthau recounted the satanic horror visited upon the Armenians in many books and articles. In the "Secrets of the Bosphorus," he stated:

I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible

episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.

A historical account of this black period in history can be found in the excellent book, "Armenia: The Case for a Forgotten Genocide," by Dickran H. Boyajian. The book contains a collection of diplomatic and other documents of the time, along with many eyewitness accounts, of man's inhumanity to man.

In his article, "The Greatest Horror in History," which appeared in the Red Cross magazine, March 1918, Ambassador Morgenthau stated:

The final and the worst measure used against the Armenians was the wholesale deportation of the entire population from their homes and their exile to the deserts, with all the accompanying horrors on the way. No means were provided for their transportation or nourishment. The victims, which included educated men and women of standing, had to walk on foot, exposed to the attacks of bands of criminals especially organized for that purpose. Homes were literally uprooted; families were separated; men killed, women and girls violated daily on the way or taken to harems. Children were thrown into the rivers or sold to strangers by their mothers to save them from starvation. The facts contained in the reports received at the Embassy from absolutely trustworthy eyewitnesses surpass the most beastly and diabolical cruelties ever before perpetrated or imagined in the history of the world. The Turkish authorities had stopped all communication between the provinces and the capital in the naive belief that they could consummate this crime of the ages before the outside world could hear of it. But the information filtered through the Consuls, missionaries, foreign travellers, and even Turks. We soon learned that orders had been issued to the governors of the provinces to send into exile the entire Armenian population in their jurisdictions, irrespective of age and sex. The local officers, with a few exceptions, carried out literally those instructions. All the able-bodied men had either been drafted into the Army or been disarmed. The remaining people, old men, women and children, were subjected to the most cruel and outrageous treatment.

In his book, "The Murder of a Nation," Ambassador Morgenthau described in gruesome details how the extermination of the Armenian people was perpetrated ruthlessly and with beastly savagery:

And thus, as the exiles moved, they left behind them another caravan—that of dead and unburied bodies, of old men and women in the last stages of typhus, dysentery, and cholera, of little children lying on their backs and setting up their last piteous wails for food and water. There were women who held up their babies to strangers begging them to take them and save them from their tormentors, and failing this, they would throw them into wells or leave them behind bushes, that at least they might die undisturbed. Behind was left a small army of girls who had been sold as slaves—frequently for a med-jidie, or about eighty cents—and who, after serving the brutal purposes of their purchases, were forced to lead lives of prostitution. A string of encampments filled with the sick and the dying, mingled with the unburied or half-buried bodies of the dead, marked the course of the advancing throngs. Flocks of vultures followed them in the air, and ravenous dogs, fighting one another for the bodies of the dead, constantly pursued them. The most terrible scenes took place at the river, especially the Euphrates. Some-

times, when crossing this stream, the gendarmes would push the women into the water, shooting all who attempted to save themselves by swimming. Frequently the women themselves would save their honour by jumping into the river, their children in their arms. . . . It is absurd for the Turkish government to assert that it ever seriously intended to deport the Armenians to new homes; the treatment which was given the convoys clearly shows that extermination was the real purpose of Enver and Talaat.

The New York Times reported in its issue of September 21, 1915, that Mehmed Cherif Pasha, former Turkish Minister to Sweden, who had fled from Turkey, wrote a letter to the editor of *Journal de Geneve*, in which he branded "the Armenian atrocities perpetrated under the present regime as surpassing the savagery of Genghis Khan and Tamerlane." The letter continued:

To be sure, the state of mind of the Unionists was not revealed to the civilized world until they had openly taken sides with Germany; but for more than six years I have been exposing them in the *Mecheroufette* (his newspaper, published first in Constantinople, then in Paris) and in different journals and reviews warning France and England of the plot against them and against certain nationalities within the Ottoman borders, notably the Armenians, that was being hatched. If there is a race which has been closely connected with the Turks by its fidelity, by its services to the country, by the statesmen and functionaries of talent it has furnished, by the intelligence which it has manifested in all domains—commerce, industry, science, and the arts—it is certainly the Armenians. . . . Alas! At the thought that a people so gifted, which has served as the fructifying soil for the renovation of the Ottoman Empire, is on the point of disappearing from history—not enslaved, as were the Jews by the Assyrians, but annihilated—even the most hardened heart must bleed; and I desire, through the medium of your estimable journal, to express to this race which is being assassinated, my anger toward the butchers and my immense pity for the victims.

On December 21, 1918, the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mustafa Resahad Pasha, stated to the Turkish Parliament:

A pallid light extends on the atrocities committed against the Armenians, atrocities which raised the indignation of humanity; it gave us land (Armenian land) transformed into a gigantic slaughter house.

Recapitulating some of the events during the period of the Ottoman Empire, from 1822-1909, 1 million Armenians, Greeks, Bulgarians, Kurds, and Assyrians were murdered by Ottoman Turks. History records the senseless hecatomb of 2 million Armenians in 1915 and nearly 200,000 Greeks from 1918-23. Not until Nazi Germany has there been anything comparable in world history.

President Woodrow Wilson, the U.S. Congress and the American people actively supported Armenian independence and claims for a homeland. Similar efforts came from other governments. The origins of the Armenian people may be traced back to 2350 B.C., and biblical history records that the ancient kingdom of Armenia was the first nation to embrace Christianity.

An independent Armenia was declared on May 28, 1918. This new nation, a fitting monument to the victims of 1915 and earlier, survived as an independent

nation only a few years. Threatened by armed attack by Turkish nationalists, the weakened Armenians accepted a cease-fire imposed by Soviet Russia and were forced to submit to the incorporation of Armenia into the U.S.S.R. To this day, the heroic Armenians struggle for national identity and independence.

Today, monuments to the Armenian martyrs can be found in Los Angeles, Beirut, Marseille, Yerevan, the capital of Armenia, and at the Armenian home in Emerson, Bergen County, N.J., a dedication at which I was privileged to appear.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the victims of this genocide are not forgotten, I have introduced the following joint resolution:

H.J. RES. 1048

To designate April 24 of each year as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man"

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 24 of each year is hereby designated as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day as a day of remembrance for all the victims, especially those of Armenian ancestry, of the genocide perpetrated in 1915 in Turkey.

NO-FAULT INSURANCE

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the conclusion of a report on no-fault auto insurance for my colleagues to consider. The experience with no-fault insurance in Massachusetts can help us to draft better Federal legislation.

The report follows:

NO-FAULT PROPERTY PROTECTION—CHAPTERS 97B AND 1079 OF THE ACTS OF 1971

In 1971 the Legislature turned its attention toward the area of automobile property damage and collision insurance and applied the no-fault principle to it, which resulted in Chapters 97B and 1079 of the Acts of 1971. No other facet of insurance has caused such discontent and aggravation amongst the public as has property damage. In 1971 the Commissioner of Insurance estimated that of all the complaints received by his department covering all fields of insurance approximately 80 per cent of these complaints pertained to problems in the automobile property damage area.

To understand the problem under the old system of property damage it is again necessary to remember that it was based on fault. If A was involved in a motor vehicle accident with B and A incurred damage to his car he could only recover if B was at fault and A was free from fault. Experience under the fault system indicated that in many instances the company's response would be to deny the claim because their insured either did not report the accident or delayed for too long a period of time before reporting the accident. Other instances have shown companies offering inadequate amounts or even completely denying liability

and refusing to pay an amount. All of these methods resulted in prolonged delays to the Massachusetts motorist. He was then left with the following alternatives:

1. Hire an attorney and be forced to pay legal fees out of the amount he recovered to repair his car and then only after considerable time has elapsed in awaiting court action.

2. Collect from his own collision policy if he had this coverage, yet having to deduct whatever deductible he had chosen from the amount he recovered which might be substantially less than the actual damage sustained to the vehicle. All of which amounted to a profession of negligence in the accident and risked non-renewal by the company and ineligibility for merit-rating discounts.

3. Accept an inadequate amount from the company and pay the remainder out of his own pocket if he was in fact offered any amount at all by the company.

Throughout these deliberations there were considerable delays which the motorist could not cope with if he needed his car repaired before he could put it back on the road. Being a typical motorist, he would have to use his car daily which put him in a pathetically weak bargaining position with an insurance company that could wait forever and invest any money it had set aside in its loss reserve for that case.

In order to rectify these inequities in the former system, no-fault property protection legislation was developed which complements the existing landmark no-fault bodily injury law. Under Chapter 97B, Property Protection Insurance is now compulsory in Massachusetts, and it is on a no-fault basis. Formerly, a motorist would buy property damage insurance to protect himself in case he damaged another car and was at fault. This necessitated a motorist to purchase insurance that would cover him in case he collided with a new and expensive car (Cadillac). However, under the No-Fault Property Protection Law, a person buys insurance to protect his own car, and the rates are dependent on the type of car and its age. Now, a person with a 1964 Chevrolet buys insurance to cover that car and not the other person's car.

Basically, the No-Fault Property Protection law allows a motorist to select the type of coverage which will sufficiently protect his own vehicle in case of damage, grant him a tort exemption for damage he may cause to other vehicles, and provides compensation to repair his car within 15 days after submitting an itemized estimate.

Although property protection insurance is compulsory, it offers three options to a motorist which allows him to choose the coverage which best protects the type of car he drives. Basically, the plan can be best understood by analyzing the three options, all of which grant the motorist an exemption in tort for any damage he may be liable for.

OPTION I. ALL RISK COVERAGE

This option provides for the insurance company of the insured to pay for all direct or accidental damage to his motor vehicle regardless of his fault or negligence up to a limit equal to the actual cash value of the vehicle minus any deductible. This coverage is in essence that of a motorist who carried both property damage and collision coverage under the old system. It should be noted that this coverage is provided with a \$100 deductible common in many collision policies under the former system. There is also a provision allowing motorists to buy back \$50 of the deductible from the insurance company; and legislation has been filed in 1973 which would offer option I with no deductible. Motorists who will select this coverage will be those who formerly carried property damage and collision coverage—motorists with late model cars and more expensive vehicles who want to protect their investment.

OPTION II. RESTRICTED COVERAGE

This option provides coverage whereby a motorist can recover for damage to his car from his own insurance company only under the following conditions:

a. Cases where the motorist either is or would have been entitled to recover in tort against the other party. Thus, where the insured is able to demonstrate reasonable proof of negligence on the part of the other party, he can recover under this option.

b. Cases where the motorist's vehicle is struck while lawfully parked.

c. Cases where the motorist's vehicle is struck in the rear by another vehicle moving in the same direction.

d. Cases where the other party is convicted of (1) operating under the influence of alcohol or narcotic drugs, (2) driving the wrong way on a one-way street, or (3) operating at an excessive rate of speed.

Those motorists who would select this coverage would probably be those who carried just property damage coverage under the old system and feel that their car is not worth protecting against all damage—just damage caused by another motorist. Thus those motorists with older cars would tend to select this option. Again this option is provided with a mandatory \$100 deductible with the \$50 buy-back provision, and legislation has been filed in 1973 which offers the option with no deductible.

OPTION III. NO COVERAGE FOR OWN CAR

Under this option the motorist is not entitled to recover damages for his own vehicle even if he is free from fault and the other party is negligent, so that the election of this option bars all claims for loss or damage to his vehicle which he might otherwise have had. He does, however, retain his tort exemption up to \$5,000 so that he is exempt from any liability for property damage which he might cause: i.e., out of state cars, and any other personal or real property that he may hit such as a telephone pole or a building. On the surface it might appear that the motorist who selects this option does not have adequate coverage but it should be borne in mind that this option is the lowest in cost of all three options and might be advantageous for a motorist with an older and inexpensive automobile who would not have any large repair bills if his car were damaged particularly in light of the fact that property protection insurance is only paid up to the limit of the actual cash value of the vehicle.

SERVICE FEATURE

The main intent of this legislation is to provide better service through the 15 day service feature of the plan. As we previously mentioned, the greatest problem facing the Massachusetts motorist is that of recovering the amount owed to him within a period of time to allow the motorist to use this compensation to repair his vehicle so that he can have his car back on the road without lengthy delays.

Thus, payments under option I, the All Risk Coverage, are to be made within fifteen days after receipt by the insurance company of proof of insurance, accident, and the amount of the loss or damage claimed. In order to prevent the insurance company from delaying making payment or denying liability, a penalty provision has been inserted into the law which would allow a motorist who has not been compensated within this fifteen day period to commence an action of contract in court and recover double the amount of damages claimed if the court determines that the insurer was unreasonable in refusing to pay the claim. This is the key to the no-fault property protection concept, for if the legislation is to be successful, motorists must be compensated for their losses within this amount of time in order to put their car back on the road and not leave it deteriorating

for any length of time awaiting a decision by the insurance company.

There would seem to be a great deal of misunderstanding as to Option II. Many have asked: "If the property protection plan is no-fault, why is it necessary to prove that the other party was at fault in order to recover under Option II?"

The plan is still no-fault; the insured will still recover from his own insurance company and does not have to file a claim against the other party's insurance company, as was done in the past. Since the plan is compulsory and the limit to which a person may recover is the book value of his car, the options are designed to give the motorist three choices which would best fit his needs. Obviously, since the coverage is different, the rates will vary with the coverage a person would buy. It was felt by the drafters of the legislation that basing Option II on the showing of fault was the logical median between the All Risk Coverage of Option I, and the No-Coverage Tort Exemption of Option III.

In determining what option he should take, the motorist should take into consideration the premium he would have to pay plus the deductible he is taking, either \$50 or \$100, and then compare that figure to the book value of his car. If that figure comes close to the book value of his car, then he should seriously consider taking a lower option.

RESULT OF NO-FAULT BODILY INJURY INSURANCE PRIVATE PASSENGER VEHICLES

I. The state wide rates on compulsory no-fault bodily injury have decreased approximately 37% since the inception of no-fault in 1971. In some communities the decrease has been even greater, for example, the average rate decrease for Boston has been 48%. This result is surprisingly greater than most people had expected. Indeed, it is interesting to note that according to figures supplied by the Department of Insurance, had it not been for no-fault the rates for 1972 would have been approximately 70-80% higher than the 1970 pre-no-fault rates.

Since there is no longer any need to prove fault in an accident, where the injury to the motorist, passenger or pedestrian is less than \$2,000 for medical, hospital, funeral expenses and loss of wages; and also recovery for pain and suffering has been denied for under \$500, the reduction of this costly litigation has resulted in a cost savings to the premium payer.

Secondly, the amount of claims filed has decreased tremendously, especially in the higher territories. When no-fault was passed, it was expected that it would effectively eliminate nuisance claims, and it has, especially in those areas that experienced an inordinately high number of them.

Upon the enactment of no-fault, the Legislature provided for a 15% decrease on all motor vehicle insurance rates for 1971; however the Supreme Judicial Court ruled that unconstitutional and decreed that the Legislature could only cut rates 15% for the compulsory bodily injury insurance, to which the no-fault law pertained. As a result, all motorists enjoyed a 15% decrease in their compulsory bodily injury premiums in 1971, regardless of what territory they garaged their car.

The rates for 1971 were further reduced 25.9% in 1972 as a result of Chapter 977 of the Acts of 1971, the so called "Rebate Act", which required the insurance companies to grant a partial rebate of the 1971 rates, which was upheld by the courts. This resulted from the unexpected success of no-fault in 1971. It was discovered that the claim frequency for 1971 had decreased significantly and the total loss and expenses of the companies was overestimated, resulting in an unfair profit or windfall of \$35,030,143. The fair profit which the companies were entitled to was

\$1,339,377 or 1% of their earned premiums. As a result of the Rebate Law, the insurance companies were required to return this unfair profit to the consuming motorist which was 25.9% of the premium paid on compulsory bodily injury insurance for 1971. Thus, the total savings in 1971 was approximately 37%.

In 1972 the rates were further reduced by 27.6%, resulting in a total rate reduction under no-fault of 38.5% state wide.

In 1973 the Insurance Department was able to use the actual experience of the first year of no-fault, 1971. The experience was based on a pure premium basis (premium loss and expenses). It was found that the experience on the state-wide level warranted a 2.5% increase in the rates, which suggests a leveling of the rates. When the over-all state rate level factor and experience factor was applied to the experience of the fifteen territories, it was discovered that in 1971 the pure loss cost increased in the lower territories (7 through 15), while it decreased in the higher territories (1 through 6).

The high rates for the lower territories in 1973 reflect their experience under no-fault. What happened was the rates of the lower territories were reduced too much in 1971 and 1972. In 1973, the pure premium loss, as based on the 1971 No-Fault experience, did not go down enough to justify a rate decrease. As a result, the rates were increased in these territories to reflect their actual experience in 1971 under no-fault.

II. What does the future have in store for no-fault bodily injury in Massachusetts? It would seem that rates will continue to level off to a point which will show a differentiation based on true claim frequency, minus the so-called nuisance claims. Indeed, the consolidation of the fifteen territories into six rating territories exemplifies this result.

Also, the data from 1971 suggests the possibility of the creation of a new class for over 65 drivers. There is evidence to show that these drivers may have better experience than younger drivers. If the statistics gathered in 1973 show that to be so, the Commissioner of Insurance has indicated that drivers over 65 can expect lower rates in future years.

Chapter 451 of the Acts of 1972 has created a new class for drivers who have wage continuation plans. It was felt by the drafters of this legislation that it would be unfair for those motorists who have a wage continuation plan to pay the same rates for compulsory no-fault bodily injury insurance, since they must deduct from their loss of wages any payment they would get under their own wage continuation plan. A flat \$1.00 discount is being given to people with a wage-continuation plan so that statistical data on their losses can be separately collected in 1973 for the possible reduction in rates starting in 1974.

RESULTS OF NO-FAULT PROPERTY PROTECTION

No-Fault advocates predicted savings across the state for approximately 85-90 percent of the Massachusetts motorists for two reasons; first, motorists would be able to buy insurance up to the book value of their own car rather than the value on the vehicle they might damage; second, the new system would decrease the number and costs of nuisance claims. Today, after two years of no-fault property protection, statistical rate comparisons show that those advocates were somewhat correct in their estimates. Hopefully, after examination of the following sampling of rate comparisons, a better understanding of the results can be achieved.

In regard to Option I coverage, it was predicted that in the most expensive territory—Boston—81% of the motorists would pay less for Option I than they would pay for property damage and collision coverage in 1971. It should be remembered that approximately 53% of the motorists drive cars four years old or older, and these people will be the ones who substantially benefit under the

plan. Today, two years after the system, the predicted reductions have become evident by dollar and cent savings.

In regard to Option II coverage, the same estimates apply. 85-90% of the motorists would pay less for Option II coverage than they would pay for property damage in 1971. The coverage provides a tort exemption plus the ability to recover damages if the other party is negligent and identifiable. Today, the no-fault system of savings has become a reality by reducing rates for this coverage in most cases.

In regard to Option III it was predicted motorists would be paying between \$60.50 and \$14.00 for an exemption from tort for any damage for which they might be liable. Today, that range has been lowered considerably.

In conclusion, before making any decision as to the results of no-fault in the area of property protection as a whole, it is important to remember certain determinables. Any rates which may not have decreased as predicted can only be explained by the skyrocketing costs of auto repairs within the past two years and the sudden jump of some cities to higher priced territories due to increased claims frequency.

DUKE ELLINGTON

HON. RALPH H. METCALFE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1974

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, when Duke Ellington died on May 24, a musical era died with him. He was without question the greatest composer in America's history. As a composer, as a pianist, as an orchestra leader, and as a gentleman, Duke Ellington had no peer.

People started calling Edward Kennedy Ellington "Duke" when he was a youngster and no man deserved the title more. He was the personification of royalty—he was urbane, he was sophisticated, he was debonair, he was elegant. Duke Ellington had one other attribute that had nothing to do with his "peerage", he was a genius.

Ellington's work transcended any labels. He wrote rags, blues, tin pan alley dance tunes, extended jazz compositions, suites, Broadway musicals, ballets, movie scores, and sacred music. He performed his music everywhere from the Poodle Dog Lounge to Westminster Abbey and every major jazz club and concert hall in between.

In all he wrote over 1,500 tunes, some say as many as 5,000. Most of what he did people liked to call jazz but early on Duke Ellington saw how restricting labels could be on his music. If his work had to be given any label, Duke always preferred that it be called Negro music because he recognized, years before many of his critics ever did, that his music was uniquely black music.

His work graphically portrayed the black experience in urban America. "Harlem Airshaft", "Black and Tan Fantasy", "Black, Brown and Beige", were all Ellington tributes to his heritage. For white audiences, whether at the Cotton Club or Carnegie Hall, these early Ellington works were their only real insights into black America.

Duke Ellington came to realize, however, that even the label of "Negro music" was too restricting a definition of his genius. The work he did, especially in his later years, transcended all definition. He took what were essentially European structures, such as the suite, and built around them a web of African rhythms, American blues melodies, and his own unique and magnificent harmonies to create what could only be called Ellingtonia.

The Duke made jazz a legitimate art form for many who refused to take it seriously. Though it took many years for critics to listen seriously to jazz, it did not take so long for "classical" composers to begin to listen. Duke Ellington's effect on them has made him, along with Stravinsky and Ravel, among the most influential composers of the 20th century.

It will probably be as a composer that he will be most remembered, but ironically, Duke always thought of himself as primarily a pianist, and an underrated one at that. His piano style was, like everything about him, uniquely Ellington and even the most casual jazz listener could pick it out of a dozen other styles.

Duke really played two instruments however, the piano and the orchestra. Perhaps one of the integral parts of his genius was his belief that the band, and the styles of the men who played in it, were a vital force in his music. Much of what he wrote, he wrote specifically for that band. He used to say that he kept the band around all year long because he liked to write something at night and have somebody to play it for him the next day. In fact, what he did was to create a musical extension of his genius while at the same time making himself an extension of the varied and talented musicians who played with him. Duke created an atmosphere where he and the band inspired each other and through this technique created some of the best music the world has ever heard.

For all his musical accomplishments, it is important that Duke Ellington the man is not forgotten by future generations. With enormous talent and great pride in his heritage and ability, Duke Ellington overcame the indescribably difficult life of a black musician in America. It is a difficult enough life for an average man to even survive. Edward Kennedy Ellington did more than survive however. He inspired countless other musicians both by personal and professional example. He created his own special brand of marvelous music which could both entertain and inspire.

Duke Ellington was a genius and a gentleman. We will not see his like again for many years to come.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, for over a decade, I have worked on and followed the progress of the proposed Tocks Island

Dam project. This plan is of great importance, not only to the people of New Jersey and my district, but to those of neighboring States.

In the full Appropriations Committee we adopted an amendment that no money for construction of the Tocks Island Dam shall proceed for 1 year until the environmental and conservation reservations are resolved by the parties involved.

The public should understand that almost everyone has always been in favor of saving this wonderful area for the people. Almost everyone agrees that the recreational facilities, the flood control, the fresh water supply, and the power source are needed.

TORTURE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, as Anthony Lewis pointed out in *The New York Times* last week, it is extremely difficult to arouse public concern about the use of torture as a political instrument, especially when our administration operates as if the views of the United States would have no influence on the abuse of human rights practiced by governments receiving our financial support.

The current situation in Chile is a prime example of our Government's policy. The stories of murder and torture are as well documented as they are appalling. Yet Congress continues to authorize military assistance for Chile, and President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger continue to remain silent.

With Greece the lack of moral leadership by the United States is even more reprehensible because it is so longstanding. The hallmark of the new regime was the reopening of the prison camp on the island of Yaros. Still the American military clings to the myth that Greek military facilities are necessary to the defense of the Mediterranean, and American policy toward Greece remains one of silence on the vital issues of human rights and a return to democratic government.

There are those of us who cannot remain silent and who will continue to remind our colleagues and constituents of our total disapproval of a U.S. foreign policy which contributes substantially to the well-being of the juntas in Chile and Greece without raising a word of restraint against excesses of political vindictiveness.

To this end, I commend to my colleagues Mr. Lewis' article, as well as this morning's Washington Post editorial:

THE MEANING OF TORTURE

(By Anthony Lewis)

BOSTON, May 29.—The use of torture as a political instrument is an evil beyond justification of 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 Ayress complained that her daughter, Luz de las Nieves Ayress, 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 85 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.

WASHINGTON'S GREEK PROBLEM

Greece presents the extraordinary spectacle of a government whose worth and staying power are questioned, at least privately, by virtually all of its allies. This is the result of the failing performance of Brig. Gen. Dimitrios Ioannides, chief of the military police. He ousted the former military dictator George Papadopoulos last fall and installed a new junta of his own. But where the Papadopoulos regime conveyed—while it lasted—a certain impression of harsh stability, the rule of Gen. Ioannides gives off a contrary impression of weakness and impermanence. The Greek economy nourishes the highest inflation rate in Europe. Practically no figure of prominence has joined the new regime. Purges and disaffection have weakened the armed forces. Just about the only area of "achievement" lies in repression. The regime has reopened the prison camp on the island of Yaros.

If Greece were Lower Slobovia, all this might be of no great consequence to Americans. But Greece is a traditional friend and a NATO ally and, in some measure, an American dependency. This country has sentimental, moral, political and strategic reasons to be concerned about the continued despoliation of Greek public life by a small clique of military men and police officers. During the six Papadopoulos years it was feasible—if, finally, fruitless—for the United States to expect that the regime would move slowly back toward representative government. Gen. Ioannides, however, has not even gone through the motions of pledging to restore democracy. The sterility and narrowness of his leadership make it unrealistic for the United States to keep on believing that time will mellow his rule. This removes, in our view, an important reason for deferring to the junta, as Washington did in earlier years. Now, if not formerly, American deference is likely only to be exploited by the dictators in Athens to solidify their own power.

The new junta's not so subtle threat is, if the United States cools, to quit NATO and thereby to dump upon Washington a whole range of geopolitical troubles. Some Greeks in the junta seem to think they could adopt a kind of neutralism on the model of Libya's dictator Qaddafi; others do not appear to have thought out their country's choices. The junta has declined to let an American aircraft carrier join the six destroyers already "homeported" in Athens, until a substantial amount of new military hardware is forthcoming. Some American military men, eager to use Greek military facilities, are prepared to swallow this treatment in the name of

Mediterranean strategic requirements. It becomes increasingly a question, however, whether grand strategy compels the United States to follow a policy which many democratically minded Greeks identify with an strategy in the long term may well require uncritical embrace of the junta. Grand the United States to ensure its position with the Greek people by stepping back a pace from the current regime now.

At the very least it is time to stop the flow of high-level visitors and salutations and to start strongly asserting the American interest—the moral interests as well as the political interests—in Greece's return to liberty.

ENERGY TODAY: A COMPLEX OF PROBLEMS

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, many independent oil and gas producers are headquartered in my district, Denver, Colo. Although they and I are sometimes at odds, I very much respect their views and often seek their counsel.

In this spirit, I would like to share with my colleagues a speech given by Mr. Caswell Silver, an oil producer, geologist, and constituent of mine, in January at Albuquerque, N. Mex. Mr. Silver is an "oilman," but he is also a man concerned with the energy future of this Nation. His speech is as follows:

ENERGY TODAY OR A FEW GLINTS FROM A
MULTIFACETED COMPLEX OF PROBLEMS

(By Caswell Silver)

Energy is the essence of life. When we talk about the standard of living of nations we use either food or energy consumption as the standard of comparison. Actually they are closely interwoven because in a highly mechanized, agricultural industry, as found in the U.S., it takes 5 calories of fossil to produce one calorie of food.

We are all aware of the worldwide population explosion, but the explosion of energy consumption compounds this rate many times, due to the aspirations of the developing nations. Energy consumption is advancing at staggering rates. The world has used up one-half of all the oil previously consumed in the last 11 years, and one-half the coal previously used in the last 33 years.

The supply of fossil fuels (i.e., hydrocarbons) is limited and therefore the hydrocarbon age, the age in which we live and in which we depend on oil, gas, and coal to fuel our economies is finite in time. We have no immediate substitutes for hydrocarbons. The kinds of energy we can draw upon after the hydrocarbon age ends are not at hand. We are therefore bound to hydrocarbons for the next 30-40 years, until alternate sources of energy are available.

Recent international events such as the Arab embargo on oil to unfriendly nations have shown that we cannot separate the problems of energy supply as being the U.S. versus the rest of the world. Unless we assure the flow of vital energy to all nations, the seeds of discord already sown by the Arab embargo could result in bitter and disputatious events to make all previous world conflicts pale.

Tonight I'd like to talk about a few aspects of the problem as seen by a geologist and an explorationist, i.e., one who explores for oil and gas.

The major deposits of hydrocarbons are concentrated in a few relatively underdeveloped nations. The large industrialized nations whose life depends upon a flow of hydrocarbons generally do not have sources of supply within their borders. The U.S. is fortunate to be one of these exceptions. And because of this and being one of the principal users as well as suppliers our actions in the field of energy have for years set the tone of world supply and pricing.

Americans and American oil companies control 70 percent or more of the world's petroleum activity—in exploration, production, refining and distribution. The U.S. with six percent of the world's population uses 33 percent of the world's oil. Until the early 1960's we were net exporters of oil and because of this we set world prices. Oil the world around was sold at the U.S. Gulf Coast price less the cost of transportation from Gulf Coast ports to the point of use.

This price was artificially held low by events in the U.S. and for years the Arab oil ministers said that oil would be low in price only so long as the U.S. did not need foreign oil. These statements seem now to have been realistic.

Now that the U.S. is short of oil and using more oil than it produces and can no longer control world prices, a monopolistic combine of oil producing countries known as OPEC (for Oil Producing and Exporting Countries) is not only setting prices but is controlling the flow. This control threatens the economies of all of the world's industrial nations and reaches into the life of every nation.

Developing nations aspiring for the better life will soon realize, as they apparently have not yet realized, that any dreams for betterment will founder or rise on the availability of energy. But more importantly, availability to the developing nations is as much a matter of a price they can afford as it is of supply.

Now let us go back and see whether there is a possible solution to the price and supply dilemma posed by the monopolists. The definition of monopoly is the concentration of supply in the hands of a few. The breaking of a monopoly comes about when there is a distribution of supply excess to demand.

If we disregard for a moment the wider world problem, which cannot be divorced from that of the U.S., and examine our own situation in detail we may find a suggestion as to what we can do and where we can go.

First, the U.S. is blessed with the world's greatest national fossil fuel resources in terms of energy, when we include coal, oil, gas, oil shale and heavy oil-impregnated rocks. One-half of the potential oil area in the U.S. has never been explored; by that I mean that a drill has never penetrated these vast areas of potential oil-bearing rocks. The reasons are political, not physical, and they involve emotional elements outside rational considerations. Let us examine a few of them.

PRICE

The price of oil and gas has been legislated in the U.S. by various means, ranging from special tax considerations (called loopholes by some), the depletion allowance, and intangible write-offs—to the direct ruling of the Federal Power Commission backed up by the courts, as to the well-head price of natural gas. All of these methods have tended to hold the price of oil and gas down, thus stimulating consumption. For this reason, consumption of energy ran away from a declining domestic supply resulting from less incentive to explore.

However, with the ability to apply the same tax considerations to foreign exploration when domestic exploration became less rewarding, American companies went abroad, carrying domestic pricing with them. Oil producing and exporting nations had little choice but to accept the price schedules the American companies brought with them—

and thus continued to encourage the overuse of energy in relation to supply.

EXPLORATION

Let's look at a typical, established oil-producing area. Geologists often call such areas basins because they are centralized areas for the deposits of the sand and mud that when compacted form sedimentary rocks.

When a discovery of oil and gas is made, and it is deemed potentially rewarding enough to develop, a rush of recognition of the new basin follows. Wildcatters, financed by industry and by speculators, pour into the area. Then comes an intensive search. Starting with the first well, we can, in a time sense, graph the exploration history of a typical basin, coming up with a distribution curve that depicts the results of the exploratory surge—a kind of productive score-card which records a peak period of exploratory drilling and, presumably, the development of new reserves. Thereafter, as the search continues, the quantity of drilled wells declines yearly. Eventually it sinks to zero.

We can also graph the oil produced on an annual basis. Putting both curves into a common graph shows how the year of peak production lags behind the year of peak discovery.

These curves remain uncomplicated only when the two main factors affecting them—"Cost of Exploration and Development" and "Reward or Price for the Product"—stay the same. With these factors constant, once a basin and the discovery rate have matured, only a change in these two factors can change the direction of the curve. That's because any grouping of discrete things awaiting discovery tends to respond to the intensity of the search for them.

Consider an Easter egg hunt. Most of the eggs are found fast—until the obvious places are denuded; thereafter the search gets tougher, the number of finds smaller. Discouragement eventually stops the search; a few eggs may remain undiscovered.

This analogy suggests a point important to exploration: (1) to find the more carefully hidden treasures takes much time and effort; (2) people lose interest as the search becomes less rewarding. Still, it is not quite so simple when you're hunting for a natural resource. In oil and gas deposits, for example, we have no inventory; who knows how many eggs originally were hidden by Mother Nature? What's more, the obvious places under one state of knowledge are not the same as the obvious places under improved technology.

Now we are prepared to consider the possibility of increasing our supplies from known, older areas. With increased incentive we can for a time step up the current discovery rate in the older areas, but the advance in techniques is not so great as to assure restoring these areas to their earlier peaks of discovery and production, except in unusual circumstances.

Such circumstances would be the discovery of heretofore overlooked giant or super-giant fields. Of the thousands of oil fields in the world found up to 1971, 85 percent of the oil was in less than five percent of the fields (238 fields). More remarkable: 65 percent of the petroleum (oil and gas) occurs in slightly more than one percent of oil fields—the 55 "Super-giants". (Super-giants: a billion barrels of oil or 3.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas or more; Halbouty et al, 1970).

Prudhoe Bay, a super-giant field in Alaska, with at least 10 billion barrels of recoverable primary oil, ranks approximately 20th in size in the world. The Greater Ghawar field of Saudi Arabia ranks number one with 75 billion barrels. Kuwait, second in size, has 65 billion barrels. Such super-giant fields can meet the production rates that would enable the U.S. to attain rapid self-sufficiency. But they are decidedly rare. Even giant fields of just 500 million to one billion barrels of oil reserves would help to change significantly

the production rate of an older producing area.

Old areas explored more intensely can help to arrest the decline in domestic production from the presently daily 9.8 million barrels of oil and 66 billion cubic feet of natural gas. But this would provide only a brief respite. For even improved cost factors—more sophisticated technology and higher prices—could not avert the inevitable decline in the rate of finds.

If the old areas will not do enough, then we must turn to new areas to satisfy the demands of our advanced industrial society. Only these can provide the required fresh, flush production. These areas exist in the U.S. mainly in the unexplored offshore sectors. Denied these areas (offshore Atlantic Coast, Gulf of Alaska, etc.), the U.S. oil industry understandably has moved abroad.

Now having discussed price and exploration, you can see that we are leading up to the proposition that the U.S. can be self-sufficient in fossil fuels for an interim period until supplies run out—given an unprecedented effort, because geologically the supplies are available.

But becoming self-sufficient in fossil fuels for a short term of 30-40 years does not take into account three gaps: the gap between now and when self-sufficiency becomes a fact; the post-hydrocarbon self-sufficiency gap; and, far more important and dangerous, the gap in usage between the U.S. and the rest of the world. World peace cannot long survive an energy gap between the have and have-not nations. Let us look at the three gaps.

FIRST GAP

The first gap can only be relieved by conservation efforts. These involve price considerations as well as voluntary cuts in usage. The nations of the world, as well as our Federal Energy Office under William Simon, are reluctantly recognizing that higher prices bring on lessening demand. Higher prices also provide the only source of funds for a more intensive exploratory effort domestically.

We may get a temporary respite from the ending of the Arab Embargo, but this will not last because the Arabs have already indicated that at the most they will not go beyond a resumption of previous amounts of oil supplied. Only the fear of military take-over will change this posture, for oil in the ground is worth more than galloping world currencies. Therefore the first gap requires recognition of two things: (1) that the immediate crisis of supply can only be solved by conservation; (2) that we have to relieve this immediate crisis of supply by rapidly increasing our domestically available energy supplies.

THE SECOND GAP

The second gap can only be filled by long term relief from our dependence on fossil fuels which in turn can only be provided by major research and development on alternate sources of energy. And here we are already running into trouble by our one-sided approach to the problem. There seems to be complete capitulation to the use of nuclear fission as the solution, and 90 percent of the research so far authorized by the Congress is in that direction. I, for one, see Dixy Lee Ray and her cohorts at the Atomic Energy Commission as least qualified to determine the direction of energy research because of their open disregard for the problems of pollution and environmental contamination posed by reactors. The containment of plutonium formed in breeder reactors is a frightening problem that has not been squarely faced by the A.E.C. Many nuclear physicists form a body of opinion that differs with the A.E.C. as to the needed areas of research.

I would like to see a far greater portion of research going into other sources of energy, especially solar, wind, geothermal, coal re-

search and nuclear fusion, which avoid the danger of a polluted world.

THE THIRD GAP

An unresolved energy problem contains the seeds of conflict among nations unsurpassed by any of the so-called causes of conflict of the past. Rivalry between nations for future supplies of oil has already destroyed the international monetary conference. Gold and silver prices are on a runaway spree, having increased 25 percent in the past few days. There is no medium of exchange capable of supplying payment for oil at present world prices of \$11 to \$17 a barrel and on-the-cuff promises of payment are no good in the face of inflation at unprecedented rates in great part induced by increasing energy costs. Many of the OPEC countries feel that oil left in the ground can only increase in value and are disinclined to increase production rates.

Three Arab nations, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Libya, control 65 percent of the presently known proven oil reserves. They have a combined population of less than 10 million people. Industrial nations dependent upon them, with all the armament capabilities of modern warfare, and not including the U.S. and Russia, exceed 500 million people. Can anyone imagine a cold, heatless European population because they cannot afford the prices demanded by the Arabs?

Among the principal nations capable of self-sufficiency or a large measure thereof are the U.S., Canada, Russia, Great Britain and the Netherlands. By a rapid achievement of self-sufficiency they could eliminate their own competitive pressure for world supplies and might even contribute an excess of supply.

France and Great Britain have already made overtures of direct barter of armaments for guaranteed future oil supplies. Iran, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Libya are arming to meet possible take-over attempts from within and without. How much unauthorized take-over messing around by the autonomous CIA (already rumored in Libya) is now in progress?

The situation is a tinderbox. Possible solutions are

- (1) Reduction in demand.
 - (2) Increase in supply.
 - (3) Self-control on prices by the OPEC.
 - (4) Major research efforts on alternative energy sources unfettered by special interest considerations now controlling the U.S. effort.
- Let us consider briefly each of the above.
- (1) Reduction in demand will come automatically with high prices. But prices which are too high may bring on the world debacle we are trying to avoid.

(2) Increase in supply can come about if higher prices are used to increase the exploratory effort. But most U.S. congressmen spend more time looking for scapegoats and ways to prevent increased profits which would normally because of taxes flow into increased exploration.

(3) Self-control on prices has already been attempted by the Shah of Iran and King Faisal of Saudi Arabia. Whether their voices will be heard or whether they can withstand the alternative political demands of their masses remains to be seen. Self-control on prices from the oil-rich developing nations may be politically untenable.

(4) The U.S. research effort has yet to be finally determined. If it can be wrested from special interest groups within the A.E.C., there is hope.

And finally, we have touched on only a few of the thousand-and-one ramifications of the world-wide energy crunch, which you can see in the short term is more political than physical.

As fossil energy declines, are we coming to the nuclear fission age which will destroy us with uncontrollable pollutants? Or, will we be able to plan for a better future—with wind, water, solar, geothermal and nuclear fusion as energy sources?

FAMILY WITH \$22,000 A YEAR IS SQUEEZED BY COLLEGE EXPENSES

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, inflation and the high cost of living is making it more and more difficult for Americans to make ends meet. College tuitions and residential fees are soon to reach the out-of-sight level. I believe an article in the Wall Street Journal of May 28, 1974, by Terry P. Brown, which expresses the way of life for one American family, will be very interesting to my colleagues:

FAMILY WITH \$22,000 A YEAR IS SQUEEZED BY COLLEGE EXPENSES

(By Terry P. Brown)

WINNETKA, ILL.—“We used to think that if we could get the first two kids through college we could relax a little,” says Marty Douds, mother of three. “Now, we aren’t so sure.”

With a total family income of about \$22,000 a year, Mrs. Douds and her husband, Prof. Charles (Chuck) F. Douds, aren’t poor by any means. But with one son in college and two daughters approaching college age, the Douds family is currently in the throes of what is coming to be called “the middle-class crisis”—the situation of having to finance the higher education of children in the face of rampant inflation.

“Things weren’t so bad when you could count on 3% to 4% inflation a year and a salary raise greater than that,” says Mr. Douds, who teaches business courses at Chicago’s DePaul University. “The prospect of inflation in double figures and two children in college at the same time in a couple of years is frightening. It’s obvious the pinch will get worse.”

And so the Doudses are scrimping and saving, making sacrifices, stashing away what they can—and wondering what continued inflation will do to increase future college costs and erode a budget that is in many respects already austere. Certainly the prospects aren’t encouraging. “In the not-too-distant future, we could see average yearly college costs of between \$6,000 and \$7,000,” says Byron L. Himelick of the Illinois Scholarship Commission, a state financial-aid agency.

Mr. Himelick adds that “many people are beside themselves now when they think of paying \$5,000 a year for college, but most of the prestigious private schools are already well above that.”

The major problem, educators say, is that skyrocketing college costs are coincidental with shrinking financial-aid funds. “The crucial issue is finding enough money to award to everyone who needs it,” says Alexander G. Sidar Jr., executive director of the College Scholarship Service, an arm of the College Entrance Examination Board. “And these days more people than ever from all income levels need help.”

TIGHT SQUEEZE

The prevailing concept, however, is that most of the limited aid available should go to the neediest families. Consequently, it is the middle-income family, like the Douds family, that is often being squeezed the tightest. The Doudses, for example, applied for an Illinois state scholarship for their son, Bryn, but were turned down. “We didn’t think we would have much of a chance because of our total income,” Mr. Douds says.

In some ways, however, the Doudses (he is 43, she 41) are luckier than many families of similar means, since they learned to scrimp

even before inflation turned yesterday's amenities into today's luxuries. In 1965, after working 11 years for a Singer Co. subsidiary as a senior research physicist, Mr. Douds decided to give up what was then a "decent" \$13,000-a-year salary to study for his doctorate at Northwestern University. (He had previously earned both a bachelor's degree and a master's degree in physics from Penn State.) From 1965 to 1968, while Mr. Douds completed his course work in the department of industrial engineering and management sciences, the family income consisted of a \$3,400-a-year grant from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. A grant for the same amount of money came from the National Science Foundation in 1969. (Mr. Douds received his doctorate in 1970.)

CUTTING OUT THE FRILLS

During those lean years of study, Marty Douds says, "we were forced to cut the frills out of our budget . . . and we've never put them back." She adds: "We bought most of our clothes at the church rummage sale, and we never went to a movie or ate out. To this day, we may spend \$15 a year on liquor and \$50 on entertainment." For their own amusement, the Doudses say, they enjoy short spins around the neighborhood on their bicycles (each family member has one) or an occasional trip to an outdoor concert in a nearby park. "We wait for the movies to come on TV," says Mrs. Douds. Adds her husband: "Money and material things have never been major goals for us."

That being said, though, the Doudses have never had any doubts about saving and spending money on a college education for their children, and 15% to 20% of this annual income is put aside toward that end. "We've always felt the kids shouldn't have to live at home when they went to college," says Mr. Douds, "but we all agreed that if they didn't go to DePaul, where tuition would be free, or if they didn't go to one of the state universities, they'd have to work to make up whatever we couldn't provide."

The Doudses' son, 18-year-old Bryn, decided on Knox College, a small, private, liberal-arts college in Galesburg, Ill. Last fall, when Bryn enrolled as a freshman, a year at Knox, including tuition, room and board, and other educational and living expenses, cost \$4,800; next fall, it will be about \$200 more.

Of the total cost, the Doudses contribute one-third, Bryn himself one-third (he worked last summer as a computer programmer and also took a part-time job at Knox grading calculus papers), and Bryn's paternal grandparents, Charles T. and Ella Douds, supplied the remaining one-third under a policy of matching the funds that their grandchildren earn and save toward their education. (Ella Douds, her son says, inherited "the money that gives them the freedom to do these things.")

Susan Douds, a 17-year-old junior at Winnetka's New Trier East High School, wants to study either architecture or engineering in college but hasn't yet decided where this study will take place. Should she decide on a private school, the cost could well be \$5,000 a year. Therefore, during the two-year period when Susan's college career will overlap with that of her brother, the Doudses could well be faced with an educational tab of \$10,000 a year; assuming that the children pay one-third and that Mr. Doudses' parents pay another third, this means a balance of some \$3,300 for Chuck and Marty. The Doudses' third child, Laurie, an 11-year-old fifth grader, will be in college in the early 1980s.

Bracing for the impending financial drain, Marty Douds, who has a bachelor's degree in political science, went back to work last fall for the first time since the early days of the Doudses' 21-year marriage. She too has a job as a research assistant at Northwestern University, working 20 to 30 hours a week. "I'm not much of a housewife, and

I probably would have gone to work when Laurie was older anyway," she says.

The combined salaries of Chuck and Marty Douds total about \$21,000 a year; in addition, they receive about \$1,000 in interest from savings and from stock dividends. "We haven't been very sophisticated with our money," Mr. Douds says. "We just take a good chunk of the checks every month and put it into savings. We haven't tried to increase our financial leverage, but we haven't been foolish with our money either."

They really can't afford to be foolish. Indeed, the Doudses have found that their commitment to the education of their children—coupled with the rising cost of this family—is causing them to adopt a more austere spending plan than they had envisioned several years ago. Each of their children has a savings account earmarked for college expenses; and, Mrs. Douds says, "a good deal more money (is being put) into the kids' savings accounts" than ever before.

MORE FORTUNATE THAN OTHERS

In one very important sense, the Doudses are more fortunate than other families in similar situations. When the family first arrived in Chicago, Mr. Douds' parents bought them a nine-room, white frame house, turning the title over to their son after he received his doctorate. "Because they did that, we were able to get through those lean years without touching our savings," Mr. Douds says. "This has made the major difference now in our ability to provide for our children."

It also has meant that no money has been necessary for rent or mortgage payments, two outlays that saddle many another family. But even with that major asset, the family has been faced with rising costs attendant to their home ownership—their electric bill, for example, recently went up 11%, and their property taxes have been accelerating by about 7% a year. As a consequence of these and other price hikes, the family has been forced to postpone some purchases and projects and, in general, to take an increasingly restrictive attitude toward nonnecessities. Their house, for example, is over 50 years old and is badly in need of interior refurbishing. Mrs. Douds would like to have the drab, smudged walls painted or wallpapered. She would also like to have carpeting laid upstairs. The project, however, is being put off indefinitely.

"We'd like to fix up our home or buy a new car," Marty Douds says. "But you only have so much money coming in, and you have to put priorities on what you have." She adds: "Right now, education comes first."

The Doudses drive a 1968 Pontiac station wagon, also a gift from Mr. Douds' parents. The body is rusting out and the car goes only about nine miles on a gallon of gasoline; but rather than buying a new car, the family is relying more on public transportation. What's more, Mrs. Douds took a 12-week evening course in automotive maintenance at the local high school last fall and has since turned to tuning the car herself when it's needed. She says she saves \$60 to \$65 dollars each time through her do-it-yourself efforts, although the payoff won't be realized for several tunings because of an \$80 outlay for the necessary tools.

Mrs. Douds says the family hasn't had a "strict budget" for several years, "although I keep a tight eye on our food budget." Every week, she says, she takes on what she calls her "Thursday night assignment"—searching the newspaper food ads for the latest sales, clipping coupons and making out her shopping list. Friday mornings, she goes to six stores, buying only the weekly bargains at each establishment.

"I cash a check for \$70 before I leave and never spend more than that," she says. "I stick to my list and avoid any impulse buying." Because of inflation, she says, her weekly food budget has stayed about the

same despite one less mouth to feed (with Bryn away at school) and fewer luxury foods like steaks and roasts on the menu.

Although they get less for the same amount of money, "the way we spend our money hasn't changed appreciably since we started a substantial savings program for the kids' education," Mrs. Douds says. The family, she adds, tries to avoid credit purchases and has "no monthly payments on installment purchases or loans." Nevertheless, they do permit themselves the use of an American Express card and gasoline credit cards for what they term their "only luxury": travel. "If we have money left over," Marty Douds says, "we'd rather set it aside for a yearly trip" than for any other extravagance.

POSTPONED LUXURY

This year, however, that luxury is being postponed. The Doudses have canceled a planned summer vacation trip to San Diego because of "gasoline shortages and rising prices." They still have hopes, however, of one day getting to Scotland, a plan that has taken priority over a new car but that is still very much below the cause of education.

"When Bryn was a junior in high school it became a goal to have \$5,000 saved up for him before he entered college," Mrs. Douds says. "Susan will have the same thing before she is a freshman, and so will Laurie—although her need isn't as pressing now."

In the final analysis, the Douds family's existence is an illustration of how an income that only a few years ago was more than comfortable has become a bare minimum for a couple oriented toward the value of higher education for the children. It is not—at least not yet—a story of true hardship. Nor do the Doudses see their lives as being lives of hardship.

Says Chuck Douds: "We've purchased very little furniture in the house. But the old furniture, the cracks in the walls and the fingerprints on the woodwork don't disturb me at all—although sometimes we worry because people may misunderstand why we live the way we do."

REDD FOXF LANE IN ST. LOUIS, MO.

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to insert in today's RECORD a copy of an article by Mickey McTague on the commemoration of Redd Foxx Lane in St. Louis, Mo.:

A RED LETTER DAY FOR ST. LOUIS AND REDD

(By Mickey McTague, Jr.)

His real name is John Elroy Sanford. He was born in St. Louis many years ago. And John Sanford—proprietor of "Sanford & Son" on NBC-TV returned to his hometown, April 20th, 1974 to have a street named in his honor, and to perform a fund-raising show at the famed Powell Symphony Hall for his friends, Congressman William L. Clay, License Collector Ben Goins and City Comptroller, John F. Bass.

The day was almost marred by tragedy when one of the workers bringing the signs—"Redd Foxx Lane" suffered a severe heart ailment and died on the spot, just prior to the festivities.

In fact, this instance sort of summed up the struggle Redd Foxx had and other Blacks who attempted to achieve recognition and fame: just as the "festivities" were to begin, something drastic "drags us back."

But the show at Powell Symphony Hall was a sell-out, with Foxx's friends, comedian Slappy White and other performers.

Congressman William L. (Bill) Clay, Democrat of Missouri, brought his Washington friends, Honorable Charles B. Rangel, 19th District of New York and Congressman Louis Stokes, 22nd District of Ohio.

Comedian Foxx reminded all of them that there would be "no streaking on Redd Foxx Lane."

"We were so poor," said Redd to the crowd of adults and teenagers, "I was born on a vacant lot—and then the city made us move."

There were genuine tears in John E. Sanford's eyes as License Collector Benjamin Goins presented a special street plaque to Foxx declaring West Spring Avenue, "Redd Foxx Lane."

West Spring Avenue is a street running in a north-south direction between Finney Avenue on the south and Page Blvd. on the north. It's an area of Saint Louis that once represented at least to some degree respectability and middle-income families, but then came the 20's, the 30's, the Depression and all of the other woes that beset major cities, and the decline began.

Congressman William L. (Bill) Clay placed the ceremony in perspective.

"I can see by this throng of well-wishers," said the First District Congressman from Missouri, "who your real heroes are. They are not the pimps and the black morons who are portrayed on the motion picture screens of today. This is not, nor has it ever been, the true and realistic image of the Black citizen of this country; the so-called Black heroes of Hollywood are as ridiculous as was the shufflin' feet of Stepin Fetchit."

The Congressman went on to say that it was a Red Letter Day for Saint Louis and Redd Foxx; and, particularly for the Black community, which had banded together for unity and community betterment.

Congressman Charles Rangel of the 19th District of New York said "... it was good to come and laugh and party and get away from Washington—where half the White House is in prison—and the other half is going."

The Congressman said, "I congratulate your political leaders in this community, and you—the voters—you have superb leaders in John Bass, Ben Goins and Bill Clay. United—we can take and make many stands—and together, there is very little we cannot do in a host of new, different ways."

Redd Foxx's old high school band began to play. The Vashon High School Band marchers strutted up and down Redd Foxx Lane, singing, "We Shall Overcome" and "Glory, Glory Alleluia!"

National press, radio and TV converged on the gathering as John Elroy Sanford, who grew up in the shadows of West Spring Avenue, and hustled the streets to survive a society that would not accept him on his basis as a youth, proudly accepted the street plaque: "Redd Foxx Lane," and said, "The people of Saint Louis have saw fit to honor me with a street bearing my famous TV name. I hope this avenue opens up a two-way thoroughfare of progress and peaceful evolution for this city and this country."

Appearing with Congressman Clay were Comptroller John Bass and Benjamin Goins. Collector Goins saw the occasion as one of joy and hope. "Let this be an unforgettable gathering—where we can look back and say to our children, and their children ... that the Black Community has assumed its rightful position in politics as a functioning and free body, independent of outside forces and manipulation. We have not only taken the FIRST step together; we are walking TOGETHER into the sunlight of a new dawn of awakening."

When the sun sank over Redd Foxx Lane and the thousands of well-wishers and supporters arrived at Powell Symphony Hall for

the fund-raising ceremonies and star-studded show, the ringing phrases of John Bass, Ben Goins and Bill Clay were in the ears for all to hear:

"More than anything, your efforts speak loudly and clearly that we are all stepping to the tune of the same drummer, as we face the grave issues of the community. We believe the people are weary of disunity and are serious in their search for political unity."

That they were.

In the 1973 Comptroller's race, for example, the Saint Louis American Newspaper pointed out on April 26, 1973—

"Although the black wards were outvoted, the pluralities they gave Poelker (Mayor John H.) and Comptroller Bass were enough to overcome the advantages Republicans Joseph L. Badaracco and Fred Whaley (Bass' opponent) achieved in the wards outside the black belt. Although the Black wards only produced about 30 per cent of the vote, Poelker got 84 per cent of it and Bass took 90 per cent."

The article went on to say that the black political leaders were together and the vote they amassed for their candidates brought them victory. This is black power in action and it underscores a theme that we have advocated in this newspaper—to be politically potent doesn't mean that you have to support a black candidate for every office. But it does mean that you support the candidate of your choice; the one who will do us the most good."

Certainly, April 20th, 1974 was a Red Letter Day for Red Foxx, and Bass, Goins and Clay and the citizens of the community.

U.S. CHEMICAL WARFARE POLICIES

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my attempt to keep the other Members informed of developments relevant to the House examination of U.S. chemical warfare policies, I have on past occasions asked to have certain articles inserted in the RECORD. I think that the enclosed report from Nature magazine, an international scientific journal, summarizes quite accurately the issues which have evolved over the past several months. Without objection, I would like to have this article included in the RECORD for the purpose of informing the other Members of the international view of our activities on this issue. The article follows:

UNITED STATES AT CHEMICAL WAR CROSSROADS

The prospects for international control of chemical weapons could well hang on the results of an intensive review of the United States chemical warfare policy now being conducted by the Nixon administration. It is the first such review for nearly five years.

Begun quietly by the National Security Council (NSC) in December last year, the review is a two-pronged study, first of an impasse which for four years, has prevented the United States from ratifying the most important chemical weapons treaty ever negotiated—the so-called Geneva Protocol of 1925, which bans the first use of chemical weapons in war. And, at the same time, the NSC is taking a close look at the Pentagon's plans to modernize its existing nerve gas stockpiles by replacing them with a new generation of chemical weapons called bina-

ries. According to Administration spokesmen who testified on nerve gas policies before a congressional subcommittee earlier this month, the review should be completed in the next few months.

Meanwhile, Congress is also faced with an important decision in the chemical warfare area, for the Pentagon has already requested approval of funds to begin producing binary weapons at the Pine Bluff arsenal in Arkansas. A decision must be made this summer on whether or not those funds will be approved.

These reviews and decisions are taking place against a backdrop of international negotiations being conducted in Geneva under the auspices of the 26-nation conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), the ultimate aim of which is to negotiate a treaty banning not only the use of chemical weapons in war but also their production and stockpiling. In other words, the goal is complete worldwide disarmament. What happens in Washington in the next few months will be crucial to the outcome of those negotiations.

At present, the official Administration policy on chemical warfare, as outlined by President Nixon in a statement in November 1969, is that the United States will never be the first to use chemical weapons in a war, and that it has renounced entirely the use, production and stockpiling of bacteriological weapons. Coupled with the no-first-use policy, however, is the understanding that in the absence of worldwide chemical disarmament, the United States army needs to maintain extensive stockpiles of nerve gas to deter other countries from initiating chemical warfare or, if deterrence fails, so that the United States can retaliate in kind. For those reasons, some 45 million pounds of nerve gases are now stockpiled in bases throughout the United States, in Johnston Island in the Pacific, and at one location in Germany.

Unfortunately, however, since the United States has never ratified the Geneva Protocol the policy of no first use of chemical weapons is nothing more than a promise, and until the protocol is ratified, United States intentions will never have the force of international law. At present, ratification is bogged down in a dispute between the Administration and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee over the Administration's interpretation of the terms of the protocol. It will be crucial to the outcome of the CCD talks that this impasse be broken.

The nub of the matter is that when President Nixon submitted the protocol to the Senate for approval in 1970, he did so with the express understanding that riot control agents and herbicides are not included in its provisions. In other words, even if the United States government formally ratifies the protocol it would still consider itself free to use those agents in warfare—in fact the United States army was doing just that in Vietnam at the time Nixon submitted the protocol to the Senate. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee argued, however, that the protocol should include all chemical weapons and it is refusing to put the matter to a vote in the full Senate until the Administration backs down from its interpretation.

There the issue has rested for the past four years, but at least the NSC is now taking a close look at the Administration's position. Whether a complete change of mind will ensue from the review is, however, doubtful to judge by statements made by Administration officials who testified before a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee earlier this month. Mr. Amos A. Jordan, Assistant Secretary for Defense for International Security, argued that herbicides and riot control agents played a valuable and "humane" role in the Vietnam war, for example, and he said that the Administration's position has not changed.

Failure to ratify the Geneva Protocol is understandably viewed within the CCD talks as a severe stumbling block in the path of efforts to secure a more extensive treaty which would outlaw chemical weapons entirely. Furthermore, a treaty outlawing the production, use and stockpiling of biological weapons, which was negotiated at the CCD talks a couple of years ago, is also held in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee awaiting a final resolution of the Geneva Protocol dispute.

That is bad enough, but according to a number of observers, the Pentagon's plans to develop binary weapons could eventually kill the CCD talks entirely. Binary weapons have been under development by the United States army for the past ten years or more, but they are now coming up for a number of crucial decisions. In short, the weapons consist of two "relatively non-toxic" chemical components which form a lethal nerve gas when they are mixed together. The idea is that they would be kept apart until they are required for use, and they would then be fed into separate compartments in a shell and allowed to mix only when the shell is safely on its way to the target.

The Pentagon's argument for binaries is simple enough. Since the weapons are safe to store, produce and transport, they form ideal replacements for the existing ageing stockpiles of nerve gases. According to official army statements, nerve gas munitions have shelf life of only 15 years, and thus existing stock of filled weapons will have to be replaced by about 1985. Consequently, in September last year, the army began to tout the advantages of binary weapons in public statements and in congressional testimony, and it has now asked Congress to approve a request for \$5.8 million to begin production of 155-mm binary-equipped artillery shells. That request is now under consideration—in secret—by a Congressional Appropriations Committee: it is being hinted that the request is running into some trouble.

The binary programme is being opposed by a small number of congressmen concerned chiefly over the possibly damaging effects of a massive new chemical weapons programme on the Geneva CCD talks, and they seem to be picking up some influential support from a few conservatives connected with military affairs—a sign, perhaps, of the way the wind is blowing, is that the House Armed Services Committee recently voted to cut about \$1.9 million from the Pentagon's request for research and development related to binaries (this, it should be noted, would be an entirely separate demand from the demand for production funds).

One particularly effective argument, which surfaced during the House Foreign Affairs Committee hearing earlier this month, is that the Administration is now conducting an "urgent review" of the binary programme itself, and that Congress should therefore delay approving the Pentagon's request for production funding, at least until the National Security Council has decided whether or not the Administration is actually in favor of the programme. At present the Congress is placed in the position of deciding whether or not to provide money for a programme which may be killed off by executive fiat at some future date—a situation that would arise only in the highly sensitive region of defense spending, and which gives substance to the view that there is little executive scrutiny of the Pentagon's annual demands before their submission to the Congress.

Although that argument may ultimately carry most weight in the Congress, it became clear during the House hearings that the binary programme could well be in trouble for a variety of other reasons, and that there is a division of opinion actually within the Administration on the merits of pushing ahead with a chemical weapons programme

of any variety at the current stage of the Geneva talks. The NSC review of the binary programme will inevitably be subjected to some critical "input" from the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which has admitted serious disquiet over the possibility of a proinary decision damaging—perhaps fatally—the CCD discussions. Dr. Fred Ikle, Director of ACDA for the past year, said, under heavy questioning from the committee chairman last week that: "It is my judgment, based on arms control considerations—and this is a personal view—that at this time the pros and cons come out in favour of not going into production (of binaries)".

The military view, as expressed by Mr. Jordan, is that present nerve gas stockpiles "do not fully provide the capability we believe is necessary to adequately support all United States forces in case chemical warfare is used against us. "Binaries," he said, "provide significant operational and safety advantages over any other known approach which could have been selected for modernization."

The situation is therefore the familiar one of the official United States negotiating position being in favour of disarmament, yet at the same time the Pentagon is pushing for a new weapons programme. According to Representative Patricia Schroeder, who attended the CCD talks last year as an official United States observer, "Where many nations last summer simply regarded the United States as having assigned a rather low priority to CCD activities, by mid-March, as the 26 reconvened, one of the more influential western delegates, Dr. Alfonso Garcia Robles, leader of the Mexican delegation, went so far as to suggest that we plan to trigger a chemical arms race."

Another factor which has recently been injected into the binary debate—and one which could ultimately prove decisive—is the potential opposition of Western European governments to the programme. In fact, Mr. Leon Sloss, Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs, admitted under questioning by the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the binary programme is running into some diplomatic difficulties.

The reason is simple. Binary weapons make sense only if they are deployed in forward positions, ready to retaliate against an aggressor who initiates chemical warfare. In other words, nerve gases stored in depots in the United States would be of little use as quick response weapons against the Soviet Union, and the only place it makes sense to keep the weapons is in Europe. Sloss refused to discuss the subject in open session, but admitted that any attempt to expand nerve gas stocks in Western Europe would run into difficulty.

Some British observers feel that the outcome of all this will be that the Administration will decide that the programme is not worth the diplomatic storm that it may cause and that it will eventually be stopped. But sources on Capitol Hill, while remaining moderately optimistic, believe that the issue is far from decided.

DUKE ELLINGTON

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, Edward Kennedy "Duke" Ellington, one of the world's greatest musicians and a cornerstone of the American cultural experience, died May 24 at the age of 75. Known throughout the world for the style and the substance of his music, Mr. Ellington made the magic of music come alive for millions.

Incredible as it may sound, Mr. Ellington composed over 6,000 pieces of music in his lifetime, including such American classics as "Mood Indigo," "Don't Get Around Much Anymore," "Satin Doll," and "Solitude." Ralph Gleason, a noted jazz critic and historian, once called him "America's most important composer," and described him as a "master musician, master psychologist, and master choreographer."

Duke Ellington's resourcefulness as a composer was only matched by his brilliance as a conductor. Widely acclaimed as one of the greatest bandleaders of all time, he led an orchestra which played continually for 56 years. In his lifetime, he received countless awards and tributes for his musical excellence, including the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Mr. Speaker, words really cannot describe the essence of the Ellington experience; for he dedicated his life to creating his own special language—the universal language of one man's music. I would like to take this opportunity however, to salute this man, and thank him for the many fine contributions he made to America.

REALTORS SUPPORT H.R. 10294

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1974

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, a number of important business and development-oriented associations support the Land Use Planning Act of 1974, including the National Realty Committee, the Mortgage Bankers Association, and the International Council of Shopping Centers.

Today I received a letter of support from the National Association of Realtors adding their support to this legislation. The National Association of Realtors represents some 500,000 real estate licensees and 50 State associations and I am extremely pleased to add their support for this legislation. I think this support reflects the growing realization by responsible elements of the business community of our need for planned, orderly growth. The letter follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1974.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The National Association of Realtors, an organization of 500,000 real estate licensees holding membership in 1,630 local boards of realtors and 50 State Associations, is deeply committed to the intelligent use of the land with which we are so intimately involved.

To that end, we have sought the development of sound and reasonable land use legislation, but we have never been blind to the inherent dangers of seeking such an approach. Accordingly, we have expressed, both to the Senate and to the House of Representatives, our overriding concern to preserve the authority of state and local governments to develop land utilization procedures. Accordingly, we have opposed any effort on the part of the federal government to become directly involved in planning the use of private land. Furthermore, we encourage the participation of the public, particularly including representatives from the real estate industry and the business community, in the development

of land use procedures at state and local levels.

Last year, the Senate passed S. 268. We believe that S. 268 violates the principle of federal non-involvement in land use decision-making. We also believe that the bill which emerged from the Environment Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs lacked those safeguards.

We are encouraged by Congressman Udall's acceptance of a number of amendments to his original bill. These amendments seem to us to be more consistent with the stated policy on land utilization promulgated by the National Association of Realtors in 1973 and 1974.

We have pursued a course of reasonable compromise in our discussions with Mr. Udall and Mr. Ruppe. As a consequence of these discussions, we support H.R. 10294. We are further encouraged that, when the House considers land use legislation, key sponsors of H.R. 10294 are willing to accept even clearer definitions of the proper roles of the different levels of government and stronger safeguards to protect private property rights.

We are hopeful that the bill will pass and recognize that the acceptance of its key provisions by the House and Senate conferees is essential to the maintenance of the balance which we seek.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH B. DOHERTY,
President.

DISSOLVING THE SUGAR ACT

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago, the United States was in throes of an economic crisis. American farmers were destroying their crops in the fields because the cost of harvesting exceeded the value of the crops on the open market. To help alleviate this pressing problem, Congress provided subsidies to farmers and established market quotas in a variety of important domestic agricultural commodities, including sugar.

Today, in 1974, we face a different economic crisis—the skyrocketing cost of living. The Consumer Price Index has risen a shocking 10.2 percent in the past 12 months. To help meet this problem, the outdated network of quotas, subsidies, and price supports, which has benefited domestic sugar producers at public expense for the past four decades, should be dissolved.

Supporters of the Sugar Act claim that the program aids the consumer by insuring low prices. They point out that the world price of raw sugar averaged \$9.31 per pound in 1973 while the regulated American price averaged \$8.65 per pound. Yet these 1973 statistics are an exception to the economic rule of the past 20 years. In 9 of the past 10 years and 18 of the past 20, the American price of sugar has been higher than the world price.

If foreign producers had free access to the American market in those years, American consumers would have paid less for sugar and the many food products containing sugar. Economic experts expect the world sugar price to resume its

customary place below the protected American price in the immediate future. Unless the sugar program is terminated, Americans will again be paying more for sugar than they would in a free market economy.

Another argument frequently advanced in support of this program is that the Government pays nothing to maintain it since money paid out in subsidies to growers is offset by tariff and duty revenues collected on imported sugar. The fallacy of this assertion is that both subsidies and import duties are ultimately paid for by the American consumer. The \$90 million doled out to domestic sugar producers each year come out of public tax revenues. Import duties are passed along to the public in the form of higher prices for foreign sugar and sugar products. If we abandon this wasteful program, consumers could buy sugar produced overseas at the lower world price.

The bill reported out by the Committee on Agriculture did provide for changes which would improve the present Sugar Act by reducing subsidies and strengthening the protection of the poverty-stricken workers in this industry. Yet the committee bill retained the structure of import quotas and grower subsidies which keeps the price of sugar at artificially inflated heights.

In addition, H.R. 14747 perpetuated inflationary price objectives bound by a floor without a corresponding ceiling. Finally, the bill eliminated the present excise tax on domestically manufactured sugar while raising the price objective, further augmenting grower income while bringing about an inevitable increase in price to be borne by the American consumer.

Some labor groups have expressed fears that if the Sugar Act is allowed to lapse, the few existing protections for sugar workers will disappear. I strongly support legislation to provide workers in our sugar fields with a fair living wage, decent working conditions, and adequate protection against mistreatment or accident. Such legislation, however, can be enacted on its own merits, without continuing to subsidize sugar growers at public expense. It is time that Congress began living up to its responsibility to stem the spiraling cost of living by giving millions of dollars in sugar subsidies back to the people and restoring the free market in this vital commodity.

HEALTH SERVICES

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important areas of legislative and national concern centers around our system for the delivery of and payment for health services. This is, and ought to be, a matter of the greatest public interest,

and attention has increasingly focused upon some form of national health insurance as the best remedy for the defects of the current system.

Many Members of Congress, and citizens who are concerned in this area, are trying to probe the complex professional and economic factors involved in the various national health insurance proposals. Therefore, I am very pleased to be able to submit for the RECORD the following excellent analysis of the goals and factors which ought to be carefully considered in any national health insurance plan. This analysis was presented by Belle Likover on behalf of the Cleveland Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers at the Northeast Ohio Congressional Council hearings:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS, INC., CLEVELAND AREA CHAPTER

Cleveland, Ohio, May 17, 1974.

Hon. LOUIS STOKES,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STOKES: We appreciated the opportunity to be heard at the Northeast Ohio Congressional Hearings on May 10 on the subject of a national health insurance plan.

This letter follows up on your request at the meeting for material comparing the Kennedy-Mills Bill and the Nixon plan. We are sending you a comparative statement, prepared by the Committee for National Health Insurance and distributed by the Americans for Democratic Action, regarding the three major proposals now under consideration. This is the clearest statement we know of the major differences.

As you know from our enclosed testimony, we approve the major thrust of Kennedy-Mills (H.R. 13870), but have reservations about the regressive features of the contributions base, the hardships which the deductibles and co-insurance features will have upon the working poor and lower middle class, the lack of consumer controls, and the free hand given the drug companies and medical care providers in price and fee setting.

At the same time, Kennedy-Mills has more progressive features than the Nixon Bill. In brief these are:

1. The deductibles and co-insurance features are less harsh and costly;
2. The role of the private insurance companies is reduced to that of fiscal intermediaries as in Medicare. However, since their track record is dubious in the latter case, there should be strict controls against profiteering;
3. A single system for all Americans as against the Nixon plan of separate systems for rich and poor;
4. More equitable insurance payments according to income;
5. Somewhat better cost and quality controls (these are actually absent in the Nixon plan);
6. Steps to assure basic reform of the health care system, notably a Health Resources Development Board, which would address itself to issues of health manpower development, geographic distribution of physicians, etc.;
7. Most significant of all perhaps is the fact that unlike the Nixon plan, which is voluntary, the Kennedy-Mills Bill is compulsory.

We urge your support and attention to the issues in our testimony which, if translated into appropriate amendments, could for the first time in history produce a bill capable of beginning to meet the health care needs of all Americans.

Sincerely,

BELLE LIKOVER.

TESTIMONY FOR THE NORTHEAST OHIO
CONGRESSIONAL COUNCIL HEARINGS

(Prepared for the Social Policy and Action Division of the Cleveland Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers by Ruth Ellen Lindenberg, presented by Belle Likover and Members of the division)

Since the House Ways and Means Committee of which Congressman Vanik is a member, is currently giving attention to the Kennedy-Mills Bill, we would like to address ourselves to this bill today.

We affirm the basic purposes of the Act (1) creation of national health insurance benefits aiming at comprehensive health care for all Americans, (2) modification of the present health care delivery system by adding new provisions for cost and quality control, (3) the development of new health care service capability utilizing national, state and area-wide planning. We are gratified that coverage is mandatory not voluntary, and universal not categorical. We note also that there is cognizance, unlike in the prior Medicare and Medicaid Acts, that existing facilities and manpower are inadequate to accomplish its purposes and can, indeed, lead to serious inflation of medical care costs unless resource development keeps pace with need and tight fiscal and quality controls are established.

While affirming the basic thrust of Kennedy-Mills, we have serious reservations on several counts:

1. Inadequacy of coverage of the working poor and lower middle class.

While we deplore a means test in principle, we find the proposed means test to be particularly harsh on the lower income person. If one is on public assistance or supplemental security income, he may make out reasonably well. Even the elderly under Medicare will benefit by the addition of unlimited hospital days and out-patient drug benefits. These are gains.

But, what about the family whose income lies between the legislated means test eligibility level (\$4800 for a family of four) and the modest but adequate budget standard of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (as of February 1974, \$13,190 for a family of four). Can such families handle deductibles and co-insurances up to 25% of the amount by which their income exceeds the means test? \$8800 is the cut-off point for any reduction in these deductibles and co-insurances for a family of four. Deductibles and co-insurance for this family would be \$1000 if illness is incurred. This is nearly 9% of the family's annual income. (The Bureau of Labor Statistics budgets allows roughly 5.3% for medical expenses for its modest but adequate budget family!)

Or, for example, the \$7000 income family. Can it manage the required deductible/co-insurance payments of \$550 or 8% of its income? We do not believe they can without serious inroads on food and other essentials or without foregoing medical care.

Let us remember too, that the low income family is generally the family with young children, prone to childhood diseases, sore throats, earaches and the sundry illnesses prevalent in children under 12. While well-child care is provided without deductibles or co-insurance for children under 6, this does not extend to sick-child care nor is well-child care available for the 6-12 year old. If we are truly concerned about the health of our children, this is intolerable. A recent study in Boston of 618 youth examined for a summer work program showed 47% with physical abnormalities, 16% severe. Half of the group with major disabilities and 84% with minor disabilities were found to have had inadequate medical care. Other studies, including the draft rejection figures from the last war, support the conclusion that children in our affluent society do not get the care they need and in fact grow to adulthood with serious correctable but uncorrected defects.

We urge amendments to the Kennedy-Mills Bill to correct the inequities that discriminate against the working poor and lower income family.

II. Cost Controls:

Review of the bill reveals that service fee-setting will be done by "the medical societies or equivalent organizations" subject to specified controls (section 2046). Supervision of drug costing falls under a Formulary Committee composed mostly of physicians. According to the Act prices are listed at the figure at which proprietary drugs are generally sold by suppliers, taking into consideration "reasonable allowances with respect to out-patient drugs and biologicals" (Section 2047). Note particularly that the bill contains no requirement that generic drugs be substituted for expensive proprietary drugs. Indeed, the door looks not ajar but wide open for abuses!

While we can hardly claim to be medical economists, we are keen observers of the many flagrant practices that have arisen in fee charging for services and drugs (gang visits in nursing homes, kick-backs on drugs, etc.) under Medicare. We believe that the bill may fail to provide adequate measures to prevent such abuses.

We also question the role of the private insurance companies under the Kennedy-Mills Act. Past experience substantiates that the "Blues" and other private insurance companies have done little to monitor fees or to institute measures to hold the cost in line. We believe that stringent cost controls, water tight regulations, and severe penalties for violations must be mandated if huge sums of money poured into the medical care system are to be converted to "people" services, not to padding the incomes of medical care providers and insurance carriers.

III. Consumer Representation:

The Act provides for several presumably high level advisory bodies. While the National Health Insurance Resources Advisory Board (Section 1401, 1421) requires a majority of members representative of consumer interests, it appears that physicians and service providers may dominate the influential Health Insurance Benefits Advisory Council (Section 2046) and the Formulary Committee (Section 2047). Lack of consumer representation would seem to be a serious lack. Health care as a social utility should be subject to public priorities, standards, and accountability. Consumer participation can no longer be a gesture, it should be mandated. We urge that the bill be amended to insure this at all levels.

IV. Long Term Care:

While we are heartened by the provision of long term care benefits emphasizing ambulatory and health maintenance services, we are concerned that enrollment is on a voluntary basis. The premium of \$6 per month is modest. Yet we have only to remind ourselves that one out of four persons over 65 have an income below the poverty level to realize that this premium prices out individuals who may need coverage the most. We urge that long term care be made available without this unrealistic premium.

V. Role of Social Service in a National Health Insurance:

Medical social services are an integral part of comprehensive health care, directly related to appropriate utilization of medical care at all levels. While the humanitarian concern for helping individuals and families to deal with the economic and social dislocations associated with illness is the primary reason for social services in health programs, these services make a distinct contribution to the economics of medical care. Older persons denied social service planning by default end up in costly long term care facilities. Medical care costs for neglected children mount when contributory social problems are not attended. Hospital days are extended when lack of planning

does not prepare patients of all ages for discharge from the hospital.

Contemporary social work with its community organizing, advocacy, and planning skills also has a critical role to play in the planning and monitoring of health care. Social workers speak for a public which they have intimate connections with at times of greatest stress and crisis.

The Kennedy-Mills Bill is silent on the inclusion of social services as a required component in the medical care service spectrum. We recommend that medical social services be included by name in the various benefit packages and defined separately in the list of definitions for all care components. We also ask for provision for payment for services rendered on both agency based and independent practice. In addition, we ask that social workers be represented at all levels of policy making.

VI. Health Manpower:

Section 1417 gives the Health Insurance Resources Development Board the mandate "to provide education for health personnel where there is the greatest need". Physicians rate a high priority and are identified by profession in the bill. We believe that social work manpower also falls into the category of greatest need. We therefore request that the bill be amended to provide for the training for social work manpower and that appropriations be provided for training and student stipends.

We appreciate the opportunity to testify, thank the congressmen of Northeast Ohio for their patience, and urge their help in the passage of a comprehensive, well-rounded health bill.

Dr. Russell Roth, President of the prestigious American Medical Association says (TV News, April 26) there is no medical care crisis. This may well be for physicians' families whose medical care can be secured via professional courtesy, for the drug companies whose profits have ballooned to unconscionable proportions in the last few years, and for doctors who in increasing numbers practice in the lucrative specialties instead of family medicine.

Ask the blue collar worker if there is a medical care crisis. The worker whose family cannot get day to day maintenance medical care because its employment-related private insurance, often as high as \$65 per month, does not pay for the out-of-hospital care most families with small children need most. Ask the poverty level family in the inner city whose neighborhood no longer has a doctor and who must utilize our crowded clinics, if such are even accessible by public transportation. Ask the Senior Citizen at this point in time when Medicare currently defrays only 42% of the medical bills of the aged.

The Division on Social Policy and Action of the Cleveland Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers believes there is a medical care crisis and that large numbers of people do not get needed medical care because of cost, inaccessibility, and the insufficiency of physicians interested in general medicine. The Division urges support for the passage of a comprehensive national health insurance program financed by Social Security and general revenue which will provide comprehensive equity, pre-paid medical benefits for all Americans, guarantee cost controls, and assure appropriate professional standards. Its criteria for such a bill are included in today's testimony. We urge that the merit of any proposed bill be judged by these.

APPENDIX: POSITION STATEMENT ON A NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN

The Social Policy and Action Division of the Cleveland Area Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, representing 900 professional social workers, wishes to go

on record as supporting a national health insurance program.

To provide for the medical care needs of all Americans, such a plan should:

1. Establish a national health insurance fund, pooling risks and financed by social security taxes and general revenue, without reliance on private insurance.

2. Provide a single track program (a program that does not separate medically indigent from those who can afford to pay for care) of pre-paid benefits without deductibles or co-insurance features to assure com-

prehensive care for all; health maintenance service, emergency care, diagnostic service, ambulatory care, hospitalization, supportive social services (including transportation), mental health care, home health services, rehabilitation, and medications and appliances.

3. Insure consumer participation at all levels of policy making and monitoring of care.

4. Establish quality of care standards enforced by well-defined procedures.

5. Establish and monitor cost controls

through the budgetary process to restrain the mounting cost of medical care.

6. Encourage collaboration among private individual fee for service system, group delivery systems, and public programs.

7. Provide strong incentives for group practice and support for the development of a variety of health maintenance organizations.

8. Establish manpower and education and training programs to insure the availability of health care personnel of all kinds, and the equitable distribution of health personnel among the population in need.

NATIONAL HEALTH SECURITY PROGRAM *Kennedy-Griffiths (S-3) (H.R. 22-23)*

Concept

Access to full health services as a right under one program.

Universal comprehensive health insurance for all U.S. residents regardless of age or income, including built-in cost and quality controls. Guarantees that all Americans receive the same high-level benefit coverage.

Abolishes Medicare, most of Medicaid, and some 19 other governmental programs which provide personal health services and integrates them into the universal plan.

Financing

Health Security Trust Fund derived as follows: 50% from general tax revenues; the balance from a 3.5% Health Security tax on the employer payroll; a 1% employee tax on the first \$15,000 of individual income; a 2.5% tax on the first \$15,000 of self-employment income.

Administration

Publicly administered program in Department of HEW, five-member, full-time Health Security Board appointed by the President. Ten HEW regions, 100 sub-regions. Advisory councils at all levels with majority of members representing consumer.

Benefits

Benefits cover the entire range of personal health care services including prevention and early detection of disease. There are no cutoff dates, no co-insurance, no co-deductibles, no waiting period.

Some limitations on adult dental care, psychiatric care, nursing home care and drugs. Provides pilot project benefit for the chronically ill and aged.

Quality Control

Establishes quality control commission and national standards for participating professional and institutional providers. Regulation of major surgery and certain other specialist services; national licensure standards and requirements for continuing education.

THE MAJOR DIFFERENCES COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN *The Nixon plan (S. 2970) (H.R. 12684)*

Concept

Three programs:

(1) Employer Health Insurance Plan (EHIP) requires all employers to offer a basic insurance package for their employees. (Employees may elect not to participate).

(2) Assisted Health Insurance Plan (AHIP) requires States to contract with insurance carriers for coverage of low-income persons and high-risk individuals. (Voluntary participation by individuals.)

(3) Continuation of Medicare Plan covering those 65 and over with certain modifications.

All three plans use private insurance carriers as intermediaries.

Financing

EHIP—Employer must pay 65%, 75% later. Employee pays 35%, 25% in three years.

AHIP—General revenues subsidize private insurance coverage for low-income and high medical risk persons. Premiums, deductibles and co-insurance adjustment based on income.

Medicare Plan—Uses present Social Security tax system and current 1.8% of payroll to \$13,200. (.9% employer and .9% employee). Also requires \$90 annual premium.

Medicaid—Certain state Medicaid programs continue. Additional \$1 billion annually required in state payments for new AHIP program.

Administration

Private insurance companies. Medicare retained, Medicaid abolished except for long-term care benefits.

Benefits

Benefits offered by all three plans for hospitalization and outpatient care would be identical but require extensive co-insurance and deductibles. Only those participating in program covered.

Limitations on dental care, drugs, psychiatric care, preventive care, home health services, eye care, nursing home care.

Deductibles in EHIP of \$150 for all services except drugs with family maximum of \$450. EHIP co-insurance of 25% after paying deductible. Maximum family deductibles and co-insurance, \$1,500. Deductibles and co-insurance also under AHIP and Medicare.

Quality Control

Relies on physician-controlled peer review organizations, i.e., Professional Standards Review Organizations.

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH INSURANCE ACT *Mills-Kennedy bill (S. 3268) (H.R. 13870)*

Concept

Health Insurance as part of the national system of Social Security, similar in structure to Medicare:

Two programs:

(1) Persons under 65 to be covered by a basic insurance plan financed with increased Social Security taxes.

(2) Medicare retained for the aged and disabled with expanded benefits.

Both plans use private insurance carriers as fiscal intermediaries.

Financing

Basic Plan—Individuals pay a tax of 1% on the first \$20,000 of income from any source (including welfare benefits). The self-employed pay a 2.5% tax on the same \$20,000 income base. Employers pay a 3% payroll tax. Federal and state contributions subsidized cost of covering low-income persons.

Medicare—Financed through a continuation of the 3% payroll tax on employer and employee. A new "Part C" benefit package for long-term care to be financed by voluntary individual premiums of \$6 a month. Additional subsidy of the long-term care package from state revenues now committed to Medicaid programs and federal revenues.

Medicaid abolished.

Administration

Independent Social Security Administration responsible for collection of taxes and administration of Trust Fund. Contracts with private insurance companies to handle benefit payments as fiscal intermediaries. (as in the Medicare program).

Benefits

Present Medicare benefits are retained but expanded to include a limited drug benefit, unlimited hospitalization and a voluntary long-term care program.

Basic plan, after deductibles are met, includes inpatient hospital services, physician services, 30 days hospitalization for mental illness, certain preventative services, home health and skilled nursing.

No cost sharing for families of four with incomes under \$4,800. Reduced cost sharing for families with incomes between \$4,800 and \$8,800. Families with income in excess of \$8,800 pay a per person deductible of \$150. Families with incomes in excess of \$8,800 pay a co-insurance of 25% on all services until the total of family expenditures for deductibles and co-insurance reach \$1,000. After that, no further cost sharing is required.

Quality Control

Relies on physician peer review organizations. Includes all services not just institutional services. Regulation of major surgery and certain other specialist services. National standards for participating institutional providers.

NATIONAL HEALTH SECURITY PROGRAM
Kennedy-Griffiths (S-3) (H.R. 22-23)

Cost Control

Operates on annual national budget, regional budget, negotiated prospective budgets for hospitals and other institutions, negotiated budgets for HMO's and prepaid group practices and negotiated budgets of physicians in solo practice charging on a fee-for-service basis.

THE MAJOR DIFFERENCES—Continued
COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN
The Nixon plan (S. 2970) (H.R. 12684)

Cost Control

Insurance company premiums to be controlled as they are at present—by "competition" and state insurance commission regulation.

Physicians to be paid on fee schedules but may charge patients above fee schedules.

Deductibles and coinsurance designed to make consumers increasingly "cost-conscious" so they will not "over-utilize" service and would seek least costly medical services when they need them.

Source: Committee for National Health Insurance.

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH INSURANCE ACT
Mills-Kennedy bill (S. 3268) (H.R. 13870)

Cost Control

Contains some incentives to improve the delivery system although the effectiveness of cost and quality controls will be substantially weakened by the private fiscal intermediaries.

NCOA AWARD TO SENATOR
JOHN TOWER

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 7, 1974

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, recently, the senior Senator from Texas, the Honorable JOHN TOWER, was recognized by the Noncommissioned Officers Association of the United States of America—NCOA—for his outstanding contributions to the legislative affairs of this great Nation.

The 160,000-plus member organization of noncommissioned and petty officers of the U.S. Armed Forces presented their third annual L. Mendel Rivers Award for Legislative Action to Senator TOWER, who is a full-fledged member of that group, the world's largest enlisted military association.

Three years ago, I had the honor of accepting the first award from the NCOA. Two years ago, the Honorable F. EDWARD HEBERT, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, received the second award, and I know that Senator TOWER is as proud as Mr. HEBERT and I to have been a recipient of such a handsome and meaningful trophy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator Tower's acceptance speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SPEECH MADE BY SENATOR JOHN TOWER UPON INTRODUCTION AND PRESENTATION OF THE L. MENDEL RIVERS AWARD FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION AT THE ANNUAL NCOA BANQUET/BALL, APRIL 19, 1974; INTRODUCTION BY MR. C. A. "MACK" MCKINNEY, DIRECTOR OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS; PRESENTATION BY MR. JAMES O. DUNCAN, PRESIDENT, NCOA

Thank you Mack, thank you Jim and thank you my fellow Non Commissioned Officers. I'm of course moved and highly honored that you should present this award to me and I'm sure I must feel pretty much like Bob Barker does. We crossed the paths of Bob Hope in Monterey and VietNam and other parts of this world many times, and I think that it is a singular honor that you pay us both tonight. Long having been associated with Strom Thurmond, Eddy Hebert, and the work of the armed services committees of our respective offices, and having been associated with the man for whom the award

is named, L. Mendel Rivers, one of the great patriots of this country, I am highly honored and I really think that I don't deserve it because it occurs to me that you are honoring me for what I consider to be my duty. I have had some rather strong instructions on that by an old chief boatswain who gave me a great deal of advice that I will not relate to you here this evening. I started out in the Navy the way that Bob Barker did, I was a naval aviation cadet. After a period of eight or nine months, the Navy in its infinite wisdom decided they did not want to entrust any of their expensive airborne hardware to my tender care. I washed out ending up as a deck hand on an amphibious gun boat and I have not regretted a minute of it since. I feel particularly honored that you would give this award to a Texan... because if my service experience is any guide certainly some of you must think that flaws exist in the credibility of most Texans...

So I know that I have some credibility problems simply by virtue of my native state; however, all these stories about Texans are hypercritical as we are tremendously honest people. A Texan never lies unless it is absolutely necessary. I am really proud to be a part of this organization and to know it is not just concerned with the welfare of its own constituency but is concerned about many things including the defense of the United States. We hear a great deal of talk about priorities these days, and we hear enough people suggest that we can't produce both guns and butter, this is erroneous to begin with because we have an economy that can produce both. There are those who say that our priorities should be for human need, that we must lavish federal monies on trying to help the underprivileged and disadvantaged of this country, and indeed my friends we should help those who, due to circumstances beyond their control, cannot help themselves.

We would be inhuman if we thought otherwise. But we should note that as a percentage of our national budget and as a percentage of our gross national products our outlays on defense has gone down steadily over the past few years. Indeed only 30 percent of your tax dollar now goes to defend your country. Some 47 percent goes to what is called human resources. So now that has been established as a priority from the spending standpoint but I must suggest strongly to you, my friends, that the defense of the United States is, and must be, our number one national priority. You cannot have a free society, you cannot have an influential society and you certainly cannot have a society that is capable of looking to the needs of those less privileged among its citizens... if you do not first have a secure flag... we have no design on the territories or the people of the areas of the world.

We want to defend ourselves, to deter any-

one who might have aggressive designs on the United States, and further, we want to create a climate in the world in which all people can aspire to self determination... and then have some reasonable hope of realizing that aspiration. It is essential that we maintain a military strength that is at least at parity with that of the other great super power, the Soviet Union. If we allow ourselves to slide into a position of military inferiority to the Soviets, this is what would happen.

Other nations of the world no longer are confident that the United States can provide a strategic umbrella to protect them. That the United States in a position of military weakness can no longer honor its commitments, when the United States can no longer maintain a credible military presence in other parts of the world then they will seek to make their own accommodation with the Soviets and ultimately there will not be two super powers of this world, there will be only one and it will be able to impose its will on this earth without ever firing a shot. They won't need to, because they can and will embark on political and economic adventures. They can intimidate and they can threaten because there is no one to stop them. We would eventually find ourselves isolated and we are not a self sufficient nation any more. We are dependent on others and we must maintain some political and economic influence in this world, in our own national interest.

Once having been isolated and seeing the economy of the world dominated by what is hardly a benevolent super bomb, we would find ourselves steadily deteriorating in the terms of the possession of resources necessary to elevate the condition of our people to bring up those who are low on the socio-economic scale or to maintain the high standard that most of us have come to enjoy. This very subject of why the security of the United States is our number one priority must also equate with the security of the free world. I am so glad that there is an organization like us that is dedicated to that proposition. I am proud to be a part of you; you honor me too much and I thank you so very much for allowing me to sit at your table.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
CLARKE-McNARY ACT

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in joining with my colleagues of the House Subcommittee on Forestry in

recognizing June 7, 1974, as the 50th anniversary of the Clarke-McNary Act.

A very important but little known provision of this act permitted private owners to donate forested lands to the Federal Government. These donations were added to various National Forests.

Under this provision, 355,000 acres of forested lands have been dedicated by public-spirited individuals for multiple use purposes to be enjoyed by all people.

**NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT
JUSTICE CHARLES J. GAUGHAN**

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, Supreme Court Justice Charles J. Gaughan, a good friend, distinguished jurist, and highly respected State leader died recently.

His long and accomplished career spanned more than 30 years, having served as Hamburg supervisor and assistant district attorney before becoming a county judge. His 11 years as a county and supreme court judge earned him a reputation as a diligent worker and fairminded adjudicator.

His passion for work and devotion to the community led him to help organize a committee of town officials in 1961 which accomplished the first major revision in the State's town law since 1933. As an innovator, Judge Gaughan also played a major role in organization of the pioneering traffic violators school for Erie County.

While the death of Justice Gaughan will leave a very real void in the hearts of all New Yorkers who knew him, it is indeed all of New York State that will miss him.

One indication of the Gaughan legacy rests in the fitting tributes paid him by all New Yorkers. Bob Curran, writing in the Buffalo Evening News, spoke eloquently about the Gaughan legacy—a family imbued with innate class—show in the tender and thoughtful way they chose to say goodbye for now to their beloved brother.

Bob Curran's eulogy follows:

THE GAUGHAN LEGACY: LOVE, HONOR, CLASS
(By Bob Curran)

On more than a few occasions when the talk has turned to the Kennedys as being the first American-Irish family, I dissented and said: "My vote would go to some bunch like the Gaughans right here in Western New York."

Then I would add something like: "Look at the record. Frank made deputy police commissioner, Vince is one of the influential Western New Yorkers on the Washington scene and is responsible for the Father Baker Bridge being so named, Charley's a State Supreme Court justice and Larry's a successful oral surgeon. Of course, Marie deserves a medal for just being the only girl in that family."

"Keep in mind that their father, Joseph Gaughan, was a scooper on the waterfront, not a multi-millionaire. And every one of the kids were raised in the First Ward. I rest my case."

I was mulling over that declaration

Wednesday when five words jumped from Judge Gaughan's obituary. They were, "foster brother James V. Speciale."

Perhaps the story of why James V. Speciale was on that list tells more about the atmosphere in which the Gaughans were brought up than any other story I have heard. The last time I was with Charley and Vince Gaughan was the night in January when Vince threw a party at the Buffalo Club for Democratic Majority Leader Tip O'Neill.

Among the other guests there was Jim Speciale. When I asked about his link to the family, I was told: "Oh, he was another nonrelative raised in the house. He was about 9 when his mother and father died and he just came to live with us." That kind act of Mary and Joseph Gaughan was made to sound like something everyone would do in a similar situation.

The other man in our group that moment was Dr. Herb Lee, who came to live with the Gaughans after his father died and his mother was obliged to move away from the area. Not too long after he joined the family, he and Vince became members of the Buffalo Police Department. It wasn't until after W.W. II that they could afford college.

When the police department was mentioned, both Vince and Herb broke up and it was minutes before Vince could tell what the joke was about. It seems that one time Vince told his mother that he couldn't pay his weekly board as the mayor had neglected to sign the officers' checks. Vince then neglected to tell Herb, who produced his board money as he did every week.

As they began talking about the old days, I began to get homesick for my big family. It seems that throwing water on friends and strangers alike was the big gag among the boys, and more than once Marie answered the door to find that her date of the evening was completely drenched, although there was no rain anywhere else on the street.

Another time Vince set what he thought was the perfect ambush for Herb. But just as he let the water—a pail's worth—fly, he saw that his victim was dressed in his (Vince's) new tuxedo, "my pride and joy." Somehow it reminded me of the time an older brother said, "Take my new belt off." My answer was: "If I do, your pants will fall down."

Among American-Irish, one of the finest compliments you can give a man is to say, "He is one of us." I've had it said to me by men whom I didn't want to be one of and vice versa. But I knew from the first that the Gaughans were people I wanted to know better.

Our first meeting came on the night before Independence Day in 1967. The former Mary Sullivan had come here to help shop for a house and arrived as the riots of that summer were at their peak. At that moment she would have made Glenn Dickey come on as a Buffalo booster.

Then Herb Lee, whom I had gotten to know in the month I had lived here alone, told us he wanted us to come to a Fourth of July bash at some friends' house. The friends were Marge and Vince and at different points during the night, we met the other members of the family.

After that I would run into Vince and Charley a lot. Whenever I did, my day was a little better for it. Just the mention of the name had made me chuckle, and I am sure it was because of their warm outlook on life.

Of course neither I nor anyone else saw Charley during the moments that he told Vince about one day. "Whenever I am faced with a difficult decision on the bench on sentencing day," he said, "I kneel down alone in my chambers and ask God to guide me on the right course. I can't tell you how many times I have gotten out of bed at night to kneel and pray that God would direct me to a just decision."

On the Mass cards distributed at the funeral Mass this morning were these words, "O Lord, God, who judges all men, remember your servant Charles, who constantly appeals to you for guidance."

"Remember also his mother and father whom he loved so dearly."

And who left him and the others raised by them a priceless legacy—an abundance of innate class which they showed in the tender and thoughtful way they chose to say "good-bye for now" to their beloved brother today.

The Buffalo Evening News also conveyed a part of Judge Gaughan's life in the following eulogy:

CHARLES GAUGHAN IS DEAD; A JURIST HERE FOR 11 YEARS

Supreme Court Justice Charles J. Gaughan, 52, died early today in Buffalo General Hospital after suffering a heart attack Tuesday in his Hamburg home.

A native of Buffalo's old First Ward, Justice Gaughan was a self-made man who worked in steel mills and put in a World War II hitch in the Army before embarking on a legal career.

He was a Town of Hamburg supervisor and justice of the peace and an assistant district attorney for 4½ years before he became a county judge in 1952.

During his nearly 11 years on the County Court and State Supreme Court bench, he built a reputation as a hard-working jurist who could trim down overloaded court calendars in a hurry.

He frequently left his own Courtroom to help out in critical judicial areas. He was detached for duty in the New York City area at times in other Western New York counties.

He also helped out with the welter of litigation stemming from the 1971 Attica Prison uprising.

He currently had been under serious consideration by Republicans as a running mate for Gov. Malcolm Wilson in his bid for reelection in this year's state election.

Justice Gaughan was born Sept. 28, 1921. His father, the late Joseph P. Gaughan, was a waterfront grain scooper.

"I grew up in a realistic neighborhood," Justice Gaughan later recalled. "In the First, Second and Third Wards in South Buffalo, you faced reality and you had to battle a lot."

He and his three brothers worked their way to distinguished careers in different fields. A brother, Dr. Lawrence A. Gaughan, is a dentist, Vincent M. Gaughan, an attorney, has risen to a high place in national political circles. He gained wide recognition as a top trouble-shooter for the late President John F. Kennedy.

A third brother, Francis P., became a deputy commissioner in the Buffalo Police Department, retiring in January, 1971.

Charles Gaughan was a bantamweight football player and trackman at South Park High School and also became a top-notch debater before his graduation in 1940.

He then went to work as a timekeeper at Worthington Pump Corp., and became a laborer for Bethlehem Steel Corp. in 1941.

"I weighed 155 pounds when I went to work in the mills," he recalled, "and I hit 159 before I left and there was no fat."

As a steelworker, he was part of the construction gang for building of Memorial Auditorium. He also started work for a degree as a part-time Canisius College student.

He was thinking about a medical career when he entered the World War II Army in 1943. He was discharged as a sergeant in 1946 after service in the Medical Corps. He said his experience as a medical corpsman turned his interest away from medicine and toward law.

He enrolled in the University of Buffalo and in a whirlwind scholastic career earned

his bachelor of arts degree in a year and 8 months.

He was graduated from the UB Law School in 1950 and admitted to the bar in 1951.

Throughout his college career, he worked to pay his expenses.

Meanwhile, he had taken on the responsibilities of a married man, marrying the former Mary Louise Bauer in 1943.

In private practice, he specialized in criminal law. Between 1952 and 1958, he put in a 4½-year stint as an assistant district attorney.

He was a busy assistant DA, doing much of the City Court and town justice court criminal trial work.

He was elected a Hamburg justice of the peace in 1963. Two years later he won election as Hamburg supervisor, at a time when a supervisor was a county legislator as well as an administrative officer.

In 1961, he helped organize a committee of town officials which drafted the Suburban Town Law passed by the 1973 Legislature, the first major revision of the state's town law since 1933.

He also helped organize and headed a committee of town and municipal representatives which settled tax equalization disputes in the county.

He also was an innovator as a judge, playing a major role in organization of the pioneering Traffic Violators School for Erie County.

On May 1, 1963, Gov. Rockefeller named him County Court judge. When he failed to win Republican organization endorsement for election to the court post that fall, he ran as an independent, winning the GOP nomination and later the election.

On Nov. 25, 1968, Gov. Rockefeller named him to the State Supreme Court. He won election the next year to a full 14-year term.

On both the County and Supreme Court benches, he was known as "a worker." He handled many difficult cases, including a drawn-out litigation over reapportionment of Chautauqua County. It ended last March when Justice Gaughan accepted a final apportionment plan for the county.

Last January, Justice Gaughan was named administrative judge of the 8-county Eighth Judicial District. The job entailed assignment of judges, even though he continued his duties as a trial judge.

Justice Gaughan was affiliated with a long line of fraternal, civic and professional organizations, many of them related to the legal profession and judiciary.

Among his favorite outside activities were as a trustee of Kenore Mercy Hospital and a member of the Men's Club of Emergency Hospital. He was on the Advisory Board of the Columbian Sisters.

Justice Gaughan described himself as "a very sentimental man" and on special occasions he often showed his emotions.

He said his hardest judicial role was passing sentence. He made this comment on that duty:

"No more awesome responsibility can fall to any human being than to sit in judgment of his fellow man. Scriptures admonish us: 'Judge not, lest you be judged.'

"To the members of the judiciary, it might be better said: 'Judge well, lest you be judged harshly.'"

FIGHTING FOREST FIRES

HON. JOHN MELCHER

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that while

the mills of the gods grind slowly they are very effective.

For example, the Clarke-McNary Act of June 7, 1924, had its genesis in a speech made in 1873 in Portland, Maine, by a physician, a Dr. Hough. He spoke on "the duty of governments in forests." His plea did not receive recognition until passage of the Clarke-McNary Act 51 years later.

Since that date in 1924, fire protection has been extended to more than 600 million acres, a great achievement, but we must not rest on our oars. There still are some 40 million acres scattered in a dozen States that do not receive fire protection of any kind and we are not at all liberal in Federal cost sharing for it. Costs are being shared 86 to 14 percent—with States and local communities carrying the 86 percent.

We need to get on with the task of protecting the remainder of the Nation's forest lands and sharing expense liberally enough to provide efficient, modern firefighting equipment, and manpower.

THE CASE FOR A FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION—NO. 41

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research's legislative analysis of the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation is an excellent contribution to the growing amount of literature on the subject.

The analysis includes some instructive comments about the role the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation would play in determining actual energy production costs and in making information about the energy industries available to the consumer.

I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress an excerpt from the institute's analysis, the text of which follows:

ISSUE OF THE COSTS OF EXPLORATION

Industry economists, government sources, and academicians do not always agree on the cost of natural gas and oil exploration, development, and production. Proponents of the FOGCO argue that this situation is the result of unwillingness—for business reasons—on the part of the petroleum companies to share information with their competitors and with agencies of the government. Lee White of the Energy Policy Task Force stated, however, that the "public's need to know what is going on . . . is paramount to private business requirements." Critics of the petroleum industry argue that the cloud of secrecy under which the industry operates limits competition. However, according to Senator Abourezk, the FOGCO would provide a much-needed independent yardstick by which to measure profits, costs, and production techniques. Instead of relying upon the artificially-based posted price, the consumers of this nation would be able to look at true cost figures. The provisions of this bill make such disclosure mandatory. No longer will the oil companies be able to hide behind their secret cost figures. No longer will the Administration reproduce company data. An opportunity for exact measurement of the

cost of oil and gas production would be created by this legislation.

In an effort to compile accurate records with respect to the actual cost of the wide range of activities involved in natural gas and oil development and production, the FOGCO proposal provides that the corporation would be subject to full regulation by the FPC and FPC pricing techniques.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND USE PLANNING ACT

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the sponsors of H.R. 10294, the Land Use Planning Act, plan to offer a package of amendments to the bill on the floor this week. These amendments are the result of various concerns expressed both at the recent hearings in April and by various organizations and Members who, while supporting the basic concepts in H.R. 10294, felt the need for clarification of the legislation in certain respects. These amendments are the result of various concerns expressed both at the recent hearings in April and by various organizations and Members who, while supporting the basic concepts in H.R. 10294, felt the need for clarification of the legislation in certain respects. These amendments are an effort by the bi-partisan sponsors and other Members to meet the legitimate concerns expressed and to clarify the intent of this legislation.

The amendments deal with the issues of first, Federal control, second, State and local government involvement, and third, private property rights.

FEDERAL CONTROL

A number of amendments clarify the intent of the sponsors that the Federal Government will not exercise any authority over State and local land use decisions. An amendment to section 106(d) (2) makes this crystal clear. Also, any possibility of such Federal control will be removed by deleting the provisions which would allow the Secretary to deny grants if a State failed to designate areas of critical environmental concern of more than statewide significance.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

A number of amendments will clarify the relationship between State and local government in the land use planning process. It is not the intent of this bill to change in any way existing State law and to mandate any particular allocation of authority in this area; any changes the people of a State desire will be a matter for State, and not Federal, legislation. Another amendment to be offered will clarify the intent of the legislation that matters of merely local concern will continue to be dealt with by local government.

PROPERTY RIGHTS

While the bill's sponsors are perplexed that this continues to be controversial, an amendment will further clarify the fact that nothing in this legislation can in any way affect property rights as defined

by the United States and State constitutions and laws.

OTHERS

Several amendments will be offered which: clarify the extent of regulation required in areas impacted by key facilities, affecting large scale developments and which encourage States to streamline their permit procedures affecting such developments. These amendments are constructive efforts to deal with problems raised by various business and real estate interests.

The amendment follows:

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 10294, AS REPORTED
Page 27, strike out line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

cost of shelter for people of all income levels; and

(c) the authority to manage or regulate non-Federal lands rests with the several States and their political subdivisions, and that general purpose local governments should continue to have the responsibility for making land use decisions which have no significant effect outside their jurisdictions.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

Page 24, line 20, immediately after "environment;" strike out "and".

Page 27, strike out lines 12 through 19 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

and future generations of Americans can be met, to use all practical means to encourage and support the establishment by the States—

(a) effective land use planning and decision-making processes that assure informed consideration, in advance, of the environmental, social, and economic implications of major decisions as to the use of the Nation's land and that provide for public education and involvement in such processes; and

(b) simplified and expedient decision-making with respect to review and approval of proposed development of land subject to a State's comprehensive land use planning process.

Page 28, after line 25, insert the following:

(d) The Secretary also is authorized to make additional annual grants to any State for the purpose of developing under its comprehensive land use planning process a procedure to simplify and expedite the processing of permits, licenses, and other governmental decisions that serve as prerequisites to proposed development activities.

Page 30, strike out line 19 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

relevant factors, each given such weight as the State may determine:

Page 32, strike out lines 20 and 21 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

land use decisions in such areas, which policies and criteria shall take into consideration (and be given such weight as the State deems appropriate) at least—

Page 34, strike out line 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

use, and storage of energy and energy resources; and

(j) development (to the extent States elect to regulate), of explicit substantive State policies to guide the use of land in areas which are or may be impacted by key facilities and for large-scale development, and explicit standards for applying the States' policies to land use decisions with respect to such key facilities and large-scale development.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

Page 32, line 16, strike out "and".

Page 35, strike out lines 8 through 11 and insert in lieu thereof:

(d) control the location of key facilities and major improvements and access factors of key facilities, and consider the use of land

in areas which are or may be impacted by key facilities;

Page 35, line 12, strike out "control" and insert in lieu thereof "consider the impact of".

Page 37, strike out line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

portunities within the State; and

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

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

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

(3) the establishment of a system designed to—

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

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

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

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

Page 37, line 13, strike out "and".

Page 37, line 25, immediately after "(b)" insert "The allocation of responsibility between the State government and its political subdivisions for the development and implementation of the State land use planning process shall be determined by State law."

Page 39, strike out line 11 and all that follows down through and including line 2 on page 40 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to—

(1) permit a Federal agency to intercede in management or regulatory decisions within the framework of a comprehensive land use planning process;

(2) authorize or permit the Secretary to manage or regulate non-Federal lands, through the issuance, approval, or disapproval of substantive State land use policies, standards, or criteria, or as a condition of eligibility for grants under this Act;

(3) enlarge or decrease the authority of a State to control the use of any land owned by the Federal Government within the State, or of any land located outside the State;

(4) enhance or diminish the rights of owners of property as provided by the Constitution of the United States and the constitution and laws of the State in which the property is located;

(5) require or encourage States to intercede in land use decisions of purely local concern; or

(6) Present a State land use planning agency from adopting a land use control plan that uses methods other than zoning for any area under its jurisdiction, and the use of such methods shall not in themselves prevent approval for purposes of eligibility for a grant by the Secretary.

Page 41, strike out lines 12 through 21 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(d) Prior to making any further grants after the five complete fiscal year period following the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall be satisfied that the State has established a comprehensive land use plan-

ning process and is implementing it under the provisions of this Act.

Page 87, line 18, strike out "title I" and insert in lieu thereof "section 103(a)".

Page 87, immediately after line 21 insert the following and renumber the succeeding paragraphs accordingly:

(2) for grants to the States under section 103(d) not more than \$5,000,000 for each of the three complete fiscal years occurring immediately after the date of enactment of this Act;

Page 92, strike out line 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

and intertidal areas, salt marshes, wet lands, or beaches; or

(g) as preventing or delaying any State or local government from receiving any Federal financial assistance to which it otherwise would be entitled prior to a finding, pursuant to section 108 of this Act, that the State has established and is implementing a comprehensive land use planning process.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

Page 91, line 15, strike out "or".

Page 93, line 2, strike out "shall" and insert "may".

Page 94, strike out lines 14 through 19 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(d) The term "general purpose local government" means any general unit of local government as defined by the Bureau of the Census.

SOUTH AFRICA'S SUGAR QUOTA

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1911 the Congress abrogated a commercial treaty with Russia because of its oppressive treatment of its Jewish minority. Last December this body voted overwhelmingly, 319 to 80, to deny favorable trade conditions to the Soviet Union unless it allows free and uninhibited emigration for Soviet Jews.

The animus underlying those two actions is rooted in a common concern: that the United States must not place its power and prestige behind those regimes which maintain discriminatory policies toward their ethnic minorities. The amendment to the extension of the Sugar Act, presented by the gentleman from Maryland, raised those same considerations. I ardently supported it.

It was proposed that the sugar quota assigned to South Africa under H.R. 14747 be eliminated. The thrust of the amendment was to deny economic benefits to a country which practices the most malignant form of racial discrimination in the world, and unspeakably enforces minority rule against that black majority. Support for this amendment would have prevented the imprimatur of the United States from being placed upon those policies, which are well known to each of us and need not be recited. I doubt if there is anyone in this Chamber who would defend them.

What then was the nature of the opposition to the Mitchell amendment? It was said that its adoption would harm the black sugar owners and workers of South Africa. After all, the argument ran, the profits from sugar sales of the

United States would be distributed among blacks as well as whites.

If the facts showed that blacks would receive substantial benefits from continuing South Africa's sugar quota, I might have been persuaded to vote for it. Or if I thought that a more limited restriction, such as allowing sugar imports only from South African companies which treat their employees fairly and without discrimination, would hasten the end of apartheid, I might have considered supporting that proposal.

But the facts are otherwise. Black ownership of sugar plantations in South Africa represents a fraction of the industry. Black workers of white owned plantations are paid outrageously low wages, and labor under deplorable conditions. Additionally, South African sugar exports to the United States are a small part of their total sugar exports. Nor would our domestic sugar market be adversely affected because many other sources are available to us. In short, there were no significant economic interests at stake, either to the American consumer or to South Africa.

Consequently the issue came down simply to whether this House, by approving a sugar quota for South Africa, would lend its weight to the egregious policy of apartheid. Rarely is the moral question so sharply drawn. I was greatly disappointed that before the House voted down final passage of the Sugar Act amendments, it refused to take this positive stand against South African racism.

WATERGATE TAPES

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, editorial comments on the President's refusal to turn over any more Watergate tapes or transcripts have appeared throughout the country. KSL, a television and radio station in Salt Lake City, recently carried a comment on this topic. It expresses so well the feelings of so many, that I would like to share it with the other Members.

The editorial follows:

[KSL AM-FM-TV EDITORIAL]

PRESIDENT NIXON, THE TRANSCRIPTS AND THE FUTURE

The White House has indicated that no more Watergate tapes or transcripts will be released. The President says the House Judiciary Committee has all the material it needs to conclude its inquiry and that it is time to put Watergate behind us.

KSL is among those who wish Watergate were behind us now—today. But it will be with us until the reasonable doubts about gross misconduct in high places have been resolved. Such doubts are now expressed in persons or institutions traditionally close to the President.

The best and quickest way to put Watergate behind us is for the President to do what he has promised to do but not yet done—cooperate fully with the House Judiciary Committee. Until he does so there will be a reasonable doubt that he has something to hide.

It is not fitting that the President should dictate which of the documents in his possession dealing with the public's business may

be used in determining his guilt or innocence of the potential charges against him. Watergate must be resolved in the American way and American law calls for the best evidence available. If justice is to continue to demand respect in our society, we cannot have the example of the chief executive inventing a legal system to clear himself.

KSL believes the American public will, and perhaps should, forgive this or any other President for indiscretions or even minor excesses of office. What is alleged in Watergate is far larger than that.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues an event that reflects a growing attempt by some to suspend the rights guaranteed all Americans by the fourth amendment.

The dangerous "stop-and-frisk" tactic used against black citizens by the San Francisco Police Department in its effort to apprehend the so-called Zebra killer(s) was illegal and has been deplored by civil libertarians throughout the country.

The recent scandals within the executive branch of Government have shown that corruption within a society eventually emerges at its highest levels. The immorality of a political system has brought the Nation to the brink of dictatorship.

Fortunately, the conscience of many Americans was awakened before it became too late. If we are blind to these new threats and ignore this further attempt to bend the rules of justice because Americans are apathetic toward the rights of minorities, we will one day awaken to a police state, and, certainly, then it will be too late.

Mr. John Robinson, a Boston Globe staff writer, has written a most perceptive article addressing the frightening meaning of this law enforcement policy. Accordingly, I submit it to the Record and urge its closest consideration by all concerned Members of Congress:

SAN FRANCISCO SETS DANGEROUS PRECEDENT IN STOP-FRISK POLICY

(By John Robinson)

Twelve white persons have been killed and six others wounded in the last five months in San Francisco. The crimes appear to be random attacks. There is evidence that the assaults are connected and that they are the work of one man, possibly more. Survivors have described a black man in the 20-30 age range as the assailant. City officials have ordered police to stop and search black male citizens on the streets and have asked for cooperation and understanding. The city has a problem and is attempting to solve it at the expense of men's civil liberties, as if these rights were things to suspend and reinstate according to whim and circumstance.

San Francisco has established in this policy a very dangerous precedent, one that other police departments across the country may find irresistible—and much easier to get away with because the ice has been broken in the Golden Gate City.

San Francisco's stop and search policy is the result of political pressure to do something about the so-called "Zebra" murders. When faced with wanton and brutalizing crime, citizens don't want reason or respect

for rights; they want action and they will settle for the appearance of action in the absence of arrest.

They do not prescribe the specific means of law enforcement in special cases such as the Zebra slayings. They leave the prescriptions to their elected and appointed officials and they will tolerate many unwise practices as long as the majority is not affected by them. It is usually, but not always, the liberties of minority groups that suffer under this arrangement but everyone's rights are jeopardized when governments begin to respond to troublesome matters in the way San Francisco is doing.

The Zebra crime stopper technique may seem remote to us in New England and perhaps none of our business. But Boston and San Francisco are thought to be close in civility, respect for one another's rights and thoughtful public policy (let's leave the nasty little busing squabble aside for the time being) and California is often the crucible from which mores, styles and methods emerge to serve the nation.

America is becoming a Pacific culture. The winds are from Sausalito, Nobody, except maybe Bostonians, care how society moves in Boston, or what directions society here takes because Boston represents the past. The West, however, is the future. California has pointed the way toward the drug revolution (Haight-Ashbury), black rebellion (Watts, Black Panthers), student protest (Berkeley) and sexual freedom (topless, bottomless lads and lassies serving tequila sunrise cocktails and abalone). We are always in danger of being seduced by what has been tried in the Golden state and the suspension of liberties to fight crime is no different.

The Zebra-inspired stop and frisk policy is not unfamiliar to black people whose rights, after all, have often been considered expendable. Nor is the San Francisco dragnet new. It does, however, introduce a new element which makes it particularly dangerous: official sanction in the name of law and order.

That the victims of the current suspension of liberties are black makes the San Francisco affair a sorry exercise in racist dictatorship. If men are willing to die for their rights, and many are, then it seems an irony that guaranteed rights are being set aside because men are being killed. The Zebra killings are damnable but so too is the flogging of black men's rights.

THE LATE HONORABLE CHESTER A. MERROW

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1974

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying deserved tribute to the memory of the late Chester Merrow of the State of New Hampshire. Chester came to Congress when I did, in the 78th. He served with much distinction until he voluntarily retired in 1962.

Always affable, friendly, and a perfect gentleman, Chester Merrow gained a host of friends and admirers while serving here. I entertained the highest respect for him, his vast storehouse of knowledge, his patriotism, and his leadership. Behind him he left a record of outstanding achievements. It is too bad there are not more men of his capacity elected to the Congress.

To surviving members of Chester's family I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement.