

day, a busy day, and a very productive day.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. If the business outlined by the distinguished majority whip is disposed of by tomorrow evening, could he give us some enlightenment as to Friday?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I would hope that I could say this off the record. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator like unanimous consent to do that?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Let me say this to the Senator sincerely. I think the Senator asked a pertinent question. If the Senate has a productive day tomorrow and is able to dispatch its business with its usual effectiveness, I would say that—

Mr. TOWER. Let us hope with better than usual effectiveness.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Well, I will say if it does it with effectiveness as usual, there is a fairly good chance that committees may be able to work on Friday without interruption.

Mr. TOWER. I think the distinguished Senator.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 4:40 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 13, 1974, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 12, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

David E. Mark, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador

Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Burundi.

Robert P. Smith, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malta.

UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES

Philip O'Bryan Montgomery, Jr., of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Regents of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences for the remainder of the term expiring May 1, 1977, vice Anthony R. Curreri, resigned.

D.C. PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

H. Mason Neely, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years expiring June 30, 1977 (reappointment).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 12, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Deane R. Hinton, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Zaire.

William D. Wollé, of Iowa, a Foreign Service officer of class 3, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Sultanate of Oman.

Robert P. Paganelli, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Qatar.

Pierre R. Graham, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Upper Volta.

Robert A. Stevenson, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Malawi.

Seymour Weiss, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Commonwealth of the Bahamas.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for terms expiring December 17, 1976:

Gustave M. Hauser, of New York.

James A. Suffridge, of Florida.

INTERNATIONAL BANK OFFICES

William E. Simon, of New Jersey, for appointment to the offices indicated:

U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 5 years and U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years;

A Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years; and

U.S. Governor of the Asian Development Bank.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The following-named persons to be members of the General Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:

Harold Melvin Agnew, of New Mexico.

Gordon Allott, of Colorado.

Edward Clark, of Texas.

Lane Kirkland, of Maryland.

Carl M. Marcy, of Virginia.

Joseph Martin, Jr., of California.

John A. McCone, of California.

Gerard C. Smith, of the District of Columbia.

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

IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Diplomatic and Foreign Service nominations beginning James E. Akins, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, and ending Annette L. Veler, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 7, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 1974.

Diplomatic and Foreign Service nominations beginning William K. Payeff, to be a Foreign Service information officer of class 1, and ending E. Ashley Wills, to be a Foreign Service information officer of class 7, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 1974.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PAPERWORK TYRANNY

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, stations WBT and WBTW of Charlotte, N.C., recently broadcast an editorial that commands our attention.

It sometimes occurs that the least conspicuous forms of government tyranny are the most obnoxious. This is certainly true of the faceless paperwork tyranny that lurks in the offices of the Federal bureaucracy.

We are all familiar, too familiar, with the subtle way in which this tyranny operates. It begins right here on the floors of Congress with well-intentioned legislators, who persuade themselves that the Federal Government needs to control

yet another aspect of American life. To maintain this control, records must be kept, orders must be dispatched, questionnaires must be answered, compliance must be secured. Anonymous forms and letters must be sent from anonymous sources to unsuspecting individuals.

The upshot of this is an unremitting flow of paper from Federal offices into the homes and businesses of America. Probably the hardest hit victims of this flood are the small businessmen, who can be observed at almost any hour of the day or night swimming in a sea of Federal forms.

Mr. President, much of this paperwork to which we subject our fellow countrymen is not only time consuming, but petty, duplicative, and silly—to say nothing of the invasions of privacy.

The Paperwork Burden Relief Act is a step in the right direction toward a return to sanity. I ask unanimous consent that the timely WBT/WBTW edi-

torial on this proposal be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[A WBT/WBTW Editorial]

THE PAPERWORK BURDEN RELIEF ACT

If you find filling out income tax forms a wearying, time consuming task, how'd you like to have to make out equally or more complex forms every 15 days?

That, says the National Association of Public Accountants, is how often the business community has to file some federal report or other. Estimates are that these report forms add up to 10 billion sheets of paper a year and cost business \$18 billion to complete. How many more billions it costs us taxpayers for the various agencies of government to process these forms is anybody's guess. Maybe it's better we don't know.

The chore of gathering and reporting all the information required by government forms—usually under threat of fine or prosecution if you don't do it right and on time—

is especially hard on the small businessman or farmer, who can't afford a computer or accountant to do the job. And it's mainly with them in mind that legislation has been introduced in both houses of Congress appropriately titled "The Paperwork Burden Relief Act."

The legislation would direct the General Accounting Office to make a survey of the approximately 9,000 government report forms to determine which ones are outmoded, duplicative, unnecessary or place too much of a burden on the small businessman. There's obviously a wide field for cutting down. One government agency—the Small Business Administration, as it happens—recently found it could make 22 forms do the work that 66 had been doing. A mere one third.

To this station it appears plain that the Paperwork Burden Relief Act would relieve a big burden not only on small business and business in general but on all us taxpayers who have to finance the paper shuffling at bureaucratic levels. We hope you'll lose no opportunity to urge your Senators and Congressmen to make this proposed legislation a working reality.

AMERICA: CHANGE IT OR LOSE IT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, most of us in Washington know how the national print and electronic media feel about Watergate. We get mail from our constituents and some of us hear about Watergate when we return to our districts. There is no lack of opinion about Watergate. Some sense a "tiredness" with the ever-continuing Watergate revelations because of this tidal-wave of Watergate opinion.

It is with some trepidation that I today add to this plethora of Watergate material by placing in the RECORD "A Sermon for Memorial Day Sunday" preached May 26, 1974, by the Reverend Raymond Shaheen, D.D., Pastor of Saint Luke Lutheran Church, Silver Spring, Md.

The sermon was brought to my attention by a staff member who attends Reverend Shaheen's church, heard the sermon delivered, and was impressed by it.

The importance to me of Reverend Shaheen's sermon is that it rebuts the idea that Watergate is a creation of the national media and that Watergate will go away if national attention is diverted elsewhere. The national media can alert the American people to an issue, but if there is no substance to the issue, the media cannot sustain interest in it.

As Reverend Shaheen's remarks illustrate, America senses that all is not well with this country. And Reverend Shaheen senses that America's moral leaders have an obligation to address themselves to this malaise.

Reverend Shaheen's prescription is not the only one possible. But it is one moral leader's attempt to wrestle with Watergate. And it is the wrestling that is neces-

sary if we are to change America. What Watergate represents will not go away if we ignore it. We need moral leadership. We do not have it in the White House and this makes it all the more important that we receive our moral leadership on public issues elsewhere. Reverend Shaheen's effort to provide moral leadership is admirable. And I think this sort of moral leadership is being provided in many places and in many organizations, religious and otherwise, throughout this country.

The United States can again become what its people want it to be—a moral force in the world.

Reverend Shaheen's sermon follows:

A SERMON FOR MEMORIAL DAY SUNDAY

(By Rev. Raymond Shaheen)

Text: "... choose life that you and your descendants may live, loving the Lord your God, obeying His voice, and cleaving to Him: for that means life to you and length of days..." (Deuteronomy 30:19-20).

This is not the sermon that I had originally planned to preach to you today. As you know, the sermons to be preached from this Saint Luke pulpit are ordinarily projected about a year in advance. What, however, with the change in calendar dates for legal holidays, suddenly this Memorial Day 1974 is before us. And as I come to this sacred desk this morning, I am made mindful of the fact that some word specifically related to this particular holiday is in order. Hence this sermon which will address an ancient Biblical injunction to the current mood and manner of America.

Oddly enough, let me begin with some commentary on bumper stickers. They are quite the thing these days. In company with many of you, they irritate me. That's a generalization, of course. As you might promise, there are some that constitute an exception. That yellow and black one which has almost become a trade-mark around our parish is easily tolerated. Folks who are members of this congregation usually show a measure of pride when they recognize the bumper sticker that parades before the community our crisis intervention telephone number. It reads like this:

SOMEBODY CARES—TEEN HELP—588-5440

But by and large, any number of other stickers fail to enthrall me. To the contrary, frequently I find their arrogances obnoxious and their sad humor offensive.

The other day I heard of another preacher who apparently is a kindred spirit where bumper stickers are concerned. He was annoyed, so I've been told, by a star-spangled one that reads:

AMERICA: LOVE IT OR LEAVE IT

And his critical assessment of its sentiment has triggered all kinds of thoughts in my mind. He maintained, my friend reported, that the tersely put slogan borders on dangerous over-simplification. And he is right. What a terrible plight would be ours if no one dared to raise his voice in criticism of the land we cherish! Any correct reading of our past can make the point that we have benefited by those who raised their concerned voices boldly and honestly. It is foolhardy to think that all who would criticize America have less than love for her, and that only the disciples of Decatur are worthy of citizenship!

As you might suspect, preachers are wont to write their own versions of what they read. And so, I'm told, it's been suggested that "America, Love It or Leave It" should be rewritten so as to read:

AMERICA, CHANGE IT OR LEAVE IT

All that follows now has been inspired by the possibility of such rewording.

Usually when one speaks of change, he means a change to something new. I would suggest this morning—change to something old!

Let us change back to the notion that we are meant to be a nation dependent, as over against being a nation independent—dependent of God. Once it was so—at the very beginning. Remember how it was back in the summer of 1776 at the old Statehouse in Philadelphia? Some thirteen colonies had sent delegates to chart their future course. It was not easily done. In the face of subsequent confusion, the wisest and the oldest among their number was asked to speak. Benjamin Franklin rather reluctantly rose to his feet. Only finally did he speak a few words inspired by a passage from Holy Writ—Psalm 127. What he said provided the "spiritual foundation" of the United States of America. Here is what he is reported to have said: "I have lived a long time; and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His will, is it possible for an empire to rise without His notice? We have been assured in the sacred writing that except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it. I firmly believe this, and I also believe that without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel!"

As the founding fathers were driven to recognize dependence upon Almighty God, so must we discover anew in our day the need to build upon such foundation.

In the second place let us change back to the nation that's intended to run by rules. John Steinbeck as far back as 1966 put his finger on a sensitive spot when he advised us of a national weakness. He considered it our most serious problem—both as a people and as individuals. He did not settle easily for it as "immorality," "dishonesty" or "lack of integrity." He reviewed the gamut of our ills: "racial unrest, the emotional crazy quilt that drives our people to the psychiatrists, the fall out, the drop out, the copout insurgency of our children and young people, the rush to stimulants as well as to hypnotic drugs, the rise of narrow, ugly and vengeful cults of all kinds." He saw all of these as the manifestation of one single cause: our disregard for rules. According to the celebrated author, our fathers lived by the rule—"rules concerning life, limb and property—rules defining dishonesty, dishonor, misconduct and crime. The rules were not always obeyed, but they were believed in, and a breaking of them was savagely punished."

America's hope may well lie in our earnest endeavor to appreciate all over again the absolute necessity to place a high value upon rules—upon principles of decency and honor.

Let us change back to being a nation that can face the future without fear.

Robert Heilbroner in a new book, "An Inquiry into the Human Prospect," raises the question: "Is there hope for man?" He answers with little, if any, encouragement. Much to the reader's dismay, he even goes so far as to suggest that "the freedom of man must be sacrificed on the altar of the survival of mankind."

Our founding fathers, facing well-nigh insurmountable odds, forged ahead with confidence. Perchance they honestly believed that they had fashioned an instrument of democratic design that would enable them to handle whatever problem would loom upon the horizon. And that is what we must remember. Dr. Daniel Boorstin, senior his-

torian of the Smithsonian Institution, is correct when he takes us to task for putting too much stock in solutions as such. It would seem to him that democracy advances the process by which problems are dealt with.

Look at it this way: democracy means people and people mean problems. We will never be free of problems. Let us, therefore, be unafraid since we do have the instrument by which we can deal with the people-problems!

Let us change back to the nation that places a high value upon private morality.

Clare Boothe Luce has observed that "Watergate is the great liberal illusion that you can have public virtue without private morality." Small wonder that some of us acclaim Adlai Stevenson as one of the finest statesmen our generation has produced. When it came to basic morality it seemed to us that he stood head and shoulders above so many. He, too, was trying to say something to us when he referred to a politician of "particularly rancid practices." Of him he lamented: "If he were a bad man, I wouldn't be so afraid of him. But this man has no principles. He doesn't know the difference."

Increasingly it becomes plain to us that "image-making" in our day can become a reckless thing. It has been reported that a certain speech writer for Richard M. Nixon in the 1967 presidential campaign counseled him in a memo: "Potential presidents are measured against an ideal that's a combination of leading man, God, father, hero, pope, king, with maybe a touch of the Furies thrown in." This same person is quoted as having further advised Mr. Nixon: "We have to be very clear on this point: that the response is to the image, not to the man, since 99 percent of the voters have no contact with the man. It's not what's there that counts, it's what is projected."

All of this, of course, brings us up short since we immediately recognize how dangerous such a thought pattern can be. And not a few of us think at once in terms of the ambitious and arrogant ones who exploited such advice. What grief we might have been spared by the President, his aides, and the Committee To Re-Elect the President!

The image is one thing. The true character of a person is another thing—basically it is the only thing that ultimately really matters.

Some of you may recall how a short while ago from this very pulpit. I reminded you of the quote that a friend wrote in my autobiography book years ago. It was the wise counsel of Polonius in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*: "To thine own self be true, And it must follow, as the night the day, Thou canst not then be false to any man."

Let us change back to the idea that democracy has its price which must be paid in patience and persistence. A free translation here presumably would be: let the system work!

We must have done with the idea that justice is best served by short-cuts. Those who clamor today for immediate resignation of the President may be ill-advised. James Reston wrote a well-deserved tribute to Senator Mike Mansfield in a recent issue of the New York Times. He gave the Montana senator credit for insisting that pressuring the President to resign would be unfair since it would "evade rather than resolve the moral and legal issues." The man in the White House is entitled to presumption of innocence, and should have every opportunity to have his case presented. Little do we realize that in a certain sense we are all on trial in one degree or another . . . not only the President and his aides, but the Congress and the Constitution as well.

Let us change back to the nation that America was meant to be—where the sys-

tem can be trusted. We can afford to give it time to be tested.

There are some of you who would be very happy if I came to the sacred desk and denounced the President of the United States of America. There would be some of you who would think that I was brave and forthright. You might even think I was very honest by telling you that he's a liar and a crook and guilty of criminal offense. This I cannot do.

Some of you would be very happy if I came to the sacred desk and placed a halo upon his head, and called him God's great gift not only to us but to the entire world, and to portray him for you as one who is absolutely faultless. This I cannot do.

I don't know whether he is telling the truth or not. With all my heart I would wish it so. But as a citizen of this land we must give him time. We must give our Constitution time. We must give our Congress time. We must pay the price to find the truth. In company with some of you I am tired, and that is one reason why Sunday after Sunday you have not come to this place to find me dragging Watergate into this pulpit. But I also know the risk of becoming ostrich-like and pretending that a cancer does not appear upon the body politic.

Which leads me now to suggest to you in the final moments of this sermon: Let us change back to the concept of democracy where each man assumes the responsibility of pulling his own weight. Many of us have a tendency to cop-out—to suffer despair in the face of the present crisis. But democracy itself is never the solution. It simply provides the process by which things are resolved. Edmund Burke's rebuke remains: "All that is necessary for the victory of evil is that good men do nothing." And the easiest thing for us as so-called good men would be to say that, "I'm tired—let's walk away from the problem."

In the comic strip *Peanuts*, Linus tells Charlie Brown, "I don't like to face problems head on. I think the best way to solve problems is to avoid them. This is a distinct philosophy of mine. No problem is so big or so complicated that it can't be run away from." Charlie with characteristic naivety asks, "What if everyone was like you? What if everyone in the whole world suddenly decided to run away from his problems?" Replies Linus, "Well, at least we'd all be running in the same direction." And one wonders whether we are not witnessing just that—a mass retreat from involvement.

Or I would add quickly, involvement for the wrong reasons. And the acid test which God always applies is: Why do you say what you say? Why do you do what you do? Why do you believe what you believe?

"Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth, upon this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation, so conceived, and so dedicated, can long endure . . ."

Said a member of this congregation to me, whose judgment I highly regard, "This could well be the greatest moral crisis that we have ever had to face." I beg you, my friend, as your Pastor, as a care-taker of the Gospel that's preached from this pulpit—

AMERICA—CHANGE IT OR LOSE IT

In this instance, let's go back and take a good hard look at the ways that have been proven before and the most basic of all is to recognize our dependence upon God, and not our independence of all that's morally pure and true.

The Biblical injunction as laid down in that book of Deuteronomy makes it perfectly plain. It's a matter of choice, and no man can escape the responsibility of involvement in the decision.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. ETHEL CLAIBORNE DAMERON

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to offer my colleagues three newspaper articles about Mrs. Ethel Claiborne Dameron of Port Allen, La. Mrs. Dameron is one of my constituents and has long been a leading citizen of Louisiana. Her most recent achievement is the construction of a museum for West Baton Rouge Parish. The museum has been named the Ethel Claiborne Dameron Museum in her honor.

Mrs. Dameron is not only one of the most outstanding civic leaders Louisiana has ever known, but she is also the aunt of another gracious Louisianian, our colleague the Honorable LINDY BOGGS. I believe these articles, like these ladies, show Louisiana at her best, and it is in tribute to both Mrs. Dameron and Mrs. Boggs that I ask they be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the *Plaquemine Post*]

WEST BATON ROUGE HAS A "SPECIAL LADY"

Sunday, April 21, has been proclaimed Ethel Claiborne Dameron Day in Port Allen, and there's a very good reason for this special day.

Mrs. Dameron has been instrumental in getting a library and a museum in West Baton Rouge Parish. She also got the bronze statue of Henry Watkins Allen, a confederate general and Louisiana governor.

Her efforts led to the establishment of a rest area in the parish under the Lobdell overpass. She helped get the Brusly live oak tree accepted as a member of the Live Oak Society. Its age was judged to be about 364 years.

The West Baton Rouge Historical Association's museum will be dedicated Sunday, April 21, at 3:30 p.m.

The building will be called the "Ethel Claiborne Dameron Museum." The new wing will be the "Paul Perkins Wing."

Perkins gave the museum some land which was sold. The proceeds were used for the new wing.

Port Allen Mayor William C. LeBlanc has proclaimed Sunday "Ethel Claiborne Dameron Day" in honor of Mrs. Irving "Puffy" Dameron.

Mrs. Dameron, known as "Puffy," is the daughter of the late Judge and Mrs. L. B. Claiborne. She was raised at Claiborne Villa in Pointe Coupee Parish. She attended Harris College for Young Ladies in Roanoke, Va.

After her marriage to C. Irving Dameron, they resided in Baton Rouge for a time before moving to Sandbar Plantation in West Baton Rouge.

Mrs. Dameron's memory of her father's frequent stories and his admiration for Allen led to her interest in the confederate governor when she came to live in the city named for him. She went before the Finance

Committee of the legislature and got \$15,000 to have Angela Gregory sculpt the statue which stands on the courthouse grounds.

After her mother-in-law suggested that the area needed a library, Mrs. Dameron, Mrs. Frank Whitehead and Mrs. Ben C. Devall were appointed as a committee by the West Baton Rouge Garden and Civic Club to begin the library in 1933. Going door to door in the parish asking for books led to people looking in their attics for books, some of which were first editions. The library began in 1933.

She went before the West Baton Rouge Policy Jury to get the library made a parish library. She persuaded the jury to save the records vault of the old courthouse. It became the library. Today the same building is the West Baton Rouge Historical Association's museum.

The museum and its new wing are being dedicated Sunday and the building is being named after Mrs. Dameron. She was the association's first chairman.

Mrs. P. Chauvin Wilkinson, vice president of the association, said, "There isn't a cultural project in West Baton Rouge Parish which Mrs. Dameron hasn't helped."

Mrs. Dameron recalls that at the time she joined the West Baton Rouge Garden and Civic Club, which is 46 years old, there were no Jaycees and no planned beautification or landscaping for the town. "So the club was truly a garden city and truly a civic club."

The club did the landscaping for the schools and the courthouse. "It brought the women of the parish closer together in a concerted effort," she said.

Among the clubs to which Mrs. Dameron belongs are the John James Audubon chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR), the National Society of the American Revolution, the Colonial Dames, the Foundational for Historical Louisiana and the Friends of the Anglo-American Art Museum at LSU.

She also belongs to the Landmarks Society of New Orleans and the Friends of the Cabildo in New Orleans.

Mrs. Dameron moved to her house on 6th Street after her husband died in 1934. She is the mother of four children: Charles Hayward Dameron, an attorney who lives in Port Allen; Claiborne Dameron, a retired colonel now associated with a Baton Rouge bank; Mrs. John Manard of New Orleans; and Mrs. Robert W. Blair of Mesa, Ariz.

She has three grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

[From the West Side Journal]
MUSEUM NAMED BY ASSOCIATION FOR
ITS FOUNDER

Mrs. C. Irving "Puffy" Dameron was honored as the founder of the West Baton Rouge Historical Association Sunday as the association's museum was named after her and presented to the parish.

The museum was dedicated and the new wing was named for Paul D. Perkins, whose contribution financed the building of the addition.

Judge Paul B. Landry Jr., master of ceremonies, said it was through Mrs. Dameron's determination and her perseverance that the museum came into being.

Addressing the audience in the new wing, Mrs. Dameron said, "You have made this room that smelled of nothing but concrete, you've made it come alive and Puffy thanks you from the bottom of her heart." She said the presence of so many people brought a heartbeat to the building.

"The thing that makes this little building a little gem are the little things..." she said. She recounted instances where a pair of girl's ballet shoes and a carnival

doubloon were acquired, the coin from a small black boy who drowned since then.

Mrs. Rawlston Phillips, president of the association presented the building to Frank Calleteau, who accepted on behalf of the Policy Jury.

Calleteau said, "We on the Policy Jury hall and praise to the utmost all the many citizens who have made this dedication possible today." He called the dedication "a new and additional milestone in our cultural growth."

Juror Barkdull Kahao presented a replica of a plaque which will mark the main museum building named for Mrs. Dameron. He said it was love of beautiful things that motivated Mrs. Dameron to her 40 years of work for the parish library, historical markers and the museum.

Mrs. Dameron was presented with a plaque from Gov. Edwin Edwards in recognition of her service. Mrs. Palma Munson of the Louisiana State Tourist Commission made the presentation. She also presented a state flag to the museum.

Herman "Monday" Lowe said, "As a former legislator, I know Puffy well," adding that she had gone before the legislature "working for antiquity." Lowe presented the plaque which will mark the new wing, dedicated to Perkins.

Among Mrs. Dameron's family present were her son, Claiborne Dameron and his wife; her daughter, Mrs. John P. Manard Sr., of New Orleans; her granddaughters, Mrs. H. Scott Kane III, the former Courtney Manard of Chevy Chase, Md., and Barbara Manard of Boston, Mass.; her grandson, John P. Manard Jr. and his wife; and her great niece, Mrs. Howard Schmalz of New Orleans.

[From the Pointe Coupee Banner]
SUNDAY TO BE ETHEL CLAIBORNE DAMERON
DAY IN PORT ALLEN
IS FORMER NEW ROADS RESIDENT

The youngest daughter of the founder of The Pointe Coupee Banner—Mrs. C. Irving Dameron of Port Allen, the former Ethel Claiborne of New Roads, will be honored in Port Allen Sunday at "Ethel Claiborne Dameron Day", so decreed by Port Allen Mayor William LeBlanc.

Mrs. Dameron, daughter of the late Judge and Mrs. L. B. Claiborne, was reared at the historic old Claiborne house on Main St., now owned by Dr. C. E. Hebert. Sister of the late longtime District Attorney Ferd C. Claiborne, the aunt of Cong. Lindy Boggs, she is a granddaughter of Col. F. L. Claiborne, and great-granddaughter of Gen. F. L. Claiborne, a brother of Louisiana's first governor under American rule—William C. Claiborne.

The new West Baton Rouge Museum which will be dedicated Sunday and named "The Ethel Claiborne Dameron Building"—was actually born at Mrs. Dameron's home, when she moved from Sand Bar Plantation, following the death of her husband, West Baton Rouge Parish official, C. Irving Dameron.

Mrs. P. Chauvin Wilkinson says "there isn't a cultural project in West Baton Rouge which Mrs. Dameron hasn't helped." She will be presented a certificate of appreciation.

Another native Pointe Coupee, Mrs. Rawlston D. Phillips, the former Virginia Soulier of New Roads, is president of the West Baton Rouge Historical Association.

Mrs. Dameron cited how the new museum was born. "My children can't use my keepsakes, and I don't know what to do with them."

"So, I called my close friends together and broached the subject of a museum, if the Policy Jury would let us use a building made available after our little library become a state demonstration library. We met

in my crackerbox, which is what I call my present home, and decided on it. We received the Policy Jury approval and were chartered in 1968."

"We are a keepsake museum, a keepsake of the Parish also. We are not trying for a Smithsonian, but are serious, not just little old ladies in tennis shoes."

Mrs. Dameron is a member of the West Baton Rouge Historical Association Board, the Foundation for Historical Louisiana, the Landmarks Society of New Orleans, Friends of the Cabildo, Friends of the Anglo-American Art Museum, the Baton Rouge Committee of the Colonial Dames of America in the State of Louisiana, the Board of Trustees of the West Baton Rouge Library. One of her sons, Hayward has for years served as an Asst. District Attorney in this district.

The new wing of the museum building will be christened the Paul Perkins wing in honor of the Baton Rougean who gave funds for its construction.

THE PANOVs ARE FREE

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, at last the Soviet Union has seen fit to release Valery and Galina Panov—freedom loving and intensely creative artists—and to allow this talented man and wife to emigrate to a new life in Israel.

Certainly, all who understand the true meaning of liberty rejoice at the news of this couple's triumph over open and flagrant oppression and harassment by their own government. Their resilient spirit and irrepressible resolve in the face of intense anguish are an inspiration to all men and women throughout the world.

Valery and Galina have been trying for over 2 years to obtain visas to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel. Both had come to realize the country in which they lived and the government they served could neither support nor permit a full realization of their creative spirit. Instead, with oppression all around them they could only feel more and more shackled by the society in which they lived.

Until their fateful decision to leave their country, the Panovs were celebrities in the Soviet Union—shining stars of the ballet in a country where ballet is a preeminent art form. Valery was first male dancer in the Kirov Ballet and Galina also belonged to the world renowned company. Upon applying for exit visas to Israel in March 1972, however, Valery, a Jew, was dismissed from the company, while Galina, who is not Jewish, was demoted to the lowest rank. Eventually she also chose to leave the company.

Since that time these two people have not only been cut off from their livelihood and their beloved art, but have also been harassed and treated brutally by the authorities. Numerous attempts to obtain visas failed, and Valery was jailed temporarily for encounters with police.

Last December, to the horror of the

Panovs and the entire free world, the Soviets gave Valery a visa but required his wife to remain in the Soviet Union. Early in February they said that Galina would never be able to leave and that Valery's visa would be revoked unless he left without his wife. Valery steadfastly refused to do this.

Freedom-loving people in the world took up the cause of the Panovs, urging the Soviet Government to release them. It was my honor to join my colleagues in the House in signing a letter earlier this year calling on the Soviet Government to allow Galina to emigrate with her husband. The letter was sent to Leonid I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Now the Soviets have decided to allow both Valery and Galina to leave for a better life in Israel. All of us rejoice at this victory of the spirit. We are happy for the Panovs, yet their success—coming after so many months of travail—should strengthen our commitment toward insuring that Jews in the Soviet Union are afforded the freedom to emigrate to other countries if they so desire. Indeed, the victory of the Panovs inspires us to work harder for freedom of emigration throughout the world.

The plight of the Panovs mirrored that of many Jews and other people in the Soviet Union and elsewhere who are the victims of oppression and cruel bondage. Let us resolve on this happy occasion to continue our efforts to make human decency and kindness a rule for the treatment of all mankind.

ENCOURAGE MORE DOMESTIC OIL

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the fair pricing of oil and gas is having immediate results in achieving greatly increased production. I just heard from Sherman Hunt, who is president of Texas Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association. He reports drilling showed a tremendous increase during the first quarter of this year. Sherman went on to say that the search for oil and gas has reached boom proportions and that it is all a direct result of better prices paid to producers.

There are no Texas drilling rigs idle at this time. If more rigs were available there would be more drilling. There is also a shortage of drilling pipe as well as other oil well field equipment. This tends to limit further drilling until these supplies become more plentiful.

Nationally, we note the same developments. It is now estimated that \$8.7 billion will be invested by the oil companies in capital and exploration in 1974. This compares with only \$5 billion in 1973.

Oil companies continue to invest much more than their profits. America is proud of the record of 30 big oil companies

who invested \$34 billion in the United States in the last 5 years while their domestic profits were only \$19 billion. This meant that oil companies were putting twice as much back in the business as they were making in profits.

Basically, the oil business is only an average business as far as return on investment. Misleading analysts have pointed to 1973 which was an unusual year, because of Arab oil complications. Taking 1972, which presents a fairer picture, the oil industry had a return of 8.7 percent of profitability on shareholders investment which compares to 10.6 percent as the average for all manufacturing businesses.

Stripper oil wells are important in Texas. There are 83,000 marginal wells run by stripper well operators which average only 3.8 barrels a day. But they have a total production of 116 million barrels a year. To show you what this total means in energy, this is twice as much energy per year as is produced by the federally operated Tennessee Valley Authority.

Oilmen in Texas believe that if the depletion allowance is removed by Congress from oil and gas, exploration would immediately drop to a low level.

Oil and the gas men are keenly responsive to the needs of America. Oil industry leaders are expanding efforts to make America self-sufficient in energy within 5 years.

Many politicians today are using an oversimplified explanation of inflation. They blame inflation on food and fuel. But a study of the Consumer Price Index—CPI—shows food makes up 25 percent of the CPI. Today, food's effect on inflation, if other prices were constant, would be 5 percent since the beginning of 1973. But the more interesting figure is on fuel which makes up only 4 percent of the index. Fuel has effected only 1.3 percent on the increase in the price index during the past year.

For those who get all of their news from headlines in newspapers, they would believe that all inflation is tied to the price of gasoline. It is well to emphasize that only 1.3 percentage points was the total net effect by petroleum of the increase in the Consumer Price Index.

IMPROVING SSI

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MILLS, for his decision to withdraw H.R. 15124 from consideration on June 11.

This bill is designed to extend temporarily the present availability of food stamps or their cashed-out value to supplemental security income participants.

Along with many other Members of Congress, I was deeply disappointed to learn that this bill represents the only action the Committee on Ways and Means intends to bring before the full House this year.

It was even more disturbing to realize that this bill does not address a major problem that has created injustice and hardship for SSI participants in the States of California, Massachusetts, Nevada, New York, and Wisconsin. In these five States, tens of thousands of aged, blind, and disabled people who had been receiving welfare and food stamps under the old State programs lost those stamps when they were transferred on to the SSI rolls.

Because of complicated requirements and technical oversights, these people did not receive the compensating bonus value of food stamps in cash as part of their SSI payments, and were therefore worse off than they had been before. At least 40,000 people in New York State suffered these losses, with comparable numbers in other States. I understand that Chairman MILLS has agreed to include a provision in this bill which will eliminate this inequity when the bill is considered again on June 17.

I hope the chairman will be just as responsive to the need for other equally important changes which the New York congressional delegation and others have been urging for several months. The SSI program suffers from a wide range of failings and oversights. No provision was made in the original legislation to compensate for increases in the cost of living, or to guarantee that SSI recipients will get the benefit of social security benefit increases, or for providing emergency funds for participants who do not receive their checks or encounter other unexpected financial calamities. The food stamp problem, the subject of yesterday's bill, is also inadequately handled in SSI legislation, especially in the five States which provide the bonus value of food stamps in cash rather than the stamps themselves. SSI participants in these States are getting far less benefit from this cash-out than recipients in other States which provide food stamps.

These and many other problems deserve the urgent attention of the Congress. The SSI program provides income to some of the most helpless and poorest citizens of this country. It is incredible that many of these people are able to survive on the meager benefits SSI provides, and the inadequacies of this program should be corrected promptly.

LITHUANIA

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, June 15 marks the 34th anniversary of the forcible Soviet annexation of Lithu-

ania. For 34 years the people of this small country have been denied the freedom they enjoyed briefly after establishing their independence in 1918.

Since that fateful day in 1940 the people of Lithuania have suffered continual religious and political persecution, and have been denied their basic human rights.

But despite the brutal efforts of the Soviet Union to suppress it, the flame of freedom still burns brightly in the hearts of these courageous people. Many have given their lives over the past 34 years so that their fellow countrymen could once again be free. Their bravery and courage, however, have been no match for the cold and calculating totalitarian machine they are up against.

It is essential that we of the free world convey to these brave Lithuanians that they are not alone in their struggle; that we stand firm in our support for them and the other Captive Nations of Europe.

East and West relationships have become increasingly harmonious in recent years, and now we stand on the threshold of historic détente with the Soviet Union. Against the backdrop of continued Soviet oppression in Lithuania and the other Captive Nations, however, détente has a hollow ring.

The Soviets must learn that détente cannot be built on a framework of words alone. The oppressive inhumane treatment of the Captive Nations people must cease if détente is to be meaningful and successful.

I join with those Lithuanians around the world in commemorating the bitter memories of June 15, 1940, and hope that the future will return that most cherished of human rights, freedom, to the brave people of Lithuania.

NEW VIRGINIA BISHOP

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Virginia has a new Catholic diocese—the Diocese of Arlington—together with a new bishop: Bishop Thomas J. Welsh. I would like to take this opportunity to welcome Bishop Welsh to our community and acquaint my constituents and colleagues with the bishop by sharing the following article which recently appeared in the Washington Star News:

NEW VIRGINIA BISHOP: A MAN WHO LOVES PEOPLE

(By William Willoughby)

Thomas Welsh used to brag about how well he played first base—at least his brother says he did. But today Thomas Welsh is thankful that he decided to go into the priesthood rather than jump into a career playing baseball.

"I would have starved to death," Bishop Thomas J. Welsh said yesterday in a telephone interview. "They always told me I never could hit a curve ball too well."

As the first bishop of the newly formed Diocese of Arlington, and faced with a rapidly growing Catholic population, Welsh realizes he's going to be thrown a lot of curves of a different nature in the next few years. But he figures his varied experience in the ministry as a pastor, educator, administrator and as auxiliary bishop of Philadelphia will help him.

Welsh's career as an educator and administrator is illustrious. While he was rector of the highly touted St. Charles Borromeo Seminary in Philadelphia for the last eight years the school produced record numbers of candidates for the priesthood at a time when there was a graphic decline in men going into the Catholic ministry.

Welsh came from an Irish family in upstate Pennsylvania which was very close physically and spiritually, he said, and the impact of this type of background will be reflected in his principal emphasis among the Diocese of Arlington's Catholics.

"I am particularly interested in the family situation and will place emphasis on encouraging my priests in the parish community life for the families. I want the liturgical life and family-related programs of the parishes to be as strong and as central as they can be," he said.

He said that aside from that he does not have any prime priorities. "I think that at first I will be merely the supervisor of a lot of things that are already going on... I know Bishop Walter Sullivan of Richmond quite well and will count on his friendship and help to move us along," he said.

While known in official Catholic circles for his administrative and educational expertise, Welsh is known by the people and priests of Philadelphia as a person who genuinely loves and relates freely with people. Invariably they speak of his quick wit and easy-going, non-protective manner.

He came from a family of second-generation Irishmen who made their home in Weatherly, Pa., a village between the anthracite coal mining region and the Poconos. His father worked for 50 years on the Lehigh Valley Railroad. His mother was from Brooklyn.

Welsh credited the example of the family's parish priest—"his sacrificial and sacramental approach to his work with his people"—as being the deciding thing that turned his attention toward the priesthood.

After only two years of high school, the youth of 15 entered the seminary he was later to lead in Philadelphia. From 1946 through 1949 he studied at Catholic University, taking a doctorate in canon law.

Pope Paul IV named him auxiliary bishop of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia in 1970. He had been rector of the seminary prior to becoming the auxiliary bishop and continued in that capacity until the appointment yesterday.

The new bishop is of athletic build, standing more than 6 feet tall, and besides baseball used to play basketball and football in school. Now 52, and gray-haired, he says he prefers swimming and walking.

One of his brothers, William J. Welsh of Bethesda, came to the Library of Congress as a fledgling clerk during Thomas' days at CU and now is director of the processing department at the Library. He chuckled when told his brother was described as being a "warm, quiet type of person." Warm, he was in full agreement with.

"Quiet!" he exclaimed. "I wouldn't exactly described him that way. Everywhere he goes there's always a host of friends around him. The outstanding thing about him is how well he relates to other people."

The bishop has another brother, Edward, who works with United Air Lines in Redwood City, Calif., and a married sister, Mary, in St.

Clair, Pa. Both his parents are dead. The announcement of his appointment came on what would have been his mother's birthday.

Bishop Welsh said it will be hard for him to leave Philadelphia. "After all, I have been associated with that seminary and with Philadelphia since I was 15. It will be difficult. But already I am getting the good wishes of so many nuns and priests and laymen in my new diocese that I am looking forward to coming."

The diocese, carved out of the Diocese of Richmond, has 136,000 Catholics out of a total population of 1,201,222, and covers 6,541 square miles. It has 49 parishes and seven missions, 60 diocesan priests and 33 religious. The new diocese embraces Northern Virginia, the northern reaches of the Shenandoah Valley and the Northern Neck.

TRIBUTE TO ELLIS A. ROTHER, SR.

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that we get an opportunity to pay tribute to people such as Ellis Rother, people who give generously of their time and talents to their community in hopes of making it a better community. The city of San Carlos is a better community for having had Ellis Rother as its councilman and mayor.

Ellis is being honored by his fellow citizens on June 13, 1974, on the occasion of his retirement from active service as mayor and councilman. I want to align myself with those who are paying tribute to Ellis on that occasion.

He has served his community well and in many capacities:

Appointed to San Carlos City Council, 1969; elected to San Carlos City Council, 1970; mayor, city of San Carlos, April 1972–April 1973; chairman, water quality administration commission, 1972–74; regional planning committee; airport land-use committee; director, tourist and convention bureau; Association of Bay Area Governments; San Mateo County Council of Mayors; San Carlos Planning Commission chairman; San Carlos Planning Commission member, 1963–69; chairman, central business district committee; past president, Santa Clara Chamber of Commerce; founded Santa Clara Symphony Association.

Unlike many of us who are first- or second-generation Californians, Ellis Rother is a descendant of one of the early pioneer families who settled in California in 1848. The Rother family has been in service to their communities and the State ever since. Ellis has carried on that fine tradition of excellence.

A graduate of San Jose, Ellis is in business in San Carlos, where he and his charming wife, Margaret, have raised three fine children: Diane, Ellis, Jr., and Brook.

The city of San Carlos may be losing the formal services of Ellis Rother, but his dedication to his community will manifest itself, I am sure, in many ways, because Ellis is an active participant in

community affairs. A few of his current activities include:

Board of directors, San Carlos Chamber of Commerce; Sierra Club—conservation programs and leading trips to Mexico and Grand Canyon, and a new scouting trip to Belgium, Germany, and Holland; Kiwanis Club of San Carlos.

In short, Ellis is the model citizen whom we all hope that future generations of Californians will emulate.

LAND-USE LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt the United States is in serious need of effective land-use legislation—legislation that will help bring some balance and priorities to the development of our country.

What we are not in need of is a land-use bill that, in essence, starts us on the road to more public control over private property and stifles private ownership.

Yesterday, the House of Representatives refused to consider such a measure and sent it back to committee. I applaud that action. The Udall land-use bill never made it to the floor of the House for a vote because the floor of the House is not the place to write legislation affecting every property owner in the country.

It never made it to the floor because its authors were lined up to introduce 21 amendments to their own bill. These amendments should have been worked out and a final bill produced by the committee after extensive public hearings. Hopefully, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will now follow that course of action.

It is interesting to note the range and variety of opposition to the legislation. Groups like the National Association of Manufacturers, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the American Farm Bureau, and the Association of General Contractors were vehement in their feelings against the measure.

In my judgment, this bill would have been a complete violation of the strong home rule tradition in New York State because it would shift traditional responsibilities from local and State governments to the Federal Government. Government works best when governments at the local level have the final determination and local prerogatives are preserved.

The legislation ignores this theory and refutes the well established fact that local government and individuals are more concerned and better able to make judgments about land use than Federal and State governments.

Another reason I voted against House consideration of the bill, H.R. 10294, was the \$800 million appropriation it contained. If we are ever going to curb in-

flation, we must start to curb Government spending.

The legislation has other dangers. Historically, the marketplace determines the best use for a piece of land. The bill undermines this tradition. In addition, it places the physical environment in a dominant position and ignores the needs for economic development, energy, and housing, among others.

What we need is land-use legislation which makes such planning consistent with the framework of our Federal system and the guarantees of our Constitution.

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON DOMESTIC NEEDS AND ECONOMIC FORESIGHT ASSESSMENT ACT OF 1974

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with the Democratic leadership in cosponsoring a resolution which would promote a uniform approach among the leadership of Government and private industry to monitor our Nation's progress and to work to head off potential future crises.

It has been said that "Foresight is better than hindsight—by a damned sight." I think that all of us are aware that we spend a lot of time and taxpayer money trying to make repairs after untoward events have occurred. I believe that this legislation, if enacted, would be a step toward exercising the responsibility of leadership expected of the legislative and executive branches, together with top figures in the private economy.

I am hopeful that the bill's actions will be more crisp than its necessarily long title: "The National Commission on Domestic Needs and Economic Foresight Assessment Act of 1974."

Why is this bill needed? We simply have not had much coordination in planning our economic course. The Federal Government, State governments, local governments, and private enterprise have, more or less, gone their own separate ways. This has led to poor legislation, poor planning, economic dislocations, misunderstandings and misjudgments of the capacities and capabilities of both Government and industry.

The act would establish a national commission of 13 members to detect the existence or possibility of long- or short-range shortages or market adversities affecting the supply of natural resources, raw agricultural products, materials, manufactured products, or impairment of productive capacity due to shortages of materials.

It would recommend actions to be taken to correct shortages and adversities or to head off threatened shortfalls of needed materials or downturns in productive capacity.

The commission would be appointed by

the President, after consultation with House and Senate leaders. There would be five members from the private sector, four senior officials of the executive branch, and two Members from each House of Congress.

I am not one generally to push a new layer of Government. I am hopeful, however, that this commission can, at minimum cost, give us a valuable overview of our American scene. I am hopeful that it would be balanced in its viewpoints, that it would take an objective look at the relationships between various branches and levels of Government, and the regulation and economic planning being done—or not done.

In my view, this commission would not be intended to regulate, but to investigate and recommend. I feel it has merit. I hope that my colleagues in the House will support this bill.

TRAFFIC SAFETY

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dedicated persons I know in the field of traffic safety, Mr. Allan A. Bass, has once again come up with an important message regarding traffic safety. This time, it is about something we all are greatly concerned with—our children, traffic, and accidents.

Mr. Bass, Traffic Safety Coordinator of Middlesex County, N.J., has long been noted for his strong and active leadership in this area, and his "To Whom It May Concern:" is well worth the consideration of my colleagues:

TRAFFIC SAFETY TRAINING IN SCHOOLS

To Whom It May Concern:

Across our Nation, thousands of dedicated police officers meet periodically with millions of young children in the classroom to better understand and review traffic safety.

A trained traffic officer accents pedestrian safety, modern traffic signs, their new colors and symbols, crosswalks and the significance of safety seat belts. He understands better than most, the exposure of the young and the old to serious accidents involving motor vehicles and bicycles.

More children between the ages of 5 and 14 die each year in traffic accidents in the United States than by any other single cause. The National Safety Council reports about 5,100 young people under age 16 were killed in auto crashes, according to the most recent annual statistics. These facts, and there are many other imposing reasons underscore the onerous responsibilities of the traffic officer.

Every parent, especially those with young children should find out more about traffic safety training in the classroom; ask your school principal about these programs. You might pick up a few pointers about defensive driving yourself.

Above all, tell your mayor, your police department and other public officials how much your family appreciates traffic safety training in schools. And, please do all you can to bring this safety message to others.

Sincerely,

ALLAN A. BASS,

Traffic Safety Bureau.

Middlesex County, New Brunswick, N.J.

WEALTH FROM WASTE

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, this past February I had the honor of attending and participating in the "Wealth from Waste" luncheon sponsored by the Indianapolis Garden Club. Through the theme and program of the luncheon, "resource recovery from solid waste," the garden club members expressed their deep commitment to the protection and preservation of the environment. Mr. Wade St. Clair, director of information for the National Center for Resource Recovery, Inc., spoke to the group about the efforts his organization is making to solve the solid waste disposal problem presently threatening our American environment. The National Center is a non-profit organization which has conducted research in the area of resource recovery from waste.

The Indianapolis Garden Club, which is associated with the Garden Club of America, is comprised of a group of women dedicated to the protection of the environment. They felt it would be helpful to bring Mr. St. Clair to speak about the efforts of the NCRRC which relate to the solid waste disposal dilemma to the attention of the community and business leaders. The members of the garden club are to be commended for their dedication to the protection of our environment.

The concerns and actions of the Indianapolis Garden Club relating to environmental protection along with efforts of other citizen groups, private industry, and governmental programs, recognize the crucial solid waste disposal problem currently facing us. It threatens to overwhelm our capacity to deal with it unless we take innovative and far-reaching steps to alleviate the problem.

Presently, solid waste disposal costs this country billions of dollars each year. The cost of disposing of municipal waste alone is expected to reach \$7.8 billion by 1976. The cities and towns of this country are constantly burdened with this problem—not only does it constitute one of the largest financial burdens for localities, but over one-half of these expect to exhaust their disposal capacity within the next 5 years. Mayors and councilmen across the country have cited this as their No. 1 problem.

Not only are we threatened by the possibility of a surfeit of waste, but we are also unnecessarily depleting our natural resources by failing to extract the estimated \$2 billion worth of recoverable materials in our waste. EPA has published facts stating that there are \$1 billion worth of recoverable inorganics—iron, steel, aluminum, zinc and glass—which can be recycled. The cost of processing these recycled materials requires 90 percent less energy than recycling virgin materials. Inorganics contained in waste are also estimated to be worth \$1

billion. Paper pulp, compost material, and fuel to generate electricity can all be recovered. EPA estimates the recoverable fuel in our waste could generate energy equal to 5 percent of our current oil consumption or 6 percent of our total annual energy production. These figures cannot be ignored.

The Indianapolis Garden Club and other groups like it are giving good leadership by attempting to bring before the attention of the leaders of business and the community the need to protect our environment and preserve our natural resources by making use of the materials recoverable from our solid waste.

Recycling resources from waste is yet a new, expensive process. Consequently, its cost is too high for most municipalities and industries to make use of it. Some element needs to provide a push to get this process into wider use and that incentive could be provided by the Federal Government.

In 1965, the Federal Government enacted the Federal Solid Waste Disposal Act (Public Law 89-272, title II) which constituted its first move in recognition of this problem. The act mainly pushed for the study of and experimentation with new and better methods of solid waste disposal. The act was amended in 1970 by the Resource Recovery Act (Public Law 91-512) which redirected the emphasis from solid waste disposal to resource recovery and recycling. Many demonstration grants have been authorized under this amendment which have shown waste recovery efforts to be profitable and economically feasible and efficient. Presently, a resource recovery plant is being constructed in the Town of Hempstead, Long Island, with the help of one such EPA grant. The town is receiving a Federal grant of \$2.1 million to aid in the financing of the \$44.6 million resource recovery system. The philosophy behind funding such individual projects is to develop systems that can be copied elsewhere at no cost to the Federal Government.

The National Center for Resource Recovery, whose representative, Mr. St. Clair, spoke to the garden club luncheon I attended, has developed a program similar to that envisioned by the Solid Waste Disposal Act. Their efforts are embodied in the National Resource Recovery Network which coordinates a group of resource recovery systems around the country. Their goal also coincides with that of the Federal Government—they plan to help establish these plants across the country and make them self-sufficient within 5 years.

The efforts of the EPA through the Solid Waste Disposal Act and those of the NCRRC do take a step in the right direction, but something more is needed. Planning needs to be made more extensive and more systems need to be built.

Right now, H.R. 13176, of which I am a cosponsor, the Comprehensive Waste Management and Resource Recovery Act which further amends the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, is pending final markup by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This bill, if

enacted, will provide the needed incentive for the further development of resource recovery systems. It envisions a 5-year self-liquidating grant program which will make grants available to those States which adopt, administer, and enforce comprehensive waste management and recovery systems. With increased numbers of localities and industries encouraged to take advantage of the resource recovery systems, the various methods would be perfected and concurrently made less expensive to build and operate. Figures from existing systems show that these plants do become self-sufficient after 5 years and even turn a profit from the sale of the recovered resources.

The incentive provided by H.R. 13176 will enable more elements in the private and public sectors to expand and utilize resource recovery systems and at the same time, alleviate the strain on our environment.

As we find ourselves in the mid 1970's in a situation where natural fuel sources are rapidly being exhausted, where we are fast falling behind in our capacity to dispose of our solid waste thus posing a significant threat to our environment, we need to provide an incentive to urge the construction and use of resource recovery systems. For these reasons of urgency, I ask the H.R. 13176, the Comprehensive Waste Management and Resource Recovery Act, be reported out of committee as soon as possible. Once before the Members of Congress, I urge that my distinguished colleagues join me in seeking the enactment of this vitally important bill.

HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
COUNSEL RETIRES TO AMERICAN
BAR ASSOCIATION

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I first came to know Herb Hoffman when he was Chief of Legislation for the Department of Justice, and was delighted when he joined the House Judiciary Committee staff 3 years ago this month.

Along with the many friends that Herb has made in his distinguished career as an attorney in both the civil and military service of the United States, I wish him much success and happiness. The job he has undertaken as Director of the American Bar Association's Governmental Relations Office poses challenges which I am sure Herb will attack as conscientiously and effectively as he has the challenges of the last 30 years.

As a Member of Congress who has worked closely with Herb in the past, I look forward to an even closer association in the future. Though no longer on the public payroll, I have no doubt his efforts

will continue to further the public interest.

PRESERVING THE CHESAPEAKE BAY—TIME IS RUNNING OUT (PART II)

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, Monday, I inserted an article in the RECORD by Washington Star-News staff writer Woody West. The article was the first in a four-part series on the Chesapeake Bay, and today I am inserting the second part of that series.

In this article, Mr. West examines the problems presented by sewage effluents, even when it is treated, to the bay's ecology. The treated effluent, which has a high content of nutrients, can choke "subestuaries" by encouraging rapid growth of aquatic plants. Much of the problem comes from tributaries of the bay, Mr. West notes, and these rivers may draw from several States.

Problems such as these can be dealt with effectively only through organized interstate cooperation, and I am among those who are anxious to encourage this sort of common effort. To provide this encouragement, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 979, allowing the creation of a Chesapeake Bay compact to foster interstate efforts to preserve and protect the bay. As Mr. West's article shows so well, the time for implementing a cooperative plan is fast running out, and none of us can really be sure how much time is left.

I hope that this series of articles will help induce action on this bill by the Judiciary Committee, where it has been referred. And I am grateful to Woody West and to the Star-News for presenting this series, which presents so well an examination of the problems and potential future for one of America's most important bodies of water.

The article follows:

[Part II]

IT'S TIME FOR DECISIONS IF BAY IS TO BE SAVED

(By Woody West)

Decade after decade, man has plumed and fished, mined and farmed, used and consumed from the Chesapeake Bay and its lands with hardly a hint that, at some distant day, a piper would require his wage.

Why has it been that only in the last few years that ecology and environmental integrity have become common topics for public discussion and debate? Dr. L. Eugene Cronin, director of the University of Maryland's Natural Resources Institute and a respected Bay scientist, offered a perspective.

"Only within decades, increasingly since World War II with the coming of big industry, big population, occurring almost simultaneously," he said, "have people started coming to the realization of the necessity of weighing costs and benefits."

"Until the 1940s, the general English base of law was dominant—you were permitted to use air and water quite freely to dispose of waste unless it directly harmed others' health. Only in a short time, have we begun

to say, 'Wait a minute, you've gone beyond your own backyard when you dump waste.'"

Even this limited consciousness, however, did not become conspicuous until the mid-to late 1960s when ecology became a symbol and rallying cry.

"The rhetorical surge was helpful in initially raising interest," Cronin said. "But beyond this, it can be harmful. I think the future of the Bay has to leave the realm of careless overstatement very quickly and there must be a bringing together of science, management and legislation—with the important addition that a very broad base of people retain interest and concern."

Dr. Donald W. Pritchard, for a quarter of a century the head of Johns Hopkins University's Chesapeake Bay Institute and now its senior scientist, said:

"We've lived in an age when we've had our cake and been able to eat it, too. We won't have that in the future. We've got to make some hard choices. To keep the Bay within some acceptable state—that's the decision and the time is now. At present, I think, 'acceptable' would certainly mean that it become no worse than it is now and, hopefully, a lot better."

The ruggedness of the Bay, its tenacious ability to sustain man's intrusions, has given those of us dependent upon it a grace period. If correct choices based on sufficient information and adequate compromise are made, these scientists feel, the Bay will continue to function with its historic richness. The Smithsonian's Dr. Frank S. L. Williamson hazards an estimate of this grace period at from "10 to 20 years, as a ballpark estimate."

Why, it may be asked, if the Chesapeake has been so immune to man for centuries, should there be a developing sense of urgency now?

The Back River is today regarded as little more than a "holding lagoon" for much of the treated effluent from Baltimore. The river is a shallow body almost choked with seasonal growths of exotic plants that no other form of life grazes on.

The Back River, even if reduced to little more than an appendage to a sewage plant, serves to prevent much of the enriched effluent from immediately flowing into the Bay proper and increasing the level of nutrient. But, at the same time, the water has lost much of its aesthetic and recreational utility.

"Who is going to make the decisions concerning the number of sub-estuaries we should preserve?" Williamson has asked. "These are vital parts of the Bay, remarks concerning the usefulness of the Back River as a nutrient trap that protects 'the Bay' notwithstanding."

"Who is going to make the decision about the upper level of nutrients that the entire system can tolerate?" he asked. "Perhaps we can only wait and see. It should not take very long."

Other major tributaries, if not in so advanced a state of deterioration as Back River, are in trouble. The Rappahannock, particularly around Fredericksburg, is showing significant pollution problems. The York, though now in comparatively good shape, is worsening, according to Dr. William J. Hargis, Jr., director of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science. Pressures also are increasing in the lower reaches of the York due both to population growth and industrial concentration.

The James River, Hargis said, probably is under more of these pressures than any tributary except the Susquehanna. Industry is a prime contributor. Yet portions of the James are in appreciably better condition now than a decade ago Hargis said.

The Potomac, from Washington downstream to Quantico, is also under enormous pressures, and water quality remains a prob-

lem. However, intensive efforts to upgrade the technology of handling human waste—the Potomac's main pollutant—and a broad array of scientific energy offers hope for significant gains.

Dr. Donald Lear, a biologist with the federal Environmental Protection Agency, sees the possibility for reversal of the eutrophication—aging of a body of water in a process not unlike senility in the human being—that is "fairly pronounced" in the river around Washington now.

The current expansion of the Blue Plains treatment plant with the addition of some of the most advanced technology now available, he said, will offer the prospect of "a major reversal of eutrophication by control, which may be the first time this has been done by control, rather than by diverting the pollutants into another channel."

It's well under way now," he said, with completion anticipated for the sophisticated system in three years.

Most scientists agree that the efforts to control waste disposal into the upper Potomac estuary look, indeed, promising. But there is another unknown for the Potomac and other tributaries where intense efforts are under way to upgrade technology and control techniques: Can the scientific efforts and technology keep pace with the demands that ever-growing population will create?

"The population increase has been faster than the increase in treatment systems," Dr. Cronin said, "so we don't even catch up to where we were. That's always a problem."

Another extensive set of potential problems is just now becoming conspicuous—the imminent use of the offshore areas for intensive exploitation. Recommendations already have been made to the federal government to permit drilling for oil and exploration for other valuable minerals along the Eastern Seaboard.

A new generation of electrical generating plants may be sited in coastal waters. Huge offshore mooring points for ocean-going freighters also are being discussed widely.

The ramifications that such development could have for the Chesapeake Bay area are obvious.

"Maryland happens to own a very neat little cross-section off the coast and, if you extend it, it goes out to include the Baltimore Canyon, which is one of the sites for possible oil exploration" Cronin said. "But the uses we make of this area for intensive recreation, for very intensive preservation, for fisheries, for navigation, all need to be carefully assured."

"The scientific knowledge of the coastal region here is really primitive," he added. "We know general circulation, we know something about the commercial species because fishermen have been out there and we have data on what they've caught. The rest of the system is very, very poorly understood."

As scientists and administrators discuss the problems and pressures the Bay system faces, an inevitable term is "exponential"—increases by leaps and bounds, rather than a steady and consistent pace. It can be an intimidating process as graphically illustrated by Dr. Theodore Chamberlain of the Chesapeake Research Consortium.

"Take a lily pond," he says. "If you decided to increase the lilies, exponentially, it would take 30 days for the pond to be fully covered with lilies."

"But you might begin to ask what would be too many lilies for that pond. And this thought might occur to you on the day when the pond already has become half covered with lilies but that day on which it is half filled would, exponentially, be on the 29th day. In just one more day that pond would be totally covered. That's what exponential means," he says.

In many areas, such as waste-water treatment and population, that is the magnitude of the pressures on the Chesapeake. That "half-filled-with-illies" point of decision is not clear but it is approaching.

CURBING INFLATION MAY REQUIRE CONTROLS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on a recently broadcast television program Federal Reserve Governor Andrew Brimmer warned that economic controls may be needed to cope with inflation.

Mr. Brimmer is the first administration spokesman to abandon the President's pie-in-the-sky forecast of a revitalized economic picture by year's end, and I commend him for his honesty.

Inflation is the gravest problem facing America today, notwithstanding Watergate. If we are to come to grips with our runaway economy we must embark upon a new economic policy response to the needs of the middle-income consumer, the poor, and the elderly—rather than big business.

Prior to the expiration of controls in April, I proposed a new approach to combat inflation as well as the abuses of the existing controls program. In light of the continuing decline in the state of the economy, I again urge my colleagues to reconsider the controls question in detail.

The Brimmer article which appeared in the June 4 edition of the Wall Street Journal follows:

FED'S BRIMMER WARNS THAT CURBING INFLATION MAY REQUIRE CONTROLS

WASHINGTON.—A Federal Reserve Board member, Andrew Brimmer, warned the U.S. may have to impose some sort of wage-price controls again this year or next to cope with inflation.

"I don't think we can resolve the inflation problem facing this country by exclusive reliance on monetary and fiscal policy," Mr. Brimmer said. He said that "by the end of this year and into next year, when we get back into what I believe will be the old traditional kind of cost-push inflation, we may very well have to give attention again to some kind of supplements" such as controls.

The Fed governor is one of the first top-level government economic officials to suggest a possible return to controls. The Nixon administration's Phase 4 controls program expired April 30 and administration officials are opposed to any return to wage-price curbs.

In an interview on the Public Broadcasting Service's television program, "Washington Straight Talk," Mr. Brimmer stressed that winding down the current inflation spiral will take a long time. Forecasting that the inflation rate will be running at an annual rate of at least 7% at year-end, he said it would be impossible to reduce it to 4% by mid-1975.

"By the end of 1975," he said, "there is a reasonable possibility of reaching a 4% grade of inflation, but to do that would require having the unemployment rate well beyond 6%," compared with 5% at last count. Controlling inflation "is going to take much longer than generally realized," he asserted.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN COLORADO, BAD DAYS FOR A CATTLEMAN

HON. JAMES P. (JIM) JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article from the June 4, 1974, issue of the Fort Collins Coloradoan. It is a short article, but in its few paragraphs it explains the dire predicament of those who supply our Nation with beef.

The writer, Bill Hosokawa of the Denver Post, analyzes the amazing loss of \$125 on one steer from the Monfort Feedlots of Greeley, Colo. Yet Monfort's, as the world's largest producer of grain-fattened cattle can withstand such losses, at least for a time. But what of the hundreds of small producers without the financial reserves to survive.

A forboding message is conveyed, and it is simple. If something is not done immediately, America need not worry about sending beef abroad, for there will not be enough to put on our own tables here at home.

I commend this article to the scrutiny of every Member of the House:

IN COLORADO, BAD DAYS FOR A CATTLEMAN

(By Bill Hosokawa)

DENVER.—Ken Monfort, whose Colorado-based company is the world's largest producer of grain-fattened cattle, sold a steer one day recently and instead of making a profit he lost \$125.

What worries Mr. Monfort is that he has 180,000 head of cattle in his feedlots and he's going to have to market most of them at a loss—probably not as much as \$125 apiece—if conditions don't change. Meanwhile, every one of these animals is munching about a dollar's worth of grain every 24 hours. It costs Mr. Monfort \$180,000 a day just to feed his cattle.

In the most recent quarter of his fiscal year, Mr. Monfort's cattle-feeding operations, around the town of Greeley, Colo., lost nearly \$9.2 million. Profits from the company's other divisions and a substantial tax break trimmed the loss to \$3.8 million.

Even so, it is not the kind of situation conducive to sound sleep at night. It also demonstrates how sensitively one remote segment of the United States economy, the beef industry, is linked to the world-wide economy.

The steer on which Mr. Monfort lost \$125 was purchased half a year ago from a Texas rancher for 53 cents a pound on the hoof. Since it weighed 700 pounds, the cost was \$371. Last fall, after the beef boycott ended, the future looked bright for the cattle business and an investment of \$371 for this calf appeared to be sound.

By the time the calf gained 400 pounds to reach ideal marketing weight, Mr. Monfort's computers told him it has cost \$216 in feed, wages, interest and other outlays. That averages out at 54 cents for each pound of growth.

Adding the original investment to the cost of fattening the steer, Mr. Monfort had spent \$587 to produce this 1,100-pound animal for market.

But when he sold the steer the market had weakened so badly that he was paid only 42 cents a pound or \$462. Instead of realizing a profit for his work, time and investment, he has lost \$125.

June 12, 1974

It is not unusual for cattlemen to buy high and sell low. That's part of the risk of a highly volatile business.

"We've taken beatings before, but this is the biggest loss in my experience," says Mr. Monfort, a former Colorado state legislator. "Our situation is typical of the entire industry. We just happen to be the biggest."

What caused the trouble? Many things.

For one, there was that grain deal that sent United States surpluses to the Soviet Union. Suddenly American reserves had vanished. Buyers began to bid up the price, and the cost of feed nearly doubled.

Then there was the Arab oil embargo and the sudden rise in retail gasoline prices. Americans reduced their traveling. That meant they didn't eat steaks in restaurants the way they used to.

Auto workers were laid off. Their wives fed their families chicken or canned tuna rather than sirloins.

Britain used to buy nearly all of Mr. Monfort's beef kidneys. But British foreign-currency reserves had to be diverted to pay for expensive petroleum. The kidneys are now sold to pet-food manufacturers for one-third the former price.

Many smaller cattle feeders, less soundly financed than Mr. Monfort, are cutting back or going out of business. They cannot afford the risks on top of paying as much as 14 percent interest on their loans.

At Brush, Colorado, Irvin "Whitey" Weisbart is shutting down the feedlot his father opened 40 years ago. "We were going to close it anyway," he says, "but the current situation speeded up our plans."

Cattlemen are retrenching all along the line. What the public doesn't realize is that it takes 28 to 30 months for beef to move from breeding farm to retailer. The calves that aren't being conceived today won't be on the meat counters two and a half years from now.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, due to official business in Boston on Tuesday, June 4, 1974, I was unable to cast my vote on the three bills considered by the House that day under suspension of the rules. I would like the Record to show at this point how I would have voted had I been able to be present.

For the bill Senate Joint Resolution 40, to allow for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services, which unfortunately failed, I would have voted "aye."

To the bill H.R. 13595, authorizing appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1975, I would have voted "aye."

On the bill S. 2844, to provide for collection of special recreation use fees at additional national campgrounds, I would have cast an "aye" vote.

In addition, the House considered two conference reports, relating to funding measures for fiscal year 1974.

To the conference report to accompany the bill H.R. 12565, the Supplemental Authorization for the Department of Defense, had I been present, I would have certainly cast an "aye" vote.

And finally, on the conference report to accompany the bill H.R. 14013, making Supplemental Appropriations for fiscal year 1974, I would also have voted "aye."

I regret that I was unable to be present for each of these votes, but I would like the RECORD to show at this point how I would have acted had I been able to be here.

PLIGHT OF THE NATION'S LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied with the amount of public attention devoted to the serious plight of the Nation's livestock producers. While this subject has not been entirely ignored by the consuming public, much of what has been said about this disastrous situation relates to the industry as a whole and the financial community which supports it. Untold are the thousands of stories of bankruptcy and failure now threatened throughout mid-America because of existing livestock prices caused by the excessive importation of meat into this country and the failure of retail meat outlets to pass the reduced cost of meat on to the consumers.

Farmers and ranchers throughout South Dakota are flooding my office with letters and calls which tell one story—unless there is an immediate increase in market prices for livestock, there will be wholesale liquidation of breeding herds and endless foreclosures of ranches and farms. In many of these cases, those wiped out will be families that have been in the livestock business for generations.

The following letter from Mrs. Vernon Randall of Chamberlain, S. Dak., expresses very well what families on farms and ranches all over rural America are now faced with. I am hopeful that my colleagues will join me in finding the solution to the problem of low livestock prices which threaten individuals and families as well as an entire industry.

The letter follows:

CHAMBERLAIN, S. DAK.,
June 4, 1974.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We shipped hogs to Sioux Falls today.

That is usually a highlight on the farm, but not this time. Usually when we get the check from our sales, we can pay off the debt we made when we bought them, but not this time. We also used to pay the bills for feed, medicine and gas used to raise these hogs. But not this time. We always hope to have some left over for living expenses and other expenses such as insurance, payment of the farm, repairs and equipment, but not this time.

If the market isn't down today, we might get 25 cents a pound for the hogs. In order to break even we have to get between 35 and 40 cents. How can we keep our heads above water with prices like that? Where is the money going to come from to meet our debts and expenses? All of us farmers are in the same boat. The farmers are the backbone of

our nation, and the United States Government is letting them down.

Something can and must be done about it. Why does the U.S. let Canada ship billions of pounds of pork into the U.S. and they won't let us export a pound of meat into their country? If we weren't importing so much, maybe we could have a fair price for our products. Why should we import from them, it just doesn't make sense.

Our son is just beginning to farm with us, but what incentive does he have (or anyone else for that matter) when he loses money every day, just because our government thinks they have to keep on the good side of every country by importing their products. Those countries are all laughing at us for being such suckers. These young boys are soon going to give up and go searching for a better way to make a living. When they all go to the city to find a job, what is going to happen to our food supply then? You had better look ahead at this situation and do something about it.

Our expenses have more than doubled since last year. Gas, feed, fertilizer, parts, machinery and everything that we must have is going up beyond reason, and yet the price of every one of our products has gone down—eggs down 43%, beef down 38%, pork down 35%, poultry down, wheat and corn down.

It is ridiculous, in a prosperous nation such as the United States, that the farmers are going bankrupt while everyone else is prospering.

It would seem that there are enough Congressmen in Washington who represent farmers that something could be done about this dangerous situation. Let's see some action.

Yours truly,

Mrs. VERNON RANDALL.

IF YOU LIKE BROWNOUTS, YOU
WILL LOVE H.R. 11500

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the first hot day of the summer has resulted in the first of many voltage reductions that will soon be commonplace if we do not get serious about developing our domestic energy supplies. On Monday, most east coast electric utilities found it necessary to use a "brownout" to meet the demands of 95° weather on electrical consumption.

The problem locally was not that the utilities lacked the generating equipment to produce enough electricity. Instead, the problem is one of fuel, as the article following my remarks points out.

Soon the House will take up H.R. 11500, the Interior Committee's bill to limit strip mining. No reasonable man can dispute the need to end the abuses which too often have characterized the extraction of coal. At the same time, no reasonable person can question the need for surface mined coal to meet demands for power production. H.R. 11500 simply goes too far.

According to Federal Energy Office Administrator John Sawhill, enactment of H.R. 11500 could cut coal output by up to 187 million tons of coal annually at the precise moment it is so desperately

needed. This would be tantamount to scuttling the Navy the day after Pearl Harbor.

If and when H.R. 11500 gets to the floor, I plan to offer H.R. 12898 as a substitute. H.R. 12898 will end the environmental abuses that H.R. 11500 seeks to end.

More importantly, it will also permit us to mine the coal we need to avoid the shutdowns and power reductions that are inevitable if H.R. 11500 becomes law.

LITHUANIA STILL DOMINATED BY
THE U.S.S.R.

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed in the recent past many positive moves in the direction of worldwide freedom. However, even in this era of détente, we are sadly reminded of the strength of the Iron Curtain behind which the tiny nation of Lithuania is still dominated by the U.S.S.R. This sovereign nation was forcibly annexed into the Soviet Union 34 years ago. I join with my colleagues in commemorating this tragic event.

After the Communist occupation of Lithuania, nearly one-sixth of the population was driven from their homeland in one of the most inhumane chapters in world history. However, their quest for a free and independent existence could not be suppressed. Indeed, even within the last 5 years, insurrections against Communist domination were staged, and unhappily resulted in the self-immolation of three brave citizens. And, of course, we must not forget the valiant attempt of Seaman Simas Kudirka who, back in 1970, unsuccessfully sought sanctuary aboard the U.S. Coast Guard ship the *Vigilant*.

This same drive and determination which was present in the spirit of the Lithuanian people back in 1940 still lives today, and I join with all Americans of Lithuanian descent in the fervent prayer that this Baltic Nation will be free once again.

THE SOVIET UNION PLANS NEW
HARASSMENT FOR SOVIET JEWS
BEFORE AND DURING THE VISIT
OF PRESIDENT NIXON TO RUSSIA

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed and depressed by news that the Soviet Union is once again planning intimidation and harassment of Soviet Jews prior to and during the forthcoming visit of President Nixon to the U.S.S.R.

I append herewith an account from the Washington Post of June 12, 1974, of plans by Russian leaders to cut off phone service of all Jewish activists in the U.S.S.R.

I attach herewith also, Mr. Speaker, an address which I was honored to give at a rally on behalf of Soviet Jewry in Baltimore on Friday, June 7, 1974.

I was pleased that our colleagues, Congressman CLARENCE LONG and Congressman PAUL SARBANES also spoke at this event expressing their deep concern over the problems and plight of the 3 million Soviet Jews.

Mr. Speaker, these two items follow.

[From the Washington Post, June 12, 1974]

SOVIETS CUT PHONE TIES OF JEWS

(By William R. MacKaye)

The Soviet government has shut off the telephone of virtually every Jewish activist in the U.S.S.R., American groups concerned about Soviet Jews have reported.

The maneuver is apparently designed to thwart any effort by Soviet Jews to dramatize to President Nixon their campaign for freedom to emigrate to Israel during the President's visit to the Soviet Union later this month, representatives of the groups said.

Jerry Goodman, executive director of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry in New York, estimated that 98 per cent of the activists' phones had been disconnected, most of them in the last two weeks.

Karen Kravette, Washington representative of the somewhat more militant Union of Councils for Soviet Jews, who also reported the massive telephone disconnection, speculated that the Soviet authorities also hoped to block news of other repressive moves against Jews by cutting their telephone ties to the West.

Activist Jews, however, have used other contingency lines of communication to alert Western friends of an increase in secret police surveillance of leading activists and of growing fears among male Jews that they will be called up for military service, she said.

Before President Nixon's Moscow trip two years ago, a number of key activists, many of them over 40, were drafted for up to 90 days of military service, effectively removing them from Moscow during the presidential visit. A similar wave of telephone disconnections also preceded the 1972 Nixon trip.

Agencies involved in the cause of Soviet Jewry are particularly edgy about the possible impact on Soviet Jews of President Nixon's speech in Annapolis last week in which he pledged a U.S. "hands off" policy regarding internal Soviet affairs and urged defeat of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the pending trade bill.

The proposed amendment, which has the vigorous backing of the agencies and the American Jewish community generally, would tie liberalized U.S. trade policies toward the Soviet Union to Soviet government easing of the emigration restrictions.

Goodman noted that Stanley Lowell, the new chairman of this agency, which is funded by a broad coalition of Jewish groups, issued a statement shortly after the President's speech expressing the hope that Soviet Jews would not suffer as a result of Mr. Nixon's assurances to the Soviet government.

free trade between the United States and the USSR to the free emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union.

Soviet Jewish emigration to Israel ran at 3000 a month in 1973—a figure slightly better than 1972.

In 1974, however, Soviet Jews going to Israel have declined in number every single month. The number was 1720 in March, 1600 in April and 1226 in May, 1974—the lowest figure in almost three years.

In June, 1973 Brezhnev made the claim to U.S. Senators on the occasion of his visit to Washington that 95% of all of those applying for exit visas were receiving permission to emigrate from the USSR. At that time about 100,000 Jews were still awaiting visa exists in Russia. Now that figure has risen to more than 135,000.

In addition to the withdrawal or denial of permission the Soviets have increased the harassment and intimidation of those who desire to leave the USSR. In Moscow and Kiev, for example, persons wishing to apply for emigration must now get application forms from the police station rather than from the immigration office. In Leningrad, moreover, the post office has blocked delivery of invitations from relatives in Israel—the invitation which is essential to the Soviet citizen before he can even begin his visa application process.

In the twenty months of the existence of the Jackson-Vanik amendment we have seen the fantastic impact of this humanitarian measure. Both in Russia and in Israel the words Jackson-Vanik are almost magic. They give faith and hope to three million Jews in the Soviet Union.

The Russians, however, appear to be taking a hard line at this time in order to try to demonstrate that they can be as tough as the proponents of the Jackson-Vanik amendment. Unfortunately President Nixon is joining those in the Kremlin who prefer to have trade for Russia rather than freedom for Soviet Jews. At Annapolis on June 5, 1974 the President stated that the United States "cannot gear our foreign policy to the transformation of other societies." The President went on to practically bless the anti-emigration policy of the Kremlin. The President stated "we would not welcome the intervention of other countries in our domestic affairs and we cannot expect them to be cooperative when we seek to intervene directly in theirs". The President is wrong on every count in this sentence. The Jackson-Vanik amendment is not an "intervention" in the domestic affairs of Russia; it is merely a device by which we can insist that those nations who desire preferential treatment from the United States observe those guarantees to which they and we have subscribed in the United Nations declaration on human rights.

The Nixon administration is calling for a "compromise" on the Jackson-Vanik amendment. Dr. Kissinger is said to have received assurances about freedom of Soviet Jews to emigrate in a meeting with Mr. Gromyko on Cyprus on May 5. We have been told that Mr. Gromyko amplified upon his alleged assurances on May 28 in a brief meeting in Damascus with Dr. Kissinger.

Even the Washington Post today, June 7, 1974, editorializes that "the time for compromise on the Jackson-Vanik amendment is now." The Washington Post states that the President understandably "does not wish to sit down in the Kremlin with his hands trussed by the Senate." The Washington Post alleges that the pressure of the Jackson-Vanik amendment is "backfiring."

The Nixon administration also takes this position by claiming that they will seek the objectives of the Jackson-Vanik amendment by diplomatic means. In advancing this claim

the Nixon administration is urging the Congress to delete from the trade bill the restrictions placed on credit to the U.S.S.R. unless it allows free emigration of Soviet Jews. No matter how this proposition is phrased it is a basic erosion if not an elimination of the entire thrust of the Jackson-Vanik amendment. This amendment would mean that the President must certify at regular intervals that the U.S.S.R. is in fact observing the right of every human being to emigrate from one nation to another. If the evidence does not support Russia's implementation of this right, then the Jackson-Vanik amendment requires that the very beneficial credits to the Export-Import Bank (Eximbank) will be withdrawn. But the President wants to use diplomatic pressure rather than a law of the Congress.

I find this particular type of compromise unacceptable. It was the adamant position of the Congress in insisting upon Jackson-Vanik which brought about the trickle of emigration which is now possible from the U.S.S.R. to Israel. A withdrawal of that pressure in the name of some vague diplomatic negotiations will do nothing except to allow the three million Soviet Jews to be returned to the state of oppression with which they have been afflicted since the days of the czars and particularly since the era of Stalin.

Now therefore, as never before, is the time when those who believe in the basic moral and spiritual principles underlining the Jackson-Vanik amendment must be firm and unyielding. The Jackson-Vanik amendment is a continuation of that policy adopted in 1892 when the House of Representatives refused to allocate funds for food transport to Russia on the grounds that the czarist regime, by its treatment of Jews, had shocked the moral sensibilities of the Christian world. The Jackson-Vanik amendment is comparable to the legislative effort in 1911 to abrogate an 80 year old Russian-American trade treaty. At that time Secretary of State Knox urged "quiet and persistent endeavors in a diplomatic way rather than treaty abrogation in attempts to change czarist policies". The State Department continued to echo the theme now familiar to the effect that America's commercial and industrial interests would allegedly be harmed by abrogating the commercial treaty with Russia. State Department voices stated that anti-Semitism would fall on Russian Jews. In December, 1911, however, the House of Representatives, having heard countless members condemn the practices of czarist Russia, voted to abrogate the treaty by an overwhelming vote of 301-1.

The pressure to compromise on the rights of Soviet Jews will be more pervasive, more subtle, and, yet, more "persuasive" in the immediate future. The contention will be made that those who want to deny Russia the benefits of the Export-Import Bank are the enemies of detente and thereby the enemies of a lasting peace. It is now being hinted that the Export-Import Bank may run into serious financial difficulties if it is not allowed to do business with Russia. The USSR may play the game itself by sharply increasing for a brief period the number of Russian Jews allowed to go to Israel. In short, all types of deception, rationalizations, and bad arguments will be used to persuade the House and the Senate to cut the heart out of the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

All of us must be more vigilant than ever before. Christians as well as Jews—perhaps I should say Christians more than Jews—must recognize that there is a basic moral question confronting the Congress and the country. The basic question confronting all of us comes to this: Will we allow those people whose immoral attitudes brought us

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT F. DRINAN AT THE NATIONAL SOLIDARITY DAY FOR SOVIET JEWRY, JUNE 7, 1974, AT BALTIMORE

Both the Kremlin and the Nixon administration are demonstrating that they prefer

Watergate and the greatest political scandal in the history of our country to persuade this nation to abdicate its moral responsibilities to the three million Soviet Jews who desire to exercise one of the most fundamental rights given to all men everywhere?

I appeal particularly to Christians to rally at this dark hour of crisis. Christians must recognize as never before what Reinhold Niebuhr, the great Protestant theologian, once said: "No one can be a good Christian until first he is a good Jew."

REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS' SPEECH ON THE PURPOSE OF THE RE- GIONAL RAIL REORGANIZATION ACT

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant pieces of legislation enacted by this Congress was the Regional Rail Reorganization Act, which I co-authored with Representative Brock Adams. This act creates a planning process whereby the bankrupt railroads in the Northeast can be reorganized into a viable and profitable rail system, and provides Federal financial backing for the creation of a new, private enterprise, railroad corporation to operate the system.

As we expected the act has generated a slew of lawsuits from disgruntled creditors challenging its constitutionality; they are demanding compensation far beyond that provided in the act. I believe that the provisions of the act are fair and equitable in their treatment of the creditors' rights and that the constitutionality of the act will ultimately be upheld by the Supreme Court.

In a speech today to the Food Industry Transportation Conference in Washington, D.C., my colleague, Representative ADAMS, gave a clear and succinct statement of the intent of Congress in passing the Regional Reorganization Act. For the benefit of my colleagues who are following the progress of the act with great interest, I am placing the full text of Representative ADAMS' speech in the RECORD. I want to emphasize that I am in complete agreement with the statements made in his speech regarding the Regional Rail Reorganization Act.

The speech follows:

A NEW CRISIS FOR THE INVISIBLE SERVICE
(By Congressman Brock Adams)

THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, A NEW CRISIS
AND THE INVISIBLE SERVICE: I. THE NORTH-
EAST RAILROADS: CREATORS, CREDITORS, CON-
SUMERS AND COURTS

I was very pleased to be invited to be a speaker at the Food Industry Transportation Conference. This is a knowledgeable audience with a distinguished group of speakers on transportation problems. My remarks this morning are intended to give you, as people vitally concerned with transportation and the food distribution system, a status report on legislation, both pending and already enacted, which will affect the day to day conduct of your business.

Over the past few years, I have given many speeches to transportation groups—to shippers, railroaders, the airline industry, to truckers, and to the men and women union members who make the various transportation modes work. To me, transportation is a fascinating enterprise. It is not always glamorous and it is not often in the news. But it is the central nervous system of our national economy. It only makes the news when something goes wrong with it. Last Saturday, a disastrous train wreck in a tunnel on the Penn Central's West Shore Line up the Hudson made the front page of the New York Times. News of the crisis which has faced the rail transportation system in the Northeast for the past year and a half has too often appeared on the back pages, the financial pages, or more ominously, on the obituary page.

The transportation of goods and people from place to place—by land, air, or sea—is something most Americans take for granted. Tomorrow the sun will rise in the East, the trains will move, the planes will fly, the trucks will roll. But you who work with transportation every day know the incredible complexity of this task of distribution. Everyone worries about the price of a can of tomatoes or a sirloin steak but few wonder how the item they are buying in the supermarket got there in the first place. Some miraculous genie has put in front of the consumer that incredible array of food and goods from which he or she can choose. I know to you it is commonplace, but in the perspective of history it is astonishing. Vegetables of almost every type—fresh, canned or frozen—the year round. Meat of every variety at the butcher's counter. Chicken, eggs, and cheese. The list could go on. The shopper of 1974 is free from the chain of seasons. Almost everything is available almost all of the time. Why? Because of transportation the Florida corn or the Arizona tomato or the Washington apple can go anywhere, from Seattle to New York, at almost anytime of the year.

For some this task of distribution may seem a miracle. For you who know the complex details of bringing those goods from the fields in which they grew to the markets in which they are sold, it is not miraculous—it is just a very complicated and difficult job. A very fragile miracle indeed. But for most people the goods for purchase in the store are there by right—just as much a certainty as the sun rising every morning. For them transportation is the invisible service. When it becomes visible, is when it stops or threatens to stop.

Before discussing the national programs necessary to maintain, let alone, improve, the nation's transportation system, I want to talk with you about the continuing crisis of the Northeast railroad system.

As many of you know, last year Congressman Shoup and I authored legislation which was a result of months of hearings and meetings with every group affected by transportation. This legislation became the Regional Rail Reorganization Act; it was a truly bipartisan measure.

We listened to all of the interested groups, and they were ably represented by good spokesmen. In the final analysis, however, it is our job as elected representatives to speak for the public interest and to make basic policy decisions on the content of the legislation.

This law became effective on January 2, 1974. In greatly simplified terms, it provides for:

1. a planning process to determine the system necessary to provide adequate, efficient, profitable rail transportation service in the Northeast;

2. the creation of an independent United States Railway Association (USRA), with a broad-based Board of Directors representing the public interest, to finalize the plans and providing financing for a new rail system;

3. the creation of a new, for-profit, privately owned corporation that would act as a buyer or reorganization partner with the bankrupt railroads of the Northeast;

4. a broad range of government assistance for interim operating payments, plant improvement, payment of labor displacement costs and help for local communities to retain vital transportation services;

5. expedited court proceeding so that all parties could have their rights determined under the statute and

6. a specific limit on the amount of the taxpayers' money to be committed to the project.

II. THE COURTS AND THE CRISIS

On Monday, June 3, 1974, a special three-Judge court in Philadelphia heard arguments by the creditors of the bankrupt railroads that the Act should be declared unconstitutional.

These creditors want nationalization or a government taking so they will be paid 100 cents on the dollar. The trustees for the Penn Central Railroad argue the statute was constitutional, but only if the creditors could obtain more taxpayer money for the assets they transfer to the new corporation than was provided in the statute.

The Government attorneys' position is a difficult one. They are torn between carrying out the intent of Congress that taxpayer liability should be limited, maintaining the statute against the creditors who want the Government to take over, and accepting the position of the Penn Central Trustees that the statute should be carried out by allowing a large contingent liability against the Government.

III. INTENT AND INTEGRITY

On Thursday, June 6, 1974, I felt it necessary to write a letter to the Court hearing this matter. In the letter, I indicated that the Congress had intended the Federal government's financial commitment be limited to the sums authorized in the Act. Congress did not intend that there be a deficiency judgment against the Federal Treasury.

I am well aware from my experience as a private attorney and as a U.S. District Attorney, that the Congress having passed a statute must rely on the Government attorneys to maintain the Government position. The Congress cannot administer laws. It must rely on Government attorneys to defend them (though I think this practice is going to change perhaps).

I was deeply distressed when the Government attorneys did not, despite the request of the Members of the House Transportation Subcommittee, inform us that, contrary to the views of the Subcommittee, they might have to concede the possibility of a contingency liability at the 3-Judge District Court level. The procedural problem was that the matter of a contingent liability against the government could be decided by concession at the lower court level and thus never be presented to the Supreme Court for final decision.

I have indicated to the Government attorneys and others that I and other Members of the Subcommittee were prepared to file an *amicus curiae* brief in the Supreme Court outlining in detail the manner in which this statute was created and what the Congressional intent was. My fear was that this presentation could be foreclosed by action of the lower court.

I realize that any statements filed with the Court by Members of Congress may seem

to be of advantage to one party or another, and I have carefully indicated to the Court that I do not intend to argue the merits of the case. However, I believe it is essential that the Court and the Government attorneys know that the basic integrity of a Congressional Act is involved. If the statute does not meet constitutional standards by the manner in which it was drawn, then the Congress must change it. Major changes, such as granting the potential of large additional payments to creditors, should not be grafted onto the Act by judicial fiat.

I am also concerned that the DOT might revert to its original position by letting the statute fall and by forcing these railroads into liquidation and onto the auction block. I am worried that the statute will not be given a fair chance and that the government will be faced with the prospect of nationalizing the system as the only way to maintain rail service.

One of the reasons the present problem developed was that the Administration failed to appoint the Board of Directors of USRA by March 15, 1974. This Board of Directors was to be composed of people independent of the Executive Branch who had the knowledge and the interest to make the reorganization process work. The timely appointment of this Board would have created an independent agency with its own general counsel to help develop its legal position.

The President did not submit the names to the Congress until the end of May and the nominees are still awaiting confirmation. The result is that the Government position in Court has been basically developed by the Departments of Transportation and Justice, and the new Agency will be bound by these decisions. This shows what can happen when the provisions of a complex and carefully drawn statute are not carried out by those who are supposed to administer it, no matter how good their intentions may be. It also places those of us who made specific representations to our colleagues through legislative history in the position of having to speak out.

The Regional Rail Reorganization Act was carefully conceived with the full knowledge and assistance of all appropriate government agencies and with the support of all parties affected by it. It is a good and a proper solution. Those of us who have worked on the Northeast railroad problem for the last three years are standing behind this Act as it was created and we believe the Supreme Court will uphold it.

IV. TRANSPORTATION POLICY—THE ENERGY CRISIS AND INFLATION REQUIRE EFFICIENCY

I have chosen transportation as my area of specialty as a Member of Congress not only because it is important and it interests me, but because it is one of the most basic of consumer interests. The simple fact is that without transportation, there would be nothing there—in the market, at the point of sale—to buy.

Today, I speak to you in a very different context from that of the past. The energy crisis and inflation have given dramatic illustration to the importance of transportation and have made everyone look again at the "invisible service." These two factors throw a new light on the traditional fight between the modes and give new importance to what Congress is trying to do to cure the basic problems confronting the transportation industry. The status quo is over and we must make news and it must be good news.

Inflation and the fuel shortage mean that our transportation system must function at its greatest efficiency. All of us here today know that we have demanded that transportation be stable and available even at higher cost or inefficient use of fuel. Everyone seems to have a special hobgoblin to explain inefficiency—to much regulation, unequal government subsidies for differing

modes, poor return on investment. However, most careful observers do not think there is any one factor that can be singled out but a complex of causes. Of all the modes, the railroads are certainly in the poorest shape both in terms of physical plant and in earnings. Yet they are certainly the most efficient in terms of fuel and cost for long distance overland hauls. The trucks are the most efficient for collection and distribution over shorter distances with the flexibility of the highways and ease of loading and unloading working for them. The barges are most efficient in use of fuel and cheapest in total cost. Yet each mode is still trying to compete in all sectors with railroads operating at a loss in switching cars for local deliveries, trucks attempting to find fuel for long haul runs and barges being limited by their access to traffic.

V. THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT

The legislation which I have sponsored, the Surface Transportation Act, is a legislative package which will meet some of the capital needs of the transportation industry through government guaranteed loans and regulatory reforms. I think the reports I hear of the demise of this legislation are very premature. Despite the heavy agenda of the Transportation Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I think that like "Little Current" I hope we will be able to find an opening in the pack and move up on the inside rail, and report a bill from the full Committee this Fall.

DOT, partly as a result of the financial collapse of the railroads in the Northeast and the truckers strike for fuel, has recognized that more than regulatory reform alone is needed to restore the transportation system to health. DOT now favors a \$2 billion loan guarantee program for railroads as well as the regulatory reforms included in the Transportation Improvement Act. My bill and the DOT are very close in many respects, and I am hopeful that we will reach agreement on two key regulatory issues—greater rate flexibility and in easing the control of rate bureaus over rate proposals. My philosophy on regulation is as follows:

"The nation's regulatory policy should be directed toward creating and maintaining a privately owned and operated intermodal interstate system regulated by the federal government in the public interest. The regulations should be uniform for all modes and the degree of regulation should vary with the degree of monopolization existing at any particular point in the system. The government regulations will thus take into account the importance of both transportation and shipping units in a particular market with competition allowed to set individual prices above cost where neither shippers nor the industry have power to control the market and otherwise the rates will all be set publicly by government regulation. The ICC should be given a period of time to demonstrate whether it can overcome its present regulatory lag and if not then the regulatory system should be restructured so as to produce prompt and fair regulation."

Developing this legislation has been a lengthy and complex task. It deals with basic pocket book issues and requires the balancing of many competing interests. In the past three years I have met repeatedly with representatives of every group affected to pass this legislation.

The members of this audience have a direct stake in the success of the Regional Rail Reorganization and a new transportation law. I wanted you to be aware of my concern, as a drafter of the Northeast railroad legislation and the proposer of the Surface Transportation Act that we need your help in persuading a somewhat reluctant dragon to carry out the will of Congress, and to agree to passage of a new transportation program.

The dragon doesn't seem too interested in what Congress has to say—perhaps it will pay more attention to the transportation community. I urge you not to assume that you can sit back, relax, and leave the driving to DOT.

ON INFLATION

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, inflation in my opinion is the worst problem confronting our Nation today. While inflation affects every American in one way or another, those who are hurt the most are those who can afford it least—people on fixed incomes and people in the middle, and lower, income groups. And while the Federal Government labors ardently to find solutions to inflation, we continue to be subject to inflation's will.

Proposed solutions for inflation have come from all corners—academia, the business community, labor unions, and the Government. Mr. A. W. Clausen, president of the Bank of America, has expressed some interesting ideas on the subject in an article written by Michael Harris of the San Francisco Chronicle. Mr. Clausen has taken a novel approach to the problem by proposing, of all things, a tax increase. While I at this time have no comment one way or another on Mr. Clausen's suggestion, I urge others to follow Mr. Clausen's lead in trying to solve new problems with new approaches. It is obvious that the old solutions are no longer working.

I was given a copy of this excellent analysis by Mr. A. R. Johnson, president of the Guaranty Bank & Trust of Alexandria, La., and I have inserted the article into the Record as follows:

INFLATION? HERE'S WHAT BANK OF AMERICA'S HEAD SAYS ARE THE REMEDIES

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article is written by a staff member of the San Francisco Chronicle and was published originally by that newspaper last week.]

(By Michael Harris)

The surge of inflation in the nation has reached a "cancerous" 11.5 per cent rate that leaves the United States with only two painful choices, according to Bank of America president A. W. Clausen.

One is to watch passively while inflation continues raising everybody's prices and stealing into everybody's savings until the process ends in worldwide recession.

The other is to accept a temporary tax increase until prices are back under control and also—in almost revolutionary fashion—to make a permanent change in the way people spend their money.

Clausen said the time has come to quit wasting money on things people don't need, no cars that wear out too soon and on products that are designed to be thrown away after one using.

"We have distorted consumption into an economics of waste," Clausen said.

"And waste itself is inflationary."

Clausen and four other top Bank of America officials discussed the dangers of inflation last week in a lengthy interview.

The tone of the dialogue across a round table in a sunny room on the executives'

floor high in the Bank of America's headquarters were quiet and sometimes technical. But the message was urgent.

As president of the world's largest bank, Clausen can talk to other bankers, to economists and to government leaders. But all of them, he said, are powerless to wage an effective fight against inflation until the public understands what the problem is all about.

"People want to fight inflation, rather than give in to it," Clausen said.

"If they are aware of what is necessary, they are willing to make some sacrifices."

The nature of the problem can be expressed in everyday terms. Put as simply as possible, if inflation continues at the present rate, the dollar will buy 54 cents worth of food, clothing and housing five years from now—or 29 cents' worth in ten years.

In 19 years, the dollar will be worth a dime.

Clausen described it somewhat differently. "Inflation itself is a tax," he said. "The people who suffer most from it are low-income people."

"It is a tax that hurts more for those earning \$5,000 to \$10,000 a year than it does for those making \$20,000 to \$25,000."

As most people realize, Clausen continued, the process of trying to match higher prices with higher wages cannot continue indefinitely. The pensioners suffer along with the very poor.

"We have worldwide inflation and the specter of worldwide recession," he said.

"The problem has to be fought, and there's not a chance of winning it unless the effort starts here in the United States."

With so much money being spent uselessly in this country on nonessentials, Clausen continued, American industry finds itself stalled in an inflationary trap of high costs accompanied by prohibitively high interest rates.

The result, he said is that industry cannot raise the money needed to build factories that could provide long-term jobs and badly needed products—the very things that are essential for long-term prosperity.

"We don't have enough steel, aluminum, paper or oil refining capacity," Clausen said. "But corporations don't want to borrow for 25 or 30 years for new plants at 9½ per cent."

Among the changes Clausen proposed for the way American deals with money and credit were:

Automatic increases in income tax rates whenever the rate of inflation gets too high.

Tax laws that encourage people to save money, perhaps by giving tax exemptions on some of the interest paid on savings accounts.

Government assistance for businesses forced to convert from one field to another by changes in government policy.

A top level commission to help chart a new, production-oriented future for the United States.

Clausen said he was advocating a commission that would produce changes as fundamental as the six-year study that led to the creation of the Federal Reserve System following the wholesale bank failures in the Panic of 1907.

He contrasted his anti-inflation program with the suggestions of some senators and congressmen who have pressed for tax cuts to help constituents whose purchasing power has been reduced by inflation.

"That's throwing kerosene on the fire," Clausen argued.

Instead of inflating the economy with still more money, Clausen said, it would be better to call for short-term belt-tightening by raising taxes temporarily whenever inflation rose too rapidly.

Such a tax would have gone into effect, for instance long before the inflation rate reached the dangerous 11.5 per cent stage.

It would have prevented the expensive two-

year delay in imposing needed taxes when President Lyndon B. Johnson used deficit spending to finance both the war in Vietnam and domestic social legislation.

What is needed, Clausen continued, is a way to have the tax go into effect virtually automatically—in effect, to "depoliticize" the inflation fight.

It might for example, be decided that the country could live safely with an inflation rate of 3½ per cent a year but that taxes should go up whenever that figure was exceeded.

The extra money collected in temporary taxes could be deposited in the government's Social Security reserves, Clausen said.

This would not only help combat present-day inflation but, he added, would reduce the need for future Social Security tax increases.

Clausen explained why he thought a short-term remedy such as a new tax law would not be enough. He told why he thought a more basic study of the nation's economy had to be undertaken.

"The traditional tools—fiscal and monetary policies—don't seem to work today," he observed.

"Maybe we need more tools, or maybe we don't understand enough about the problem. Maybe we ought to go back to the drawing boards."

A group of no more than 15 persons ("We want to build a horse—not a camel") should be drawn from government, business, labor and consumer interests to spend three or four years studying the problem, Clausen said.

"If we tried to put a 90-day or one-year time limit on them," Clausen said in reply to a question, "all we could get would be a knee-jerk or shoot-from-the-hip job."

Clausen said he did not believe unemployment would increase if the committee succeeded in drawing up plans to transform the economy from its present emphasis on consumer spending to a new stress on production.

Clausen gave part of the answer to the question in a speech earlier this month when he said, "The major industrial nations of Europe have never approached our level of consumption, and for the most part they have retained the quality of durability in their durable goods to a greater degree than we have."

"Yet they have consistently kept their unemployment rate below ours."

Despite the dangers, Clausen said he was still optimistic.

"Inflation is our Number One, enemy," he said. "And when it comes to a choice between doing something or committing hara-kiri, we're going to do something."

THE NEW DEFENSE POSTURE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my Washington report entitled "The New Defense Posture":

THE NEW DEFENSE POSTURE

Congress is now debating a military budget which points to major changes in U.S. defense policy. The key issue in considering U.S. global defense responsibilities is whether the U.S. has the arms and the men to fulfill them. A new Secretary of Defense, the lessons of the Middle East war, and a lagging economy have all contributed to the new look in defense. But the most important factor has been, in spite of the spirit of detente, that Soviet nuclear and conventional forces have steadily improved relative to the U.S.

To meet these defense responsibilities, the Administration believes that the U.S. requires greater combat capability and forces sufficient to fight one major war and a limited war elsewhere at the same time (the 1½ war strategy).

The new defense position, with its emphasis on increased combat potential, weapon modernization, force readiness, and nuclear weaponry flexibility, also means higher defense spending of about 6 to 9 percent (in addition to the increase for inflation). In judging the appropriate level for defense spending, the probable nature of the next war, if one should come, and the enemy's strategy in that war, are difficult questions. Would it be a conventional or nuclear war? Where would it occur? Military planners have plenty to worry them, with an unfinished war in Southeast Asia, an uneasy peace in the Middle East, intense competition for the world's diminishing resources, exploding populations, and with large NATO and Warsaw Pact armies poised to strike one another.

The Administration is making several changes in the nation's defense posture to meet these challenges. Nuclear weapons development is moving toward greater accuracy for the strategic missiles and with less emphasis on weapons of mass destruction. The emphasis is on expanding the options available to the President in time of crisis, and meeting projected Soviet capabilities. The mass destruction weapons still exist, like the B-52 bombers, but the U.S. is entering a new era of weapons development with "refined" strategic and tactical nuclear weapons which stress accuracy over size. American nuclear power rests today on the triad of 1,054 land-based, intercontinental ballistic missiles, 656 submarine-launched ballistic missiles on 41 nuclear-powered submarines, and the 490 B-52s and F-111s of the Strategic Air Command. The emphasis in the years ahead will be on the nuclear submarines and the bomber forces, with the Navy pushing the development of the Trident submarine and the Air Force pushing the B-1 bomber.

Modernizing their arms on a wide scale, the Navy and the Air Force are also making sweeping and costly changes in their general purpose forces. The Navy wants more nuclear carriers, new sea control ships, several kinds of destroyers and frigates for escort, and anti-submarine ships to help guard against Soviet submarines. The Air Force is seeking, in addition to the B-1 bomber, a new aircraft for the support of ground forces, the A-10.

With rapid advancement in weapons technology apparent in the 1974 Middle East war, the Army has also launched into a major modernization program. The major efforts will be to shift Army manpower from support to combat roles, to increase inventories of equipment, and to improve the sophistication of the weapons. A big question, prompted by the 1973 Middle East war, is whether new missiles used by the infantrymen will make the tank and the whole family or armored vehicles obsolete. While the debate rages among the experts, the policy at present is to balance both the tank and the anti-tank weapons. The Army is developing the TOW (anti-tank missile), a new main battle tank (the XM-1, which has better fire control and armor than the present M-60A1), two more lightly armored vehicles, an attack helicopter, and a combat support helicopter. The Army's most immediate need, according to Defense Secretary Schlesinger, is an effective air defense system where a lag has occurred partly because ground forces in Vietnam were comparatively free of attack from enemy planes. So despite detente and the end of the U.S. combat role in Southeast Asia, the fiscal year 1975 budget is the highest peacetime military budget in history. A \$100 billion annual defense budget can be expected within a few years.

Congress has always been reluctant to reduce the defense budget, and usually cuts it no more than 4 or 5 percent each year. This reluctance arises because of the difficulties and the uncertainties of judgments on defense and also because of the high cost of being wrong. I believe that there is plenty of room for efficiency improvements in the defense budget, and that these improvements can be made without diminishing national security. These improvements include reductions in the number of support forces (not, however, a reduction in combat forces), cuts in headquarters personnel, slow-downs in the modernization programs, development of less expensive weapon systems, closer coordination of reserve and active duty units, and better procurement practices (cost over-runs in the billions are unacceptable).

Reductions in defense spending without risk to the national security can also come about if the U.S. proceeds cautiously to define more modestly U.S. objectives abroad.

TRIBUTE TO HERBERT E. HOFFMAN: HOUSE JUDICIARY COUNSEL EMBARKS ON FOURTH CAREER

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, Herbert E. Hoffman, one of the senior counsel of the House Committee on the Judiciary, retires from his third career at the end of this month. I join his many friends in wishing him well.

Herb Hoffman sandwiched 4 years of military service between two 2-year periods of the private practice of law in New York City. Then, in 1948, he moved to Virginia to raise his children on green grass rather than city sidewalks, joining the Justice Department in the Office of the Deputy Attorney General. After serving 10 Attorneys General and 10 Deputy Attorneys General as Chief of Legislation, Herb began a third career—on Capitol Hill.

During his first year with the Committee on the Judiciary, he assisted with the monumental and controversial legislation considered by the subcommittee chaired by your distinguished former colleague, Emanuel Celler. During the 93d Congress, Herb has been majority counsel to the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, rendering yeoman service on legislation to enact proposed rules of evidence for use in the Federal courts and legislation to provide for the court appointment of a Special Prosecutor.

Those of us on the House Judiciary Committee who have worked with Herb view his leaving with mixed emotions—regret because we will lose the direct benefits of his tremendous talents but also with a feeling of good will as he now embarks on his fourth career.

It is reassuring, however, that in his new position as Director of Governmental Relations for the American Bar Association his talents will still be available to us in Congress and will be in

addition more directly available to the organized bar.

SUPERTANKERS AND POLLUTION

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to my colleagues' attention an editorial decrying a situation which drastically affects our delicate ecological balance.

This article focuses on the imminent threat to the Virgin Islands environment that would result from the increased flow of unsafe oil tankers if additional oil refineries are built in the Islands. The central issue, however, is that safety considerations have not increased with the size of modern oil tankers. Ships now under construction are up to 70 times the weight of the largest tankers used after World War II. They are being built faster and with less consideration for sufficient safety measures. With increasing worldwide dependence on oil, the producers of this valuable resource are becoming obsessed with the profits available through faster transport of their product. Larger ships, more ships, but no sufficiently trained crews or safety factors to limit the number of jettisoned cargoes, leaks, and sinkings.

This editorial rightly calls for immediate attention to construction practices of the supertankers that enter our coastal waters daily. Is a 100,000-barrel oil shipment that ends up floating in our oceans today more valuable than a 1,000-barrel load that arrives intact tomorrow?

I present this timely editorial comment with special attention to its mention of the detailed New Yorker articles of May 13 and May 20. The article follows:

SUPERTANKERS AND POLLUTION

Those Virgin Islands residents concerned with ecology and those who have been contemplating the construction of a second and possibly a third oil refinery on St. Croix would be well advised to read a pair of articles on supertankers in the May 13 and 20 issues of The New Yorker magazine. In what the New York Times has described as a "brilliantly detailed and powerful account," the magazine describes the recent and rapid increase in the construction of these giant vessels and the unforeseen consequences of their use.

Less than 30 years ago, at the end of World War II, the largest tanker in use was 18,000 tons. About a decade ago the first of the 100,000 ton tankers made their appearance, and with the closing of the Suez Canal during the 1967 Six Day War the supertankers came into their own. Now, there are dozens of tankers in the 200,000 to 250,000 ton range, with vessels up to 1,250,000 tons being built or planned.

The increasing numbers of these enormous ships have caught the world unaware. Many are operated under flags of convenience by crews falling short of American or British standards, and most are built more with an eye for profit than safety. In crowded areas such as the English Channel there have been numerous collisions and supertankers have

broken up in storms, sprung leaks, or jettisoned cargo in order to save themselves when hit with mechanical failures far from the few ports in the world that can handle them.

All of this may seem a long way from these sun-bathed seas, yet eventually such uncontrolled pollution will effect us all. Virgin Islanders should have a heightened awareness of this problem, though, for it seems inevitable that, as refineries multiply here, there will be a greater likelihood of supertankers bringing their cargoes here for refining and transshipment to the mainland. Consequently, Virgin Islanders would be well advised to join those urging the major oil importing nations, such as the United States, to demand rigid safety standards and crew training for supertankers calling at their ports, and in particular that their operators be held strictly accountable for every drop of oil that they transport.

The result has been the spillage of tens of thousands of barrels of oil into the ocean, much of it in the heavily travelled tanker route around the Cape of Good Hope, whose stormy winter seas are doubly perilous for with loads suitable for only calmer waters. The New Yorker article ponders the question of the effect of oil killing spills on fish, fish eggs and phytoplankton in these nutrient rich waters. Millions of people depend for their lives on fish caught in these waters as they are carried along the South American and African coasts by the ocean's currents, and pollution of these waters could become a disaster of the first magnitude.

BILLY MATTHEWS CONTINUES TO RENDER DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, few men who have ever served in the U.S. House of Representatives enjoyed as many friendships as our former colleague, D. R. "Billy" Matthews of Gainesville, Fla.

In that regard, I know that those of you who knew Mr. Billy will be interested to know that he was recently elected by the Gainesville Exchange Club to receive its annual Golden Deeds Award. This outstanding civic club annually names one person to receive this award for contributions to the community and "responses to need that go beyond the call of duty."

Returning to Gainesville to make his home after serving in the Congress from 1952 to 1967, he has added to a distinguished service career as a professor of political science and social studies at Santa Fe Community College there. He is one of the most popular of instructors.

I saw him recently and can relate to my colleagues that he is in good health, good spirits, and is enjoying life to the fullest. He continues to make a tremendous and lasting contribution to his fellow man and I wanted to extend my personal best wishes and congratulations on this well-deserved tribute given him by this outstanding club.

BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF
HARRODSBURG, KY.

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I congratulate the people of Mercer County and Kentucky, and join with them as they celebrate the bicentennial of the founding of Mercer County's seat, Harrodsburg, during the month of June 1974.

On June 16, 1774, a settlement called Harrodstown—now Harrodsburg—was laid out 3 miles east of what later was to be known as Fort Harrod. However, an Indian uprising caused Daniel Boone to order the return of Kentucky surveyors to Virginia for their safety.

In the early months of 1776, a boy of 16, James Ray, was hunting near Fort Harrod. He had just killed and roasted a blue-wing duck when a "soldierly looking" man stepped from the forest. The boy offered to share his duck.

Ray later revealed:

The man seemed starved and ate all of it.

The stranger asked a great many questions about the settlement and Jimmy offered to lead him to the fort. In this way, according to old accounts, George Rogers Clark was introduced to Harrodstown and to become its leader.

Clark later went on to open up the West by blazing a trail to Louisville, and thence on to Illinois. He left behind him three stockaded forts in that part of Virginia later to become Kentucky—Boonesborough, Logan's Fort, and Fort Harrod.

One of the festivities scheduled during this bicentennial celebration will feature the issuance of the Harrodsburg commemorative stamp this Saturday, June 15, followed on June 16 by ceremonies unveiling a historic marker at the site of Fort Harrod.

Because of this historic occasion—a part of the prelude to the opening of the West—I place the following brief history of Harrodsburg and Fort Harrod in today's RECORD:

HARRODSBURG AND FORT HARROD, KY.

Harrodsburg of Mercer County, Kentucky, in the geographical center of the State, has the distinction of being not only the first permanent settlement in the State, but also the first permanent settlement west of the Alleghenies. It was here on Thursday, June 16th, 1774, that James Harrod, woodsman and veteran of the French and Indian War, and 31 other men—ignoring King George III's Proclamation of 1763 prohibiting settlement west of the Appalachians—laid out the settlement called Harrodstown. Each member of the company was assigned a half-acre and a 10-acre lot. By the end of the summer at least five cabins had been built.

From the first Harrodstown contained in microcosm the America to be; for the Harrod's company were English, Irish, Scotch-Irish, Poles, Germans and Welsh. All had certain things in common—a love of independence, an ideal of self-government and a belief in an all-powerful Providence.

During the summer of 1774, however, the settlers received word from Virginia's Governor Dunmore that the Indians were on the

warpath and all were urged to return to Virginia until the menace had passed. The bearer of this bad news was Daniel Boone, who was so taken by the activity and promise of Harrodsburg that he built a cabin for himself. However, the danger of Indian attacks did not dissipate and, after the settlement was attacked, Harrod and his company left. They returned the following year (March 1775) to reoccupy the cabins they had deserted and word was pushed forward on a project begun the preceding year—a stout fort to protect the settlers who were now beginning to arrive.

When finished the fort was protected by blockhouses and a palisade of logs 12 feet high, making it the largest enclosure and the heaviest palisade in Kentucky. Within the fort was a spring that furnished the inhabitants a constant supply of water. It was in Fort Harrod that the first schoolhouse in Kentucky was established. In 1776 Mrs. Coomes taught reading and writing to the children of the settlement.

It was also in this fort that Ann McGinty operated the first spinning wheel in the West, making the first linen (from the lint of nettles) ever made in Kentucky, and the first linsey (from this nettle lint and buffalo wool).

It was in the fort that the first clergyman ever in Kentucky, the Rev. John Lythe, preached the Gospel. Rev. Lythe, of the Church of England, came to Harrodsburg in April of 1775. Here also Squire Boone, brother of Daniel and an occasional preacher, walked about with a Bible in his hand.

In the spring of 1776 George Rogers Clark encountered a young settler in the woods near the Fort, introduced himself and after eating the young man's roast duck lunch, was led to the fort. In this manner, according to some accounts, George Rogers Clark introduced himself to Harrodstown (later Harrodsburg) and became its leader.

The settlers soon found themselves embroiled in a legal problem of proving title to their land and in June of 1776, Clark called a meeting of the settlers. As a result of this meeting Clark and Gabriel Jones were authorized to go to Virginia to re-establish the settlers' claims. After a voyage of some hardship and danger Clark and his companion arrived in Williamsburg, only to find that the assembly had adjourned. Undaunted, Clark went to Governor Patrick Henry who gave him a letter of approval to the Council of state.

Clark asked the Council for protection from a rival land company, Henderson's North Carolina Transylvania company) and for recognition from the Virginia legislature. The Council could only offer to lend Clark 500 pounds of powder, as a friend, but could not give it to the settlers as fellow citizens. Refusing the offer Clark said "that a country which was not worth defending, was not worth claiming," and intimated that he would seek help elsewhere, whereupon the Council changed its mind, gave Clark the powder free of any Virginia conditions, and promised that Virginia would acknowledge Kentucky as a county. This was done in December of 1776 and the Transylvania project broke down.

After another hazardous journey Clark arrived in Harrodsburg with the powder. It was sometime during this period that Clark conceived the idea of attacking the British in the northern territory, and obtained Governor Henry's permission to attack wherever he thought it advisable.

Clark's plan was for an expedition into the Illinois Territory to proceed across the Ohio, attack the English in the heart of the West, wrest military posts from her hands, prevent Indian outrages, and seize the vast domain of the central west for the United States. On April 20, 1777, Clark sent Benn

Linn and Samuel Moore of Fort Harrod as spies into Illinois. On June 22 they returned with information on the situation of the British in Kaskaskia.

Three of the four original captains who went with Clark into the Illinois Territory came from Fort Harrod—Joseph Bowman, William Harrod and Leonard Helm. Joseph Bowman was in command at Cahokia, William Harrod was in command in Kaskaskia, and Leonard Helm was in command at Vincennes.

When the English Lt. Col. Hamilton, the "Hair Buyer," surrendered and led his scarlet-clad soldiers between the lines of Clark's men, it was Leonard Helm of old Fort Harrod who hoisted the first American flag to fly over Vincennes and the British West.

Clark accomplished these military wonders with 175 men, 60 of whom came from Fort Harrod. Thus was this vast territory claimed for the United States and the Mississippi River assured as the western boundary of the new Nation.

Throughout the Revolutionary War Harrodsburg was the seat of Kentucky County, which was organized in December of 1776. By September 1777, in the first census in Kentucky, the town had a population of 198 persons, of whom 81 were eligible for military duty.

The first court in Kentucky convened January 16, 1781, in the blockhouse at Harrodsburg. One of the first cases tried was that of Hugh McGary, charged with playing the ponies. Found guilty McGary was proclaimed "an infamous gambler . . . not to be eligible to any office of trust or honor within the state."

Despite the Indian threat, disease and other hardships too numerous to enumerate, the people of Harrodsburg persevered although the year of 1777 was especially tragic; it became known to the settlers as the "year of the bloody sevens," in which the settlement almost perished as the Indians harassed the settlers and destroyed much of the corn, wheat and other crops. Fortunately, a large turnip patch had been planted and it was this food that helped save the settlement.

In 1775 John Harmon raised the first corn in Kentucky in a field at the east end of Harrodsburg. The first woolen mill and the first grist mill in the West operated here. Later the first wooden plow of the West was made by William Pogue at Fort Harrod. The first wheat was sown in the fall of 1776 in a field of four acres west of the fort at Harrodsburg. It was reaped July 14 and 15, 1777.

Harrodsburg can claim other firsts: the first white child in Kentucky was born in Fort Harrod; the first practicing physician was Dr. Hart, who settled in Harrodsburg in May 1775; and the first Baptist sermon was delivered by the Rev. Peter Tinsley in May of 1776 under a great elm at the Big Spring.

Harrodsburg continued to prosper, cultivating flax, hemp, tobacco and other money crops on the adjacent rich farm lands. Later the town developed a thriving tourist trade, largely because of its many sulphur springs but also because of its historic interest.

At one time, Harrodsburg was the summer resort of many of the plantation owners of the Deep South. The 1820-1860 period was one of steady growth as log cabins gave way to more fashionable houses modeled after those in Tidewater, Virginia.

Education was not neglected during this period and many strides were made in this field. Bacon College was moved to Harrodsburg in 1839 and remained there until destroyed by fire in 1864 when it merged with Transylvania College at Lexington, then known as "The Athens of the West."

Greenville Female College, later known as Daughters' College and now Beaumont Inn, opened in 1840. In 1847 there were two female academies, one under the direction of the Christian Church and the other under the auspices of the Presbyterian Church.

During this period, many men of distinction were born or lived in Harrodsburg. Gabriel Slaughter (1818-20), John Adair (1821-24) and Beriah Magoffin (1859-62) became Governors of Kentucky; George S. Houston took the same high office in Georgia. John B. Thompson served as a United States Senator (1853-59) and William Linney (1835-87) was a pioneer Kentucky botanist and geologist.

The Civil War disrupted this era of prosperity. Torn in its sympathies Kentucky again became the "dark and bloody ground" of old. In 1862 the 11th Regiment of the Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry and the 19th Regiment of Kentucky Volunteers, U.S.A., were recruited in Harrodsburg. In the same year, Morgan's Raiders, C.S.A., passed through Harrodsburg. No count was kept of the young men who slipped away quietly to join the Confederate forces.

Rehabilitation and growth were slow in the decade following the conflict, but by 1900 Harrodsburg had regained some of its prosperity. Since that time the town has become a trade center in the Bluegrass agricultural area, producing fine horses, poultry and burley tobacco. Some people still visit the sulphur springs to "take the water," and others visit the historic shrines of the region. Foremost among these shrines is the restored Fort Harrod, complete with replicas of the cabins and the first school. The Pioneer Memorial State Park includes the Taylor Mansion Museum, the Thomas Lincoln Marriage Cabin (moved from its original site in Beech Fork), the pioneer cemetery, and the George Rogers Clark Memorial, the money for which was appropriated by Congress.

In November 16, 1934, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Gov. Ruby Laffoon joined in dedicating the park. In his address, the President called attention to the fact that Harrodsburg had been "the scene of more historical first things than any spot" he had known. Referring to Clark and his expedition, President Roosevelt reminded the audience that the event being celebrated was "vital in the extension of the new Nation."

Other places of historic interest include the Old Mud Meeting House, the first Dutch Reformed Church west of the Alleghenies, and Morgan Row, once a stagecoach stop and tavern.

Fifty years ago, on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the founding of Harrodsburg, the Hon. Ralph Waldo Emerson Gilbert, a Representative from Kentucky, delivered a short address to the members of Congress in which he informed them of some Harrodsburg's heroic history. He concluded by saying that there "The horses are swiftest, the women are the prettiest, and welcome is sincerest."

MEMORANDUM TO COLLEAGUES: RESURFACE COAL MINE REGULATION

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today circulated the following memorandum to Members of this body:

MEMORANDUM

To Colleagues.
From CRAIG HOSMER.

Both surface coal mining bills—H.R. 11500 and H.R. 12898—will effectively mandate the reclamation of mined land.

But only one, H.R. 12898, will also allow the needed amount of coal to be dug.

The other bill, H.R. 11500, is so arbitrary and restrictive that it would seriously abet the energy deficit.

CAN THERE BE "NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS"?

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon be debating various methods of protecting radioactive materials from theft or sabotage. I fear that most suggestions thus far advanced do not go nearly far enough.

Would a Federal police force be effective—or in itself, dangerous? What about worldwide security measures—since American firms are now building nuclear reactors in countries like Japan?

These questions are raised by the National Resources Defense Council in a letter in the Washington Post for June 9. I would like to insert that letter into the RECORD:

WE DO NOT HAVE TO RELY ON NUCLEAR FISSION

We would like to congratulate The Washington Post and Thomas O'Toole on the two excellent articles on nuclear theft. We would like to add a postscript to these articles.

While it may be possible in theory to devise a nuclear safeguard system, there is little reason to believe that such a system would be acceptable in practice. We say this for two reasons. First, a foolproof safeguard system is almost certainly an impossibility, particularly in light of the projected expansion in the nuclear power industry here and abroad. The illegal diversion of weapons material, which O'Toole discusses cogently, is only one type of anti-social behavior a safeguards system must protect against. Terrorist acts against the reactors, shipments of radioactive wastes, fuel reprocessing facilities and waste repositories can result in catastrophic releases of radioactivity. Such threats against nuclear facilities have already occurred.

To counter such threats, Senator Ribicoff recently called for the creation of a "Federal Nuclear Protection and Transportation Service to provide an immediate federal presence whenever the use of force may be needed to protect these incredibly dangerous [radioactive] materials from falling into the hands of would-be saboteurs and blackmailers." But is there any one who believes that police are effective at a level commensurate with the potential nuclear hazard?

Moreover, such a security system would have to exist on a vast, worldwide basis. Over 1000 nuclear reactors are projected for the United States in the year 2000, with hundreds of shipments of radioactive materials daily. Abroad, American firms are constructing nuclear reactors in countries that have little political stability and in countries, such as Japan, who have not signed the non-proliferation treaty. Safeguarding nuclear bomb material would ultimately require a restructuring of the socio-political institutions on a worldwide scale. The United Nations unfortunately gives us little reason to believe that this is a practical reality.

Our second reason for believing that the safeguards system would not be acceptable in practice is the tremendous social cost of such a system in terms of human freedom and privacy. Safeguards necessarily involve a large expansion of police powers. O'Toole notes that already 1-2 million persons have been trained in the handling, moving and operation of nuclear weapons. The projected growth of the nuclear industry will give rise to a parallel and an ultimately much larger group of persons, in this case civilians, who will be subjected to security clearance and other security procedures now commonplace in the military weapons program. Indeed, the AEC recently announced that it would be initiating a program of background security investigations for all nuclear power employees with access to "significant quantities" of weapons grade material. How much more government investigation into the private lives of individuals can be tolerated by a free society? These security procedures at best infringe not only upon the privacy of his family and friends. At worst, they are the instruments of repression and reprisal.

Once a significant theft of plutonium or other weapons material has occurred, how will it be recovered? To prevent traffic in heroin, police have asked for no-knock search laws. This infringes upon one of our most cherished freedoms. To live with plutonium we may have to abandon this freedom along with others. In the presence of nuclear blackmail threats, the institution of martial law seems inevitable. It has been said that the widespread availability of weapons material in the nuclear fuel cycle will radically alter the power balance between large and small social units.

The social-political implications of a worldwide commitment to nuclear power are thus staggering. The conclusion that many members of the scientific community have drawn is that the real issue is not safeguards but nuclear power itself. We believe that in order to reduce the risk associated with nuclear power to an acceptable level, an unacceptable alteration in our society and its institutions would be required.

We do not have to rely on nuclear fission. There are alternatives such as solar and geothermal energy and energy conservation that could be quickly developed as viable systems. And then there is fusion. A public fully informed on these issues would certainly opt for these alternatives.

ARTHUR R. TAMPLIN,
THOMAS B. COCHRAN,
J. G. SPETH,

National Resources Defense Council, Inc.
New York.

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, each summer, 10 to 12 million children enjoy the adventurous life of being campers. For many families, including my own, this yearly excursion to summer camp has become a tradition, offering children an enriching and unique experience as they learn to substitute one lifestyle for another.

Their activities will range from backpacking through mountain passes to changing bed linens and washing floors. Some chores will be done grudgingly, per-

haps, but done at the direction and with the assistance of camp staffers who assume the responsibility of their care and safety. Too many camps and too many States have not met that responsibility.

Many conscientiously operated camps subscribe to health and safety standards of their own. The problem is that these are voluntary, generally lack enforcement provisions and are adhered to with differing degrees of enthusiasm by subscriber camps. Worse, only 28 States have even minimal regulations of their own, and of these only 6 have and enforce what can be considered adequate codes. One of the six, I am pleased to report, is my own State of New York.

This situation is simply not good enough. That is why this Congress must enact the "Youth Camp Safety Act." I am proud to be a sponsor of this bill.

Eight years ago Senator RIBICOFF first offered legislation to tighten camp safety requirements. The bill was introduced at the request of Mitch Kurman, whose one man crusade for camp safety began when his son drowned in a camp canoeing accident in Maine in 1965. The canoe David Kurman was in did not contain lifejackets. Since then, many more children have died needlessly while the Congress and the administration have been debating the need for Federal legislation in this area. The time for study is long past. We must act—and act decisively without further delay to stop the needless injury and loss of life.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has consistently fought effective Federal youth camp safety legislation, saying it was unnecessary, not enough was known about the problem and, anyway, it should be left to the States. In a 1968 report, HEW admitted to a gap in camp safety standards and its own general unawareness of this deficiency. It acknowledged that most States required absolutely no camp licensing or inspection, and that only half the States had any kind of regulatory programs at all. The same report cited favorably the various camp accreditation programs now in effect by the American Camping Association and other similar voluntary groups, but admitted such programs place relatively slight emphasis on compliance with minimal safety codes.

When, in 1968, HEW claimed insufficient data to make authoritative judgment about pending youth camp safety legislation, the bill died. Legislation was resubmitted in each succeeding Congress. In 1971 a minimum measure was enacted, authorizing the Secretary of HEW to determine the effectiveness of the State and local camp safety laws and regulations, and the extent of preventable accidents and illnesses so as to determine the need for Federal laws in this area.

This most recent HEW study was nothing more than a halfhearted literature search and mail questionnaire. Fewer than half the camps surveyed—3,343 of 7,861—bothered to respond. Results showed 25 deaths, 1,223 "serious" illnesses, and 1,448 injuries associated with camping in 1972. Even these figures are not adequate representations since, according to the HEW report, "there is no systematic or comprehensive monitoring

of serious illness, injury, and death." This, especially in light of HEW's report that a quarter of a million children are involved in serious camp accidents each season, appears to contradict the Department's conclusion that—

The incidence of illnesses, injuries and deaths in summer camps does not appear to be a severe threat to youths.

It would be tragic if we waited any longer for more disasters to motivate us into action.

One need only spend a short time at a summer sleepaway camp or on a youth travel program to know the potential threat to safety and health that most activities pose. Swimming and boating activities, athletics, hikes, and campouts all may be hazardous to some extent. All questions of food supply, preparation and distribution, all questions of adequate sleeping arrangements, fire safety, water supply and sewerage, and health services become the responsibility of camp directors. Parents are almost helpless after they transfer the responsibility for their children's safety to camps; camps which they cannot adequately evaluate. Given insufficient information, it is hard for parents to differentiate between rustic, though adequate and inadequate facilities.

Critics of the youth camp safety bill have consistently downplayed the legitimacy of Federal intervention in what they considered to be a State matter, yet this measure gives individual States the opportunity to establish and implement their own regulations. In fact, it encourages them to do so by authorizing grants for this express purpose.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, youth camp safety is a subject I am vitally concerned with. I introduced legislation in this area as early as 1967, and have testified on it before the House Select Subcommittee on Labor on several occasions. I have seen the number of accidents and deaths mount with each passing camp season. I feel grateful that the camping experience has been a positive one for my own children, but for too many other children it has been a horror. The obligation we have for the protection of our children is basic. Immediate passage of the Youth Camp Safety Act would lead to such protection.

HOW TO SELECT A SAFE SUMMER CAMP

Parents need not wait until meaningful youth camp safety laws become a reality in order to make sure their children are under adequate supervision. Here are some helpful things they can do:

VISIT THE CAMP

First. Do not rely on brochures alone. There is no substitute for a personal inspection.

Second. Make sure the swimming area is unhindered by rocks or boating traffic, and that the water is clean and platforms are provided for close supervision.

Third. Camp vehicles and all camping equipment should be in good repair and driven only by licensed camp staffers.

Fourth. Examine the cabins for potential overcrowding. There should be at least 30 inches between beds and at least two exits—one may be an easily opened

window—in case of fire. Be certain there are no exposed wires in or near the bunks. Check bathroom facilities for health and safety standards.

TALK TO THE DIRECTOR

First. Whether you make a trip to the camp or not, talk to the people in charge about personnel, policies, and precautions.

Second. A doctor or registered nurse should always be on call, and emergency medical equipment should be readily accessible.

Third. Counselors should be at least 18 years old—check the ratio of counselors to campers, 1 to 6 is recommended for overnight campers under age 8, and 1 to 8 for those older.

Fourth. Waterfront directors should hold advanced Red Cross certificates.

Fifth. Note the ease with which the director discusses safety as well as the knowledge and concern shown.

Sixth. Ask what kinds of hikes and outings are planned, how well supervised they are, and who participates in those events that require some skill and hold a potential for danger.

ACCREDITATION AND INSPECTION

First. New York is one of only six States—the others are California, Colorado, Connecticut, Michigan, and New Jersey—that have strong camp safety laws and enforce them. State and county health departments conduct annual inspections of New York camps. If you have any questions about a camp in New York State, check with the New York State Health Department, Bureau of Residential and Recreation Sanitation, 845 Central Avenue, Albany, N.Y. 12206.

Second. The camp should be accredited by the American Camping Association, which has a strong safety code—though no power to enforce its standards and ACA inspections are made only about once every 5 years.

MIDDLE EAST GREED RISKS NEW CONFRONTATIONS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have frequently observed that those in charge of governments in oil dependent nations cannot stand idly by while their economies are bankrupted from prices demanded by a few oil rich countries. The full impact of the enormous balance of payment deficits to be caused by the cost of Middle East oil cannot fail to undermine the stability of the economies of oil short nations—and the latter are most of the larger members of the family of nations.

If the few oil rich exporting countries fail to grasp the full significance of their unilaterally demanded excessively high pricing policy as it relates to a risk of aggression they make a serious mistake. There is just no justification for doubling the price of oil whose lifting cost—which is in pennies—remains a constant. The leaders of such great nations as Japan,

West Germany, Britain, and France, among others, will face an urgent economic crisis within a time frame as short as months, if \$12 a barrel pricing by oil exporting countries is continued.

These nations that have no oil to speak of within their own territorial areas must have oil, but they do not have the funds with which to procure it in the needed quantities without incurring huge deficits that will be attended, as David Rockefeller points out in Joseph Alsop's column, by "disruptive domestic unemployment and depression." Government leaders in such countries cannot tolerate such a consequence for obvious reasons.

The Middle East oil bloc simply must lower its prices by nearly one-half, or their greed literally risks eventual confrontation and even ultimate aggression as desperation confronts government after government of nations lacking oil. One of the chief objectives of combined current diplomacy must be to make the Middle East oil bloc understand this fact.

In this connection the following comments by Joseph Alsop appearing in today's Washington Post are of interest. The article follows:

GORGING THE FINANCIAL SYSTEM WITH OIL MONEY

(By Joseph Alsop)

In Europe, the economic equivalent of the Bible's "cloud no bigger than a man's hand" is already there, hovering on the horizon for all to see. On all the evidence to date, the cloud foretells a great tempest in the fairly near future.

The nature of the cloud is simple enough. Owing to a lag in the payments-system, the oil producing countries only recently began to take in their huge profits from the new high oil prices. They have had most of the money earned in the first quarter of 1974 for not much more than two months. They will not get the profits of the second quarter until mid-summer.

Yet even the first quarter profits are proving to be unmanageable. The Arab oil producers, particularly, have mostly banked their money in Europe in the form of short term Euro-dollar deposits. As a result, even the biggest banks are now so gorged with this oil money that they have just begun refusing such deposits at more than 4 per cent interest, or even refusing the deposits absolutely.

In other words, the first outpost of the world financial system to feel the strain is already proving to be unequal to the strain. But this initial strain from the new oil money is a mere trifle to what the whole world financial system will somehow have to withstand before long.

This country's two outstanding forecasters in this field, the staff of the Chase Manhattan Bank and the independent petroleum expert, Walter Levey, have just admitted to excessive conservatism. Formerly, both estimated that after paying for all possible imports, the oil producing countries would have \$50 billion left over to invest at the end of this year. Their new figure is \$60 billion.

In other words, this problem of the new oil money is getting bigger, not smaller. With \$60 billion to invest, in fact, the oil producing countries will have to find ways to place an amount of money, in just one year, equivalent to about two thirds the total value of all the overseas investments of the United States in the last three quarters of a century.

Nor is that all. Before the new high oil prices, the oil producing countries had already accumulated reserves of about \$14 billion. Looking further down the road, the wise head of the Chase Manhattan Bank, David Rockefeller, has recently noted that

the oil producers' reserves will reach about \$140 billion in 1975, and will pass \$200 billion in 1976.

These are enormous transfers of wealth from the rest of the world to the little group of oil producers. As Mr. Rockefeller also made plain, the world financial system has never before had to handle such transfers, and is almost wholly unequipped to do so.

In addition, the majority of the richest oil producers are also unequipped to handle the mountains of gold they are now accumulating. The largest single accumulation will unquestionably be made by Saudi Arabia, for instance. Yet the Saudi Arabian monetary agency is still a vestigial institution, which keeps its books in Arabic—and entirely by hand!

Naturally, in Saudi Arabia and from Kuwait down through the Persian Gulf hotel rooms are literally unobtainable because of the hosts of foreign financiers and promoters who have flocked in to tell the oil producers how to spend or invest their money. Much of this activity is shady, but not all of it. The Chase Manhattan, for instance, is opening a merchant bank as a joint enterprise with the Saudi Arabian government.

For this country, there may even be a short-term gold lining. In the opinion of both Walter Levey and the Chase Manhattan staff, the United States is the natural refuge for final deposits or investment of much of the new oil money. Thus our balance of payments may show huge surplus on capital account, partly concealing the deficit in the trading account that high oil prices will cause.

Over time, however, the poorer nations' total inability to pay for the energy they need; plus the trading deficits due to be incurred by almost all the richer nations; plus the unmanageable sums of money the world financial system will be called upon to manage, can all add up to "economic and political chaos," marked by "disruptive domestic unemployment and depression." The ominous quotations, once again, are from Mr. Rockefeller.

The one hope for a solution—and it is a slender one—lies in the total transformation of the Mideastern scene by Dr. Henry Kissinger's diplomacy. But nowadays the new game of hunt-the-Secretary of State has been added to hunt-the-President.

You can argue, in fact, that Washington Watergating while the tempest approaches is worse than Nero fiddling while Rome burned.

STANTON PRAISES NEIGHBORHOOD LIBRARY INFORMATION CENTERS

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most visible, and yet often neglected, institutions in our society is the neighborhood public library. For years, it has been viewed merely as a sanctuary for contemplation and scholarship. It pleases me to call to the attention of my colleagues an exciting, innovative program, which may transform our libraries into active dispensers of information, while retaining as well their traditional role as a haven for contemplation and scholarship.

Two years ago, five public library systems were awarded a direct grant from the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to research and design criteria for the im-

plementation and establishment of neighborhood information centers in our public libraries. The participating library systems were Cleveland, Atlanta, Detroit, Houston, and the Borough of Queens. Each city conducted its own program under the general supervision of a national project office, headed by a distinguished professional person, Dorothy Ann Turick, of the Cleveland Public Library. The Cleveland Public Library, thus served as chief planner and coordinator for this consortium of five major public library systems.

The neighborhood information center is an interesting and an intriguing idea. Information centers are established by the main office of a library system in various branch libraries throughout its system. These centers are manned by library personnel, who collect and systematically organize information on various services available to a citizen within the local neighborhood, the city, and even the State. This information runs the gamut from such an item as who may give piano lessons in the neighborhood to the appropriate agency one should contact for health services or food stamps. In essence, this system seeks to link the individual with a problem or a talent with that individual or agency who can solve the individual's problem or utilize his talent. In this process, the libraries are in a position to assist in long-range community planning processes by discovering gaps, overlaps, and duplications in available services.

The activities of these neighborhood information centers, however, are not limited to simply dispensing information. In addition, these information centers are intended to use followup and referral techniques. The individual requesting assistance is given personalized service. If necessary, the center's personnel may make an appointment for an individual with the appropriate Government agency and at times even provide transportation or bus fare for such appointments. With the individual's consent, a followup check is made to determine whether the citizen received either the information needed or the services requested.

All of us, I am sure, are well aware of the confusion, and at times ignorance, among our constituents as to available governmental services and assistance. These information centers serve a valuable function by helping to eliminate much of this confusion and ignorance through their information and referral system. At the same time, because of their community orientation as branch libraries, these libraries are readily accessible to many citizens.

The present project conducted under the general directorship of the Cleveland Public Library has received praise from numerous public library systems throughout our country as well as several from abroad. Many have expressed a desire to undertake similar projects. The multiplier effect of the Office of Education's initial investment in the neighborhood library information center program has been extensive. Other library systems can now call upon the experience of the Cleveland Public Library and the other participants in this program to

explore the establishment of similar systems in other towns and cities.

It has come to my attention that the grant for the final year of this project, largely for evaluative purposes, is to be substantially reduced. The national project office will apparently be transferred to Houston from Cleveland.

It is distressing that considering the waste of taxpayers' money on many other projects, this worthwhile program should be reduced in funding for its final year. But perhaps this is but another symptom of the misplaced priorities of the current administration. After all, there are no special interests pushing for grants to libraries; the only interests involved are those of the common citizen who may occasionally use their local library.

The reduction in Government funds for this project, however, should not be taken as a reflection upon the worth of the project, nor the efforts of the individuals associated with it. Credit for a job well done should be extended to Dorothy Ann Turick, national project director, and the highly capable Mr. James Rogers, director of urban services of the Cleveland Public Library.

THE BUSINESS WORLD ACKNOWLEDGES NET ENERGY CONCEPTS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 30 I inserted an article on Dr. Howard Odum's views on net energy under the title, "Energy, Ecology and Economics," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 17126. I was surprised and greatly pleased to read a brief, but enlightening article on the impact of the work of Dr. Odum in the Government and business world, in the June 8 edition of Business Week. I would highly recommend this article to my colleagues, and also refer them to the earlier item by Dr. Odum that has already been submitted for the record.

The article follows:

THE NEW MATH FOR FIGURING ENERGY COSTS

Recently, Texaco, Inc., decided to forego bidding on oil shale leases in Colorado. "The figures just didn't work out," explains one executive. "It was hard not to make a bid, but we couldn't justify it." Texaco figures that shale oil will not pay off. After developing the necessary technology, buying massive new machinery, moving tons of earth, reclaiming acres of land, and processing the shale oil for market, the Btus produced would barely make up for the Btus consumed. Though the company did not phrase it quite that way, Texaco's conclusion is that shale oil recovery is an energy standoff.

Months before, Howard T. Odum, a controversial ecologist from the University of Florida, reached the same conclusion during a broad study of energy and the planet's ecosystems. To Odum, Texaco's analysis is the epitome of a concept known as "net energy," the study of the amount and cost of energy required to produce energy. On a net-energy basis, says Odum, shale oil loses time and time again. In fact, he adds, a net-energy accounting system would raise the

eyebrows of people studying quite a few other alternate energy sources as well. And unless long-range planners start incorporating his theories right now, he warns, the U.S. may never be able to afford such promising energy technologies as solar power and nuclear fusion.

APPLYING A THEORY

Odum is attracting considerable attention. The Florida legislature is considering a "carrying capacity" plan for the state that was inspired by Odum; it will be based on analysis of Florida's ability to support a swelling population amid dwindling energy resources. In Oregon, Governor Tom McCall has set up a planning council that will use Odum's "energy accounting" principles as the framework for planning that state's future. The Federal Energy Office, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Council on Environmental Quality have all started to incorporate net-energy thinking in their policy studies.

To the uninitiated, Odum preaches a strange creed, festooned with complex diagrams that are supposed to link biology, technology, and money supply. In his staccato way of speaking, he explains net energy in the language of systems analysis: "If the money in circulation is the same or increasing, and if the quality of energy reaching society is less because so much of it has to go to the energy recovery process, then the real worth to society per unit of money circulated is less. Because the economy and total energy usage are still expanding, we are misled to think the total value is expanding, and we allow more money to circulate. This makes the money-to-work ratio even larger."

Even experts say glossolalia is sometimes needed to understand him. "I went to hear one of his talks," says Leonard Fish, director of planning for the American Gas Assn. "By the time he finished putting up his flow charts he completely lost me."

Still, the AGA is becoming more net-energy-conscious, especially as the concept relates to capital. "The money supply is a really serious concern to us," says Fish. "One pipeline to get gas from Alaska's North Slope will cost \$6-billion. That represents one-third of the total U.S. investment in natural gas pipelines. Yet the gas flowing through this pipe would supply only 5 per cent of present demand." That is precisely the economic whirlpool that Odum warns of: Energy becomes harder and harder to obtain, hence the cost of getting it keeps rising, while energy-fueled inflation inexorably pushes other prices higher.

Odum is not without critics. Some economists familiar with his ideas say they are really century-old concepts that the ecologist befores with needlessly complex presentations. "I've debated Odum on television, on campus, and on panels elsewhere," says fellow faculty member Rafael Lusky, a member of the university's Economics Dept. "I don't understand what he says because he uses a language that doesn't make any sense." Lusky also claims that Odum's models for relating nature and economics are limited. "You can calculate how calories move everywhere with them," he says, "but you can't use them in any predictive way." Odum readily concedes that the net-energy ideas is not new. What is new, he explains, is the move to promote net-energy thinking as an integral part of energy planning. "I would like to see both energy companies and federal agencies report the results of their projects in terms of net energy," he says. Odum believes "energy impact statements" would provide a more meaningful way of assessing the real costs of developing new energy sources.

The results can be eye-opening. Odum says the biggest lesson to be learned from net-energy thinking is that all the new technologies being developed to attain energy

independence are draining present energy supplies and are therefore hastening the day when fossil fuels run out. For example, enriching uranium for light-water reactors consumes, in the form of coal, 60% of the energy released from the nuclear fuel. Unless the process is improved, the costs in energy and money will continually rise. The result, concludes Odum, is inevitably a cash squeeze along with the energy squeeze.

SUPPORTERS

"With Odum's thinking, you can see the fallacy in our energy policies," says Joel Schatz, who runs Oregon's new planning council. "The nuclear industry buys so many kilowatts, but it doesn't matter to these companies where the power comes from or how much energy went into the steel used to make their plants. The reason this new kind of thinking is important now is that more money in circulation is going into getting energy and less into producing goods and supplying services."

Working independently, Vanderbilt University economist Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen has arrived at much the same conclusion in his book, *Entropy Law and the Economic Process*, currently the hottest economics text in Washington despite its forbidding title. Georgescu-Roegen says current economics assumes unlimited supplies of materials and energy. But abundance is no longer assured, and the price is inflation.

Despite such seconding of his thinking, Odum may have trouble getting across his message in industry, since his conclusions often clash with those who have a vested interest in one energy technology or another. Moreover, he can be impatient with people who do not immediately agree with him, and his cocky, almost messianic attitude sometimes puts people's backs up. "Odum thinks that all he needs to do is talk about his theories and people will catch on," says Richard Kaplan, director of the newly formed Energy Institute in New York City. "The fact is that his diagrams turn people off."

With funds from several small foundations, Kaplan set up his institute to familiarize government officials and corporate executives with net-energy principles. He has brought in some graphics experts to develop better visual aids for conveying the concept.

FRIENDS IN WASHINGTON

Government planners seem to be hooked, however. The Bureau of Mines recently began a study to determine how much energy it takes to produce various fuels. The FEO, charged with the responsibility of preparing a game plan for achieving energy independence, is also intrigued. "Net energy is a viable concept," says Administrator John C. Sawhill. "I've asked Alvin Weinberg [chief of R&D] to look into it."

FEO staffers have already made some limited net-energy analyses. They recently recommended against producing oil from stripper wells, for instance. Explains Walter Hibbard, Weinberg's deputy: "If you produce oil from these small wells for \$5 and sell it for \$10.50, you may make money. But it's possible that you could be wasting energy. There's no reason why we can't apply this principle across the board and start talking in terms of kilowatts per kilowatt."

INFLATION IS EXACTING ULTIMATE PRICE FROM POLITICAL CHIEFS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, inflation is a serious danger to the future stability

of the American economy and society. Speaking at Illinois College on May 26, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur F. Burns declared that—

If past experience is any guide, the future of our country is in jeopardy.

In his address, Mr. Burns stated that if the "debilitating" inflation continues at anything like present rates, it would "threaten the very foundation of our society." Mr. Burns placed most of the blame for inflation on "awesome" Federal spending, a response to "individuals who have come to depend less and less on their own initiative and more and more on Government to achieve their economic objectives."

In the first quarter of 1974 the rate of inflation in the United States was above 10 percent in terms of three important yardsticks:

First. A 10.8-percent annual rate in the Gross National Product price deflator, which is the broadest measure of price performance.

Second. A 12.2-percent annual rate in consumer prices.

Third. A 28.8-percent annual rate in wholesale prices, which is subsequently reflected in higher retail prices.

The fact is that rampant inflation is not only a problem in the United States, but is even worse in other Western countries. Discussing this fact, Nick Poulos, financial editor of the Chicago Tribune, writes that—

Rampant inflation is beginning to administer poetic justice to the political leaders of the Western world. Having lacked the political courage to fight rising inflation, they are now starting to pay the ultimate political price.

The Canadian Government of Prime Minister Trudeau fell on the issue of inflation and West German Chancellor Willy Brandt had been losing popularity steadily before his resignation, because of his government's inability to curb inflation. The Government of Iceland has fallen on this issue, as did Prime Minister Heath's government in Great Britain.

Mr. Poulos notes that—

Yet, it is encouraging that the problem of inflation is emerging so forcefully that national leaders are coming to be judged by what they do or don't do about it. Perhaps we are learning something after all. It is ironic that the Congress should permit wage and price controls to expire at a time when the country is in the worst inflationary period of its peacetime history. This reflects full recognition—finally—that controls solve nothing; that, in fact, they do more harm than good.

If we have learned that Government spending and Government intervention in the economy are the causes of inflation, we will be less likely to believe that they are also the solutions. Hopefully, many are learning this lesson.

I wish to share with my colleagues Mr. Poulos' thoughtful analysis as it appeared in the Chicago Tribune of May 12, 1974, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

THE MONEY SCENE: INFLATION EXACTING ULTIMATE PRICE FROM POLITICAL CHIEFS

Rampant inflation is beginning to administer poetic justice to the political leaders of the Western world.

Having lacked the political courage to fight rising inflation, they are now starting to pay the ultimate political price.

In Canada, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau's Liberal government fell Wednesday on the issue of inflation. The opposition parties ripped Trudeau's budget and forced an election on the issue of high prices.

It was the first time a Canadian government had been defeated on a vote of non-confidence in the budget.

Willy Brandt's dramatic resignation earlier in the week as West Germany's chancellor was triggered by the disclosure that one of his personal aides was a spy for the East German Communist regime.

But Brandt had been losing popularity steadily and one of the main reasons was his government's inability to curb inflation.

Inflation, along with a welfare-state philosophy, has all but ruined Great Britain. Her government has been reduced to a rather ineffective bureaucracy.

Americans may be disgusted by President Nixon's involvement in the Watergate cover-up, but they are angry over the unwillingness of the government to contain inflation.

Inflation may prove to be as important an element as Watergate in President Nixon's final undoing.

And yet, it is encouraging that the problem of inflation is emerging so forcefully that national leaders are coming to be judged by what they do or don't do about it.

Perhaps we are learning something after all.

It is ironic that the Congress should permit wage and price controls to expire at a time when the country is in the worst inflationary period of its peacetime history.

This reflects full recognition—finally—that controls solve nothing; that, in fact, they do more harm than good.

Consider that in the first quarter of 1974, the rate of inflation was in double-digit territory in terms of three yardsticks:

A 10.8 per cent annual rate in the gross national product price deflator, which is the broadest measure of price performance.

A 12.2 per cent annual rate in consumer prices.

A 28.8 per cent annual rate in wholesale prices, which is subsequently reflected in higher retail prices.

Consider that in the second quarter of 1971—the last full quarter before Nixon imposed the wage-price freeze as a prelude to controls, the annual rate for the GNP price deflator was 4.9 per cent, and the annual rate of consumer price increase was 4.1 per cent, and the annual rate for wholesale prices was 4.8 per cent.

Yet back in 1971, labor leaders and businessmen were urging Nixon to impose controls. So the President junked his sound economic program in the interests of political expediency.

We have since acquired such a distaste for controls that George Shultz, in a parting interview before leaving his post as Treasury secretary, warned of a possible "rebellion" by labor leaders and businessmen if the government tried to reimpose economic restraints.

The former dean of the University of Chicago's Graduate School of Business said inflation can be checked only by government moves to control spending, restrain money supply, increase supplies of key commodities to reduce prices, and stimulate competition in the marketplace.

Shultz' prescription for curing inflation is the only way to go. And while it would be painful in terms of higher unemployment and other tradeoffs, it is the only way the economy can be restored to a healthy state.

Meanwhile, the high level of inflation and interest rates is extending the current recession in business activity.

The economic consulting firm of Lionel D. Edie & Co. now expects that real growth in the gross national product will decline by 1.6 per cent in the second quarter of 1974.

Coupled with an estimated 5.8 per cent

decline in real GNP in the first quarter, the economic slowdown this year would be labeled a recession.

That degree of economic slowdown should help cool off the inflation rate near-term.

But whether inflation can be curbed on a longer-term basis depends on what the politicians think they have to do to save their jobs.

Perhaps Pierre Trudeau's experience will have a sobering influence on 'em.

NEWSLETTER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I distribute a newsletter to my constituents in a continuing effort to keep them up to date on my activities in Washington as their representative and to get the benefit of their thinking on major issues. At this point in the RECORD, I would like to share my most recent newsletter with my colleagues for their information:

NEWSLETTER TO CONSTITUENTS

(By Representative LESTER L. WOLFF)

DEAR FRIEND AND CONSTITUENT: In this issue of my newsletter, I would like to discuss with you the still highly pertinent topic of drug abuse in our communities and the directly related incidence of thefts and violent crime.

Today, while our nation is in the grip of an inflationary hammerlock, plagued by increasing costs and expenses for every commodity of family living and business, Americans are suffering losses in excess of \$27 billion a year for property stolen in connection with heroin addiction. Additionally, nearly \$6 billion a year—\$16 million a day—is being spent across the nation on illegal heroin.

For this reason, as well as for the shocking and debilitating overall destruction heroin addiction wreaks on our society, I am determined to continue to fight the cause of this evil at its root source—the poppy fields.

Most recently, together with Congressmen Rangel and Rodino, I introduced a House Resolution calling on the President to begin serious negotiations with Turkey to prevent that nation from lifting its ban on the production of the opium poppy—a ban that cracked the French Connection and successfully abated the supply of illegal heroin destined for the eastern shores of the United States. This Resolution, simultaneously introduced in the Senate by Senators Buckley and Mondale and now co-sponsored by more than 216 Members of the Congress, further directs the President to utilize his authority under the Foreign Assistance Act to cut off all aid to Turkey if these negotiations prove unfruitful.

Just as the get-tough policy on drugs I advocated be applied to the Far East is effecting a massive clampdown on the illegal narcotics traffic from Thailand, Burma and Laos, I believe we must be consistent and firm in our insistence that Turkey retain her ban on the production of the opium poppy. For until 1972 the poppy fields of Turkey were the beginning of a long and ruinous road of corruption and profiteering that stretched halfway across the world to the streets of New York, its environs and suburbs, where its lethal traffic was dispersed to pollute untold numbers of men, women, and children as heroin addicts.

I am firmly convinced that if we are ever to contain the wave of heroin addiction that swept this nation in near epidemic proportions in the 1960's and early 1970's, and if we are to stop the addicts who steal and plunder to support their habits, we must see to it

that the illicit supply is completely eradicated at the sources. America cannot afford to continue to pay the price of allowing its citizens and institutions to be contaminated by drugs.

It is apparent that the Turkish ban on the cultivation and production of opium is working and I applaud the cooperation and understanding being exerted by those Turkish officials who wish to continue this policy. Their support, which has severed the heroin pipeline, is both courageous and humanitarian. Agitation by greedy forces, including some American pharmaceutical companies and some demagogic Turkish politicians to reverse this policy and renew the illicit cultivation of the opium poppy must not succeed for the result will be to open the floodgates of further heroin addiction.

Since the Turkish government in return for compensation from the United States agreed to suppress the growth of opium poppy, there has been a dramatic decrease in the amount of heroin available in the streets of New York. . . . If the United States government, bowing to pressure from Turkish poppy growers and the domestic pharmaceutical industry agrees to a lifting of the ban, it will be a backward step that is almost guaranteed to lead to an upsurge in heroin addiction nationally with the consequent rise in addict-related crimes.—Verone Hornblass, Commissioner, New York City Addiction Agency, April, 1974.

Concerned with the increasing reports that Turkey is weighing the necessity and propriety of resuming open cultivation for the world market, I, as chairman of the House Special Subcommittee on International Narcotics Control, went to Turkey during the March 1974 Congressional recess to talk firsthand with Turk officials and farmers, Ambassador Macomber, and American and Turkish drug enforcement agents. Together with Rep. Rangel, whose Manhattan district is one of the most drug-plagued in America, we learned that the average Turk is unaware of the effects of heroin addiction in the United States—since it is not a problem in their own country—and that the U.S. aid was not reaching the farmers. The average Turkish farmer we visited realizes between \$35 and \$50 per year from the sale of legal morphine gum to the Turkish Government and is hardpressed to live on this meager sum. However, he is totally unaware of the destruction wrought by the poppy which he previously channeled to the illegal market for greater remuneration. He uses the poppy seed himself for cooking oils and native bread, not as an opiate—a practice he shuns.

In our discussions, we conveyed the serious manner in which Congress views this drug situation and emphasized the high priority this nation places on combatting the illegal narcotics traffic and its direct relationship to crime. I reminded the Turkish Government that both the House and the Senate—during the height of the American involvement in Indochina—passed an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, which I authored, to cut off U.S. aid to Thailand unless it cooperated fully with our drug enforcement efforts.

Just recently, my amendment to impose trade sanctions on any non-cooperating nation was included in the new U.S. trade bill. The actions, I believe, are necessary for we have too often paid the piper without calling the tune.

Congressmen like Wolff can be useful in foreign relations—a Congressman can make threats that diplomats can't and sometimes the diplomats like having Congressmen speak out.—Government official quoted in Newsday article by Anthony Marro, Washington Bureau, April 1, 1974.

What is really behind the recent activity on the part of the Turks to resume opium production after the ban has proven so successful?

Is it economic? Only 1 percent of Turkey's gross national production was in legal production of opium at the time the ban was instituted.

Is it people? Less than 1 percent of the population of Turkey was engaged in opium poppy growing at the time the ban was instituted.

I think the reason is much more sinister. It is quite obvious that the influence of organized crime and selfish interests of others are overpowering the need to halt international narcotics trafficking.

Recent data indicates that a six-year pattern of increasing numbers of new addicts has been reversed. The rates of overdose deaths, drug related hepatitis and drug related property crimes, indicators of instances of heroin dependence, have declined throughout the U.S. for the first time in six years.—Dr. Robert DuPont, Director Special Section Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, at U.N. Commission, Geneva.

The problem is compounded and made even more acute by local Turkish politicians who are attempting to use the issue of the ban as a device to mask the severe economic problem Turkey is now facing. There are some who are critical of the hard line I have taken pertaining to the reciprocal elements in our foreign aid policy. We do have a mutual defense treaty with Turkey, and over the years we have given more than \$3 billion in military assistance to Turkey.

America today is engaged in a war on drugs. Is it too much for us to ask Turkey to come to our assistance and join in this fight, just as we have joined in their defense?

I intend to vigorously pursue my efforts to insure that the American people will never again be subject to the level of availability of heroin in our streets, the attendant crime and the deterioration of our society so prevalent prior to the heroin ban. If Turkey re-enters the opium business, I reluctantly predict that these ills will strike our communities again and that would prove disastrous.

NEW JUDICIAL POSTS FOR M. MICHAEL POTOKER AND JACOB LUTSKY OF QUEENS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to acknowledge the achievements of distinguished residents of one's home community. I am therefore happy to advise my colleagues that M. Michael Potoker of Forest Hills, who has been on the Family Court bench since 1965, and Judge Jacob Lutsky of Beechhurst were recently appointed by the Governor as special narcotics case judges on the State Court of Claims.

Although it is true that ours is a country of laws and not of men, it is still a fact that the quality of the men selected to enforce and interpret those laws determines to a large extent the future well-being of our society.

The future is in good hands with Mr. Potoker and Judge Lutsky.

I recommend the following articles from the Long Island Press on these distinguished judges to my colleagues:

NEW JUDICIAL POSTS FOR POTOKER, LUTSKY

Gov. Wilson yesterday appointed two Family Court judges from Queens as special narcotics case judges on the state Court of Claims.

Named to the nine-year terms on the bench were Judge M. Michael Potoker of Forest Hills and Judge Jacob Lutsky of Beechhurst.

The appointments require State Senate confirmation which is expected to come Thursday.

Potoker, 59, has been on the Family Court bench since 1965. He was appointed a Criminal Court judge in 1964.

A graduate of Brooklyn Law School, Potoker is a former reporter for the old New York Daily Mirror and New York American. He also served for 14 years as secretary-treasurer of the New York Newspaper Guild.

Potoker is president of the newly formed New York City Family Court Judges Association and vice president of the Association of Judges of the Family Court of the State of New York. He is also a representative to the Fair Trial Free Press Conference and the Council of Judges of the State Bar Association.

Potoker also is a member of the American Bar Association, New York State Bar Association and Queens County Bar Association.

He once served as chairman of the Queens Labor Committee for the Election of then-Mayor Robert F. Wagner, was a vice president of the State CIO and a member of the Democratic Speaker's Bureau.

Lutsky, 63, was appointed to Family Court in 1966.

A graduate of the Cornell University Law School, Lutsky is a former legal aide to Mayors William O'Dwyer, Vincent Impellitteri and Wagner.

Most recently, Lutsky served as a member of Mayor Beame's transition panel.

He has received numerous special appointments in city, state and federal government capacities and is considered an expert on municipal government.

Potoker and Lutsky have been found professionally qualified by a screening panel headed by Francis Bergen, former Associate Judge of the State Court of Appeals.

In announcing the two appointments, the governor said the screening panel "was appointed last year by Gov. Rockefeller and assigned to determine whether candidates recommended by the governor are qualified to serve on the Court of Claims and to meet the responsibilities which enforcement of the state's amended drug laws will give them."

"LAW ALONE CAN'T STEM DRUGS"—REHABILITATION'S NEEDED TOO, NARCOTICS JUDGE SAYS

One of two Family Court judges from Queens, confirmed yesterday as special narcotics case judges on the Court of Claims, warned that the courts alone can't cure the drug problem.

Speaking to The Press after his confirmation by the Senate, Judge M. Michael Potoker of Forest Hills emphasized the role of other institutions.

"What I impressed upon both the steering committee and especially the Senate Judiciary Committee was that I hope they don't depend on the law exclusively to get rid of the narcotics problem. I think education and rehabilitative services are still very important. Perhaps a combination of all three might do it in the long run."

Potoker said that Judge Jacob Lutsky of Beechhurst, also confirmed to the Court of Claims, held similar views.

"He became a Family Court Judge on Dec. 29, 1965," he said reeling off the date from memory, "and we've had 8½ years to compare notes."

Continuing to expand his views, Potoker said, "As a trial judge for the past 10 years, I told the legislators that I would rather enjoy the discretionary powers of a judge in sentencing. However, as a judge of the court, I am duly bound to observe the law."

Potoker was referring to a provision in the state's new narcotics law for mandatory sentence for certain drug offenders.

Potoker cited the importance of the Family Court as a key to curing problems before they become irreversible, and said he urged the legislators to increase that court's funding.

He became most animated as he recalled his early career, which began in newspapers as an office boy for the now defunct New York Mirror.

"I remember my first story—I was supposed to go to Sunnyside at Lowery Street and Queens Boulevard. It was raining and I was thinking, now where the heck is Sunnyside?"

Potoker went on to graduate from Brooklyn Law School and served for 14 years as secretary-treasurer of the New York Newspaper Guild.

He is president of the newly formed New York City Family Court Judges Association and a representative to the Fair Trial Free Press Conference, among his many judicial associations.

He once served as chairman of the Queens Labor Committee for the Election of then-Mayor Robert F. Wagner, and was a vice president of the state CID.

Lutsky, 63, is a graduate of the Cornell University Law School and former legal aide to Mayors William O'Dwyer, Vincent Impellitteri and Wagner.

Most recently Lutsky served as a member of Mayor Beame's transition panel.

He has received numerous special appointments in city, state and federal government and is considered an expert on municipal government.

HUREWITZ.

A LITHUANIAN COMMEMORATION

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 15 we will mark an important date—a sorrowful anniversary in the lives of all Lithuanian-Americans. For on that date we commemorate Russian occupation of the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia which took place 34 years ago.

This commemoration marks also the beginning of a very tragic period for those noble people for less than 12 months after this occurred a mass deportation of more than 150,000 Balts to slave labor camps took place.

Lithuania, however, a symbol of great courage and hope, did not permit itself to be enslaved without a strong fight. Just shortly before the Nazi invasion of Russia, the citizens of Lithuania stood firm and overthrew Russian domination and gained freedom. But the joys of this victory were short-lived since less than 2 months later with Hitler's invasion, independence was torn from them.

In a way, this anniversary not only causes us to pause and reflect over that particularly tragic era for the Baltic States, but it also stands as a symbol for the trials and heartaches these Balts have known throughout their history as a result of countless invasions from other countries both East and West. These invasions have cost the country dearly in population, but they have never been able to destroy the strong spirit and deter-

mination that the Balts adhere to as they strive to achieve freedom.

We in America have never accepted the tight grip with which Russia holds Lithuania and all Baltic lands. We share their desire to see free elections, freedom of religion, and the other important components that signify independence.

On this occasion, let us renew our commitment to their efforts to gain lasting independence and self-destiny. Let us, moreover, go on record as sharing the grief they have known over the death of their countrymen, and awaiting the joy which will come when freedom is no longer a goal, but has become a reality for Lithuania.

NATIONAL PARKS IN THE CHANGING WORLD OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, Ronald Walker, Director of the National Park Service, recently addressed the Fourth Annual American Family Camping Congress in Chicago. Because of the timeliness of Mr. Walker's remarks concerning visitation at our National Parks in view of our energy situation, I felt his views should be shared with all Members of Congress through inclusion in the RECORD.

The address follows:

NATIONAL PARKS IN THE CHANGING WORLD OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Good Morning, Ladies and Gentlemen.

When I was asked to speak to the Camping Congress, gasoline lines were long and the Arab oil embargo was in effect. Prophets of doom were crying over the death of the camping industry—the upcoming bankruptcy of the recreation industry—and the hopelessness of the situation in general.

It reminds me of a story about Mark Twain. One of the wire services reported his death, and even printed a rather flowery obituary. When friends brought this to his attention, Mark Twain sent a telegram to the newspaper wire service, which said "The report of my death was an exaggeration."

The reports of the death of the camping industry were also exaggerated. The camping industry—and we in the National Park Service, along with that industry—went through a traumatic experience which had an effect—a very marked effect—upon America.

The United States had been on a growth binge for more than 200 years. We had been gyrating wildly through a "bigger is better syndrome," a ritualistic dance which said that there will always be more and more products, torn from more and more acres of America . . . that this wonderful horn of plenty would never come to the end. We bragged about Stonesville, USA, and boasted that Stonesville was the fastest growing little city in the world, that we had added 5,000 new citizens this past year, which led to an increase of \$112,000 worth of bank deposits, an increase in gross sales of more than 12% and business was booming, God was in his heaven, and all was right with the world.

Let's apply that to the National Park Service. We found that the increasing flood tide of visitation was rolling on . . . we were

receiving more and more visitors every year, from 102 million in 1963 to 217 million in 1973, and we were building more and more campgrounds each year to meet the demands of an ever-increasing crowd of campers . . . more and more, bigger and bigger . . . and here again we thought that bigger was better!

But long before the oil embargo and the gasoline crunch, we had learned that there was an outer limit and that we could not continue to accommodate increasing numbers of visitors in the old, traditional ways. The National Park Service could not meet all the demand for camping opportunities in the national parks. If we had continued to meet the demand, we would soon have had wall-to-wall campgrounds and would have over-used the parks, over-enjoyed the parks, to the point where we would be violating the fundamental purpose which Congress' Organic Act of 1916 set for our guidance . . . to preserve the historic, natural and scenic values of the parks and to provide for the public enjoyment of the parks.

So, now we find the reports of our death were greatly exaggerated. We have gasoline for the summer and America is not, as some would have led us to fear, doomed to an existence as a second-rate power. This is still the greatest and most wonderful nation on earth—and it will remain the greatest nation on earth. But we cannot look forward to unrestricted use of everything, without fear of exhausting the resources, as we once did. Obviously, we are not going to return to the era of "sky's the limit" use of our resources. If the price of gasoline could be rolled back to 1970 levels, if the flow of oil from overseas could be trebled—if the horn of plenty could reappear again—right now—the situation would not return to 1970. For the first time in our two hundred year history as a nation, Americans saw that there was a bottom to the barrel—that there was a limit to what we had thought limitless. This summer may reveal the greatest change in vacation patterns since World War II. We are no longer living in a fool's paradise. We are intelligently tackling our situation, learning to live with the realities of life and that has to be an improvement.

About the same time that the double-barreled price and energy crunch was building up on our horizons, another event had an important effect upon your campgrounds, and upon our status as a camping landlord. Public Law 93-81 was enacted by the Congress of the United States. Aimed at preventing an increase in launching ramp fee charges—the new law did things which not even its sponsors wanted it to do. It threw out the baby with the bath water, and suddenly last August it became impossible for the National Park Service to collect fees for camping facilities. According to the wording of 93-81, we had to provide a myriad of services (including hot showers and flush toilets!) or else stop charging. We never gave a thought to the possibility of trying to upgrade our campgrounds to meet the requirements of the law—to do so was patently impossible for us—after all, we operate 539 campgrounds providing more than 28,000 camp sites in 93 parks areas.

Public Law 93-81 had two big results—both of them harmful. It deprived federal agencies of the campground user fees which would have been available for campground operation and maintenance. In the case of the National Park Service, we would have suffered a loss of revenue estimated between six and seven million dollars a year in fees willingly paid by campers.

Secondly, Public Law 93-81 worked a disservice to the commercial campground and to the state and local government-operated campground—both of which continued charging for their facilities while everything was free in the federal campgrounds.

It is not my intention to increase the total number of campgrounds available in the na-

tional parks. Our needs and our objectives are being studied in depth at this moment and we will soon have the information upon which to base our future actions. We want to operate the national parks to provide for the greatest good of the greatest number of people—now and in the future. To meet this end, we hope to encourage construction of campgrounds outside of the parks—rather than in the parks. By this I mean that, I am not advocating some sort of financial aid from the Park Service, to further construction of private campgrounds outside the parks. Where existing campground facilities are not numerous enough to meet the demand of the camping public, the National Park Service believes that the private sector of our industry will meet that demand.

The National Park Service has no intention of trying to provide camping facilities to meet demand, not when expansion of camping would conflict with our larger aim of preserving the values of our 298 park areas. There is no room for compromise on that issue. The statistics show that the total number of campsites available in the national parks is decreasing—very slightly but steadily—since about 1968, as campgrounds are improved and marginal sites are eliminated.

I am happy to report to you that when I left Washington, Congress was moving toward passage of legislation to restore the authority to charge campground user fees under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The federal government would resume charging for its campgrounds, effectively removing the artificial subsidy for federal camping and will restore the badly needed funds with which we can maintain these facilities.

Last year we had a reservation system working in Yosemite, Grand Teton, Yellowstone, Grand Canyon, Acadia and Everglades National Parks. The passage of this legislation will clear the way for us to institute a 1974 camping reservation system. We hope the system will handle reservations for 23 national parks this summer, an increase from the six parks included in the successful experiment of 1973. We were delayed in our efforts to set this up for 1974 by the uncertainty surrounding the charging of user fees in the campgrounds. Obviously, the two problems are inter-related, and the passage of the legislation will solve both problems.

It is our hope that this computerized reservation and information system can be improved to handle the matter of referring requests when the park campground cannot accept the reservation. Computers can do wonderful things—and we hope that we will soon have the capability to refer the applicant from the reserved NPS campgrounds to a nearby campground operated by the state, by the county, by the city and by the commercial operator. Why not? We look forward to a completely integrated system, eventually, which will accept the campground reservation request—and either place it with the NPS campground, or refer it to the appropriate campground outside of the park and actually make the reservation for that alternate campground—all by computer. This system would not only allow us to handle our own problem more efficiently, but would also prevent the needless waste of gasoline which is a part of the frustrating business of driving from campground to campground looking for an open space, often late in the evening after a hard day's drive.

I would like to see a totally different pattern of visitation to the parks resulting from the necessity for saving limited supplies of fossil fuels. The 1974 visitor may drive a shorter distance to reach the park at lower speeds, and he may stay longer at the park when he reaches it. No more would we see the 500-mile-a-day syndrome—where the tourist boasted that he had driven 500 miles, and

"seen" three national parks in 24 hours. About all he had to show for that "experience" was a stack of picture postcards and a need for a rest.

Our modern park visitor wants more out of his visit than a trip to the newsstand to buy post cards, a quick trip to the rest room, a bottle of pop and he's on his way to "visit" the next park. The new visitor, especially the youth, wants to know the park. He wants to learn about the values the park was designed to preserve. He wants to learn—in depth—and we are gearing up to give him the rewarding park experience which he deserves. There are 200 areas in the national park system located within 100 miles of a metropolitan area. So almost any kind of park "experience" you may want, historic, natural, cultural or recreational, is less than a tankful of gas away. And at today's gas prices, this makes a difference.

In addition, this year, we would like to lessen overcrowding by encouraging very rewarding visits to national parks before Memorial Day and after Labor Day. I am certain many of you will agree that some of the most spectacular scenery is to be found in the spring and fall and, for that matter, even during winter months in many parks. Another way to beat the crowds is to get off the beaten paths to the most popular parks and visit the 92 park areas we call "lesser used" or "under used." I visited 62 park areas during my first year as Director and I can assure you that most of my most pleasant memories are of "off season" trips to "lesser known" parks. And I've been told that because of the gasoline problems, we will add probably another 20 parks to our "under used" listing this year. You can still "get away" in this country.

Interpreters in the National Park Service have always complained that the visitor doesn't take time to read the pamphlets, look at the exhibits, walk the interpretive trails, listen to the recorded messages, attend the educational film—that the visitor doesn't really see the parks. We hope this complaint will be heard less often this camping season. We want to present the quality experience which the park visitor wants. We think for us that this is the most important and far-reaching benefit to come out of the energy crunch which caused such consternation some months ago.

It is apparent that the visitor who makes an in-depth visit to a national park area will also make an in-depth visit to the campground of his choice. At that campground, he is apt to require more goods and services than before. The campground which provides a laundry facility, for example, will probably be more attractive to the visitor who stays a week, than it was to the visitor who spent only one night. The services and facilities which were sometimes provided incidental to the provision of a campground, are now deemed of central importance. We in the National Park Service will not be providing these increased goods and services, although some of our concessioners may.

The in-depth park visit should also include greater awareness that parks are a different environment for urban Americans. But common sense safety rules apply everywhere. Most park regulations are in concert with state codes, but driving safety and observance of park regulations and speed laws is something I should mention to you. There were 179 fatalities in the parks last year and 59 of these involved motorists, second only to 73 drownings.

There is another aspect of the travail of the past six months which is worthy of mention. Recreational travel seems to have been recognized as a worthy use for fossil fuels, not as a luxury consumption of fuels. Representatives of many facets of the camping industry have been at work in Washington during the last eight months. They have done a good job of presenting your point of view

to administrators in the Executive Branch of government and—of equal importance—to your elected representatives in Congress. It is apparent that their work has been effective and that any planning on the part of the federal government in regard to allocations of fuels will take into consideration the needs of the recreation industry.

I have appreciated the opportunity to share with you these observations from my own philosophy regarding management of the part of the economy which I have some small part in determining results—the National Park Service which I have the honor of directing. I can sum up the things we have been talking about in these few statements of principle:

1. National park areas will continue to welcome the family camper. As we have replied to hundreds of inquiries, there is no intention of prohibiting trailer campers in your national parks.

2. We expect to maintain the existing camping facilities within the parks, but we do not anticipate expanding the number of camping facilities within the parks.

3. We encourage the development of camping facilities outside the parks, in order that more campers can enjoy the parks without harming them.

4. We recognize the role of the recreational travel industry as an active, valid segment of the American way of life, and we will continue to cooperate with the segment of the American public which enjoys camping.

5. We will continue strenuous efforts to make the national park areas of this great nation even more worthy of your visits—even more worthy of representing the priceless heritage of scenic, historic and natural values that is so much a part of America.

I thank you very much for inviting me here today, and I want you to know that the National Park Service, under my direction, will always listen to whatever opinions you wish to express. We welcome your cooperation, and we pledge you ours.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY MULAY

HON. SAMUEL H. YOUNG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of this Nation's most treasured institutions is its free press. All across this country, publishers, editors, and reporters can be proud of the job they have done in helping to make the citizens of the United States the most well-informed people in the world.

Today, I would like to pay tribute to one of this country's finest and most diligent journalists, Larry Mulay. Larry is retiring after a 55-year career that has brought honor to the journalism profession.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial from one of Chicago's leading newspapers:

If Chicago's newspeople ever organized a fan club, it likely would be to sing the praises of Larry Mulay. Hundreds of them have come under his tutelage and enjoyed his friendship as they broke into Chicago journalism by way of the City News Bureau.

Not many newspaper readers come to know about the City News Bureau, for it is a behind-the-scenes operation, providing a vital information service on a co-operative basis for the print and broadcast media. And over the years it has also provided a training ground for reporters.

Larry ran a tough school at CNB, although he admits it has "mellowed some" now. And the lessons he helped teach through 30 years as city editor of the service and nearly a decade as general manager are firmly implanted in the work of newsmen and newswomen in Chicago and throughout the nation. In his incredible 55-year career at CNB (he began as a copy boy in 1919), Mulay estimates he has helped to train 6,000 aspiring journalists. Among his "graduates" are many now at the top of their profession.

Larry is finally going to retire from his 12-hour days of keeping watch on the accuracy of the news of Chicago. And his many friends and former pupils who bid him a fond adieu may yet get around to organizing that Larry Mulay Fan Club.

CONGRESSMEN PETTIS AND BELL SEEK TO END SWINDLING OF STUDENTS BY UNETHICAL VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of Reader's Digest contains a very interesting article about one of the most disgraceful rackets rampant in America today: the vocational school ruse. Rather than explain the entire situation in detail myself, I will enter the article in the RECORD. I would, however, like to take just a moment to commend two of our colleagues from my own State, the Honorable JERRY PETTIS and the Honorable ALPHONZO BELL, who have introduced legislation to begin to deal with this problem.

It is more important that we do something about this racket now than ever before, Mr. Speaker, since the nationwide economic problems which have grown so incredibly over the past few years are causing more people than ever before to enroll in these vocational schools, either to find jobs in this period of massive unemployment or to move up into higher paying jobs to cope with today's runaway inflation. Many vocational schools promise far more than they can deliver—in many instances under circumstances that cannot be described as anything less than criminal fraud—and the innocent students are taken for untold millions of dollars. Congressional action is made even more necessary by the fact that the Federal Government often plays a peripheral role in this scandal, loaning tuition money to students through the Veterans' Administration and the Office of Education. Even when one of these schools goes bankrupt, the student is left owing money to the Federal Government for an education which he or she did not receive.

It should, of course, go without saying that the practices of some of these institutions should not cause us to look with disfavor upon the many fine vocational schools which are honestly and competently fulfilling a genuine need in our society. The good schools, in fact, are among the most adversely affected vic-

tims of the bad schools, since the rotten apples bring discredit upon the entire barrel.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I submit the text of the article, and I urge our colleagues to join as cosponsors of H.R. 11927 when AL BELL and JERRY PETTIS request our support for this measure, which I understand they will be doing very shortly.

The article follows:

CAREER SCHOOLS AREN'T ALWAYS WHAT THEY CLAIM

(By Jean Carper)

"Earn more money!" blazon the advertisements. Become an aircraft mechanic, insurance adjuster, writer, machinery operator, broadcaster, computer programmer, lab technician or truck driver. All you have to do is enroll in a private career school. When you graduate, you'll step into a fabulous, high-paying job.

Unfortunately, too many Americans have discovered to their sorrow that the promised jobs never materialize. Complaints from victimized students to the Office of Education about unethical vocational schools nearly doubled from 1972 to 1973. In a nationwide crackdown over the past two years, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has conducted 400 inquiries into schools suspected of deceptive practices.

The nation's 10,000 private vocational, or career, schools—resident and correspondence—annually enroll over three million students at a tuition cost of \$2.5 billion. Undeniably, much of the money is spent on schools which do provide solid educations that enable graduates to obtain jobs. But, tragically, millions of dollars are wasted on substandard education for jobs that are not available. Poor governmental controls make it easy for career schools to prey on students. In some states, all you need to set up a vocational school is a postal address and the price of a license, while other states—such as Indiana, Minnesota, New York, Texas, Wisconsin—have strong regulatory laws.

Consequently, few schools are held accountable for high standards. Only 1700—a mere 17 percent of private vocational schools—are accredited by such nationally recognized agencies as the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools, the National Home Study Council and the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools. But accreditation or lack of it does not necessarily determine a school's reliability. Many of the FTC's recent complaints of deceptive sales practices were against accredited schools, including several large computer-training schools.

Amazingly, both the Veterans Administration, which grants G.I. payments for training in any state-approved resident or correspondence school, and the Office of Education, which approves federally insured student loans for accredited vocational schools, are prevented by law from giving any assurance that these schools are reputable. The federal government merely puts up the money for grants or loans, and if the school is dishonest, substandard, or collapses mid-term, the student is left holding the bag. A typical case is Denver's Western Technical College, a trade school which folded in 1971 after a history of financial troubles, leaving 600 students owing \$1 million in federally insured loans. According to Maury Tansey, chief of claims and collections for the Office of Education, his agency will pay off the loans to banks holding the notes and dun students for repayment—for an education they didn't complete. Says the angry father of one student who owes \$1200, "We thought if the government approved the loan the school was okay."

What are the main complaints against the

career schools? Essentially, prospective students should beware of:

MISLEADING ADVERTISING

Invariably, ads promise high pay and job placement, but these claims often bear little resemblance to the actual job market. A 1972 FTC study in the Midwest showed that schools were luring would-be aircraft mechanics with ads like "Need men for high-paying positions immediately." Yet an FTC check revealed that among major airlines, American had laid off 365 mechanics in the previous six weeks, United had no openings and Eastern had not hired a mechanic since 1969.

In one New York case, a truck-driver training school charged \$985 in tuition for a three-week course guaranteed to get graduates "\$200 per week and more." Investigators for the state's Bureau of Consumer Frauds and Protection discovered that only 14 out of 179 students who had graduated—a scant eight percent—had been placed as promised in jobs as heavy-equipment operators, and none received salaries approaching those advertised.

HIGH-PRESSURE SALESMEN

Commissioned salesmen with glorified titles like "counselor," "registrar" or "educational consultant" make pitches at school career-days or canvass door to door—their sole aim to get a signature on a contract. They often conduct phony aptitude tests anyone can pass. One salesman in Nebraska who talked a woman on welfare into taking an artist's correspondence course administered the "talent test" himself (he gave her a high score). Some salesmen lie about accommodations. A now-defunct airlines-personnel training school headquartered in Missouri once pictured the University of Missouri campus in its brochures. The school's dormitory was actually a boardinghouse over a bar. Sometimes salesmen pose as civil-service officials. For \$300 to \$900 they sell instructions on how to pass civil-service examinations—which anyone can obtain from the Civil Service Commission absolutely free!

POOR-QUALITY EDUCATION

Frequently, so much money goes into the sales operation of vocational schools that little is left for schooling. During a recent year, one of the nation's largest vocational-school chains spent 65 percent of its gross income on advertising and administrative expenses, and only 15 percent on instruction.

Both prospective employers and public officials are disturbed about the quality of teaching at some vocational schools. Says Dr. Morris Schaeffer, former assistant commissioner of health for New York City, about private vocational schooling in medical technology: "Instructors generally lack adequate credentials, the equipment is poor and there is a lack of practical materials." Dr. Henry Isenberg, head of Microbiology Laboratory at Long Island Jewish-Hillside Medical Center in New York, reports that he is unable to hire 95 percent of those with vocational training who apply for jobs as lab technicians. They are too ill-prepared.

UNQUALIFIED GRADUATES

Some students earn a diploma from a career school—only to be left out in the cold because of additional standards they have not been informed about, such as industry or union regulations and licensing requirements. For example, a boy who trained to be a detective couldn't qualify because he was five-foot-six—too short. A girl who completed a stewardess course couldn't be hired because her vision was so bad as to brand her nearly legally blind. After graduation from a broadcasting school, a Chicago man was rejected by 40 stations in the area; all said they wanted someone with experience or a college degree. Though a California school touted its court-reporting courses,

none of its graduates had ever passed the state's exam to practice.

All in all, these vocational-school practices add up to what Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota has called "the last legalized con game in America." What can you do to protect yourself from them? Before signing up for vocational training, the FTC urges you to ask four crucial questions—not of the schools themselves but of several prospective employers: 1) Would you hire graduates from X school? 2) How many have you hired in the past year? 3) Were they hired because of school training? 4) Did training make any difference in starting salary?

Check also with local and state employment agencies, guidance counselors, unions, trade and professional associations to find out about special qualifications needed in your field. Ask the prospective school for the last year's job-placement rate and a list of several graduates whom you can contact as references. Find out whether the school is accredited and by whom. Always visit a residential school's campus before enrolling. Read every contract thoroughly, and never sign one under pressure.

If you decide to drop out of a school, send a registered letter immediately informing the registrar's office—this is critical in getting a refund. If you feel cheated, write a formal complaint to the school, the state licensing agency, the accrediting agency (if the school is accredited), your local or state consumer-protection agency, the Office of Education (if you have a student loan), and the Federal Trade Commission, Room 479, Washington, D.C. 20580. As a last resort, consider filing suit.

Many authorities are now supporting strong state regulations to clean up vocational schools. For example, after Texas put through a tough new regulatory law, about one third of the state's private vocational schools shut down. The Education Commission of the States has proposed model licensing legislation, calling for strict standards of financial stability, equipment and instruction in all states. Congressman Alphonzo Bell and Jerry L. Pettis, both of California, have introduced a bill requiring the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to make a study of the federal government's involvement in funding private vocational schools and to adopt new procedures to prevent students from being cheated.

As Congressman Pettis says, "It is foolish to squander national resources on shoddy education. Students who enter vocational schools deserve—and should receive—a good education."

ALARMING SECURITY LAXNESS BY BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is my duty to call the attention of the House to a situation which I find to be alarming, and to the lack of responsiveness in connection with it exhibited on the part of the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, James Conlan.

A private printing firm with a repeated record of losing securities which subsequently find their way into underworld circles was provided by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing with materials used to make plates bearing the image of George Washington that appears on \$1 bills.

Dies used to make plates bearing the image of Washington and special ink were provided to the private firm by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing in a vain effort to adapt the firm's presses to help the Bureau print gas ration coupons, though Federal supervision of the materials appears to have been minimal.

The materials were provided despite a past and current record by the firm of losing stocks, bonds, letters of credit, travelers' checks, and other materials which have later turned up in such far-away places as Panama, Greece, Luxembourg, Frankfurt, London, Geneva, and the United States.

The private printing firm was Jeffries Bank Note Corp., of Los Angeles.

Three years ago Jeffries was mentioned in connection with the loss of potentially billions of dollars worth of negotiable and nonnegotiable materials.

While no one charged anyone at Jeffries with any responsibility for the loss, it was evident that a virtual absence of adequate security procedures allowed these materials to find their way into the wrong hands. The list of lost stocks, letters of credit, and other materials runs 42 pages.

There have been 21 indictments in the case, but no one has gone to jail in this country in connection with the case. There have been three murders of persons involved in the case, including the murder of an assistant U.S. attorney in Los Angeles the day before he was to seek an indictment in the case. The public defender appointed to represent the man charged with the murder was then murdered. The most recent murder occurred 2 months ago in Las Vegas of another person indicted in connection with the securities losses.

Jeffries inadvertently launched the chain of events when it sought a means to destroy stocks and bonds for which new certificates were being issued, along with printing overruns of other materials it had printed itself on its presses. Jeffries is a leading printing firm used to produce stocks, bonds, travelers checks, and similar materials. Among the items slated for destruction were stock certificates in International Nuclear Chemical which had been shipped 3,000 miles west to Jeffries for the purpose by Chase Manhattan Bank.

However, Jeffries did not have the capability at that time of destroying the materials in-house, and an outside firm it had been using refused to do further work for Jeffries because the high rag content of the materials was damaging their shredding equipment.

Jeffries then "turned to the Yellow Pages," and called a listed number for a firm headed by a Larry Gamson. Law enforcement authorities identify Gamson as the brother of Benny "Meatball" Gamson, who died some years ago in a Chicago gangland war.

Gamson did not have the capability of destroying the materials either, law enforcement records indicate, but he took on the job. Hiring a U-Haul truck, Gamson carted away 18 dempsy dumpsters full of materials and transported them to the Harry Kassap Rag Co., run by Jerry Kassap. Kassap was observed having

lunch in New York with Joe Colombo a week before Colombo was gunned down, according to law enforcement officials.

Jeffries issued a certificate of destruction to Chase Manhattan Bank for the materials sent to Jeffries. But they and other materials later reappeared in financial capitals throughout the world and in the United States, where they were often used as collateral for short term loans from FDIC banks. Kassap was indicted in the case. Gamson was not accused.

There was a partial housecleaning of personnel at Jeffries following the case. But under new management, losses have continued. Some \$60,000 worth of signed Travellers Cheques were discovered missing from Jeffries only last September when they turned up in London and were subsequently recovered by U.S. law enforcement authorities. Reports of other losses have also been under investigation.

The Bureau of Engraving and Printing conducted only the most cursory and slipshod investigation of the security background of the company and of the personnel at Jeffries.

One individual involved with providing outdoor security at Jeffries is a convicted felon. Sentenced for mail fraud in that case, he has only recently been indicted again on a new charge of bribery to fix an election. He has pleaded not guilty, and there is no evidence indicating he has any connection with the most recent losses at Jeffries. But I cite it because the Bureau of Engraving and Printing was not even aware of it.

Federal energy officials as late as mid-March were totally oblivious to Jeffries' poor security record and history of losses.

Yet this is the firm which the Bureau made extraordinary efforts to give a contract to for the printing of gas ration coupons, despite the fact that without adaptation of its equipment it apparently did not have the capability to do the work of the kind and quality desired.

Even after the effort was made with strenuous Bureau assistance to adapt Jeffries' equipment, they could not do the work.

Two other private reputable firms, U.S. Bank Note Corp. and American Bank Note, were used to print a portion of the gas ration coupons the Bureau itself could not handle. U.S. Bank Note was never approached to handle an additional volume of coupon printing it appeared Jeffries could not handle, though the Bureau has claimed it went to Jeffries in the first place because of the need for an additional printing capability it could not find elsewhere.

Bureau officials made three attempts to help Jeffries adapt its equipment but finally ended up doing the job itself.

Officials of Jeffries contributed at least \$13,000 to the Committee for the Re-election of the President—CREEP—after April 7, 1972. Jeffries is a wholly owned subsidiary of Title Insurance & Trust Co.—TI—of Los Angeles, which holds title to San Clemente and in which Bebe Rebozo and Robert Abplanalp have a beneficial trust. Jeffries does printing work for many Los Angeles area lawyers,

including the President's personal lawyer, Herbert Kalmbach.

I have no way of knowing why the Bureau of Engraving and Printing made such extraordinary exertions to give a contract to Jeffries. But I do know that the Bureau's bureaucratic rhetoric about the thoroughness of their security precautions is as phony as a gas ration coupon or a \$2 bill. It is incredible that a firm with the notorious record of "losing" things that Jeffries has should be given materials used to manufacture the picture of George Washington used on U.S. currency.

Bureau of Engraving and Printing Director James Conlon has denied any laxness in security in connection with attempts to use Jeffries for the printing of ration coupons, but promised a prompt audit of materials used by Jeffries to make sure all were handled under proper security arrangements.

That was 3½ weeks ago. Director Conlon has not forwarded the results of that audit to date. I believe this is a matter that should be subject to a thorough investigation by the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, and I have indicated my willingness to cooperate in any way with the members and staff of that subcommittee in an effort to determine the facts in this matter.

RELIEF URGENTLY NEEDED FOR LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in response to a deluge of calls and wires received from desperate livestock producers in Minnesota, I have today introduced legislation that would slap a 6-month freeze on all beef imports. It is the same essential legislation just introduced by our colleague from Nebraska, Congressman DAVE MARTIN.

I have also wired Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger urging that he institute a crash program to buy beef and pork for military feeding programs. A similar telegram has been sent to Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz in which I recommended quick Government beef and pork purchases for all appropriate civilian programs, like school lunches and feeding the needy, in order to try to bolster the present sorry farm producer prices.

Tragically, cattlemen are losing anywhere from \$100 to \$200 a head on today's depressed livestock market. Hog prices are down at least 30 percent from a year ago. Prime beef in some places is being sold for dog food. There is no way that many thousands of family farmers with livestock to sell can survive at these prices. Their credit sources are drying up, and the whole farm economy is being damaged.

A group of farmer-feeders in my congressional district recently reported to me that:

The problem is not that of the livestock feeder alone. Within a short period of time it will extend to other industries such as packing houses and their labor force, the trucking industry, the grain farmer, and the finance industry. . . . Ultimately, it becomes the problem of the consumer, since the reduction in the number of livestock feeders will cause serious food shortages that will greatly increase the cost of food to the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, we ignore such valid assessments at our peril. The Livestock and Grains Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee announced today that public hearings on the serious livestock situation will be held on June 25 and 26. This is too long to wait when immediate relief is required. I would hope that our subcommittee will reconsider and move these dates forward to a much earlier time.

A number of alternate legislative ideas have been introduced that should receive consideration. It is especially urgent to deal with the beef imports problem, either administratively through the President's revocation of the suspension of red meat import quotas, or through legislation along the lines being recommended by a number of us in the Midwest.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to encourage the administration to move expeditiously to see what can be done to encourage lower meat prices at the retail level, thereby prompting increased consumer demand for meats of all kind. Current livestock prices on the farm are simply not being reflected in the prices being charged to consumers at the meat counter.

I also hope our Government will take the lead in encouraging new volume purchases by Canadian and Japanese meat buyers. Our sales to these countries have been interrupted by the public flap over the artificial hormone, diethylstilbestrol, or DES. But I understand that a method has been worked out now to assure that U.S. beef is free of this substance, so that our meat sales to these countries should be resumed as quickly as possible.

Finally, I would like to mention that late last week, I wrote to President Nixon urging him to review the meat import situation as it presently prevails and to order immediate action to protect our rural economy. The President has authority, under section 2 of the Meat Import Act of 1964, to revoke suspension of red meat import quotas. The action would have the effect of quickly curtailing meat imports currently spilling into the United States, to the great detriment of the U.S. livestock industry and our family farmers.

SINGLED OUT FOR DISCRIMINATION

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the House Ways and Means Com-

mittee is considering reforms intended to make our tax system more equitable, Miss Kitty Kelley has written an excellent analysis of the current tax status of one group of Americans. That particular point of view expressed here is that of a single taxpayer. Her article from the April 22, 1974, issue of Newsweek follows:

SINGLED OUT FOR DISCRIMINATION

(By Kitty Kelley)

Income-tax day is April 15 which, logically, should make this week the biggest of the year for marriage proposals. Roping a spouse is the only way a single taxpayer can beat the system and escape the gouge of the Internal Revenue Service, which graciously subsidizes marriage to the tune of \$10 billion a year while slapping single taxpayers with an annual \$1.7 billion penalty. The 38 million second-class citizens in this country who are single by choice, death or divorce must either play house or pay through the unringed nose. There is no other option.

Our Federal tax laws protect the poor, the elderly and the handicapped and provide generous loopholes for the very rich. There even used to be a well-publicized cushion for a civil servant who tried to deduct a half million dollars for a passel of papers collected during his days as second banana to President Eisenhower. Special privileges are also accorded to married individuals, who pay much lower taxes than their single counterparts. As the IRS states: "Filing a joint return often means tax savings . . . because the joint-return rates are lower than other rates." Even if only one spouse works, the IRS code permits married couples to pretend while computing taxes that half their income is earned by the other partner, and so the marrieds get the tax break.

For example, a \$12,000-a-year bachelor coughs up \$2,630 in taxes for 1973 while his married friend in the same income bracket pays \$2,260. The senseless \$370 penalty worsens as the bachelor and his married friend continue to make more money. At 1973 tax rates, by the time they reach the \$20,000 bracket the penalty is \$850, and at \$50,000 the difference in their taxes is a whopping \$3,130!

NO FRILLS

Justification for joint-return rates rests largely on the assumption that it costs married couples substantially more to live than unmarrieds. However, this is not true. Government statistics from 1970 show that a married couple without children on a no-frills budget spent \$5,250 to maintain a basic standard of living whereas two single people living separately spent \$7,760 to maintain the same standard of living.

Because single, widowed and divorced taxpayers do not have the option of filing jointly, they pay considerably more in taxes than marrieds in the same taxable-income bracket. Men and women accustomed to this split-income provision experience a sudden financial jolt when they lose their spouses through death or divorce. For instance, a woman who must find a job to support herself after losing her husband usually finds she must pay more taxes on less income than she and her husband previously reported together. Meanwhile, she has to pay the same mortgage payments, the same property taxes, the same car payments and the same tuition on her children's education. And if she is an unliberated soul who relied on her husband to take care of odd jobs around the house, she must now pay a plumber or electrician or painter to do what her mate did for free. Since she is not entitled to deduct these expenses, she is penalized a second time for being single.

The Sixteenth Amendment to the Con-

stitution stipulates a tax on income, but the connubial types in Congress apparently forgot to read the instructions on the package. Instead of taxing the income, they decided to tax the individual by designing a system that forces singles to shoulder the greatest burden of government revenue. For the past 60 years, unmarried pigeons have been feathering the Federal nest with 40 per cent more in taxes than married people.

RIPPED OFF

When singles began computing the thousands of dollars in a lifetime of earnings that would be ripped off by the government, outrage mounted, and by 1968 thousands of people refused to send in their tax payments. The mutiny on this and other issues, combined with heavy lobbying in Washington, finally forced Congress to pass the 1969 Tax Reform Act, which reduced the 40 per cent inequity to 20 per cent.

The protest worked to reduce grand larceny to manageable dimensions, but there were still complaints. However, faced with the prospect of a grueling IRS audit, most singles paid up. They had no other recourse.

"They have been doing it for so long, it is now a habit," declared Robert Keith Gray, former secretary to President Eisenhower's Cabinet. "But it is an outrageously bad national habit and one that should be broken immediately." Mr. Gray, himself a Washington bachelor, finally got fed up paying higher taxes than his married friends and decided in 1971 to fight the discrimination by forming CO\$T—the Committee of Single Taxpayers, a nonprofit, nonpartisan lobby to influence Congress.

Putting his money where his mouth was, Mr. Gray contributed \$10,000 to finance the organization and enlisted the support of two former senators who have never agreed on anything except the Ten Commandments. With Eugene McCarthy, the liberal poet from Minnesota, and George Murphy, the conservative song-and-dance man from California, the crusade for the single taxpayer began in earnest.

BOMBARDMENT

The odd couple stalked the halls of Congress, buttonholing former colleagues to support the bills introduced by Democrats Rep. Edward Koch of New York and Sen. Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut to give singles the same tax schedule as marrieds filing jointly. Unmarried citizens began bombarding their congressmen with letters and telegrams that helped push the bill through the House of Representatives. And it was passed in the Senate even though retrogrades like Democrat Russell Long of Louisiana and Republican Wallace Bennett of Utah interpreted the legislation as a license for living in sin. Their insistence that you must marry and multiply to get a fair shake from the IRS eventually succeeded in killing the bill in conference between the two chambers. So single taxpayers are paying their unfair share of taxes again this year.

But there is still hope for next year. CO\$T is confident that with continued lobbying by the odd couple and the help of concerned singles, Congress will see its way clear to admitting the unmarried to the human race. "We're on the right track now," says Gray. "We have professional people involved. We have viable representation in Congress, and the legislators are interested because we keep pushing."

If the bills pass, the government would lose an estimated \$1.7 billion in revenue collected each year from single taxpayers. But Congress should be reminded of what it cost to desegregate the South. Civil rights are always expensive. Still, the cost of righting the wrongs of discrimination is the best investment a democratic society can make.

H.R. 15200

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, many adverse comments have been made against H.R. 15200 which I cosponsored last week. The legislation would exempt from full-time babysitting coverage a single head of a household whose earnings would not exceed \$7,500 per year and would further exempt joint heads of households whose total income did not exceed \$15,000 per year.

I maintain that this is realistic legislation, and while I am aware that certain groups in this country are adamantly opposed to its passage, I feel it is definitely needed. I am submitting a letter I received from the manager of the Georgia Department of Labor, Training, and Employment Service office in Griffin, Ga., which I feel substantiates the need for this legislation, and I want to share it with my colleagues:

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Griffin, Ga., June 7, 1974.

HON. DAWSON MATHIS,
Congressman, Second Georgia District,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I read with great interest your Bill to strip minimum wages from "Baby Sitters" and to exempt families who make less than \$15,000 a year from paying "Domestics" the new minimum wage. I am the Manager of the Georgia Department of Labor, Training and Employment Service office in Griffin, Georgia. This new minimum wage has created a bad situation. Why should a working mother be responsible for paying her maid \$1.90 per hour when service workers, waitresses, cashiers, sales clerks, and yes charwomen for doctor's offices are not covered under this law?

My area covers eight counties which are predominantly textile and garment. These mothers average \$100 to \$120 per week. Do you think they can afford \$76 per week for a Domestic? Absolutely not, they are forced to quit, discharge the maid. The family income is lowered at a time when cost of living is sky-high. The minimum wage for Domestic is a bad piece of legislation; it should be based on family income at least.

To bring out another point, employers are having their troubles. We cannot supply qualified workers in all instances, so production goes down. The maids themselves in most cases are not qualified for mill jobs or many other jobs. They are usually elderly, uneducated black females who have great difficulty in securing employment; most are also untrainable. What is the alternative—Welfare—they go right back to the system we need to break up.

I noticed that Ms. Edith Sloan said your bill was "dumb". She is out of touch with rural areas. Her experience no doubt is in the large metropolitan areas where Domestic made more than \$2.00 per hour before this law became effective. The average lower and middle class family cannot afford this minimum wage. There should be a salary limit. If retail service businesses are exempt, why penalize the young working mothers who need work to supplement the family income?

I do hope your Bill passes. I am urging the women in my area to write their Congressmen and Senators protesting this wage law. I would enjoy talking with Ms. Sloan; she is out of touch with reality. You could

sound out Employment Service offices in your area to verify these facts. It is not only Griffin, but all over the State objections to this new law are being heard daily.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY D. DELL,
Manager, Georgia Training and Employment Service, Georgia Department of Labor.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS M. JENKINS

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in this time when the news media would give one the impression that there is a lack of confidence in Government, it is important now that we recognize those citizens who, by their day-to-day actions, dispel that impression.

One of those citizens is Thomas M. Jenkins, whose excellence in local government is equalled by few people anywhere. Tom is retiring as mayor and councilman of San Carlos after many years of service to his community and the State of California. Some of his former community and professional activities include:

Vice president and board of governors, State bar of California, 1969-72; president, American Association of Homes for the Aging, 1969-72; president, Peninsula Division, League of California Cities, 1971-72; chairman, conference of delegates, State bar of California, 1967; House of Delegates, American Bar Association, 1959-64; mayor, city of San Carlos, 1965-69; chairman, council of mayors, San Mateo County; vice chairman and national board of directors, Camp Fire Girls, 1964-68; president, Peninsula Council, Camp Fire Girls; president, United Community Fund of San Francisco, 1962-64; Governor's hospital advisory council, State of California; board of directors, 17th District PTA; chairman, planning commission, city of San Carlos; executive committee, San Francisco program for the aging; board of governors, Legal Aid Society, San Francisco; president, the Lawyers' Club of San Francisco; vice president, Mission Neighborhood Centers.

Perhaps the finest tribute that can be paid to an individual is to be honored by his peers. Tom will be so honored on June 13, 1974, when a committee made up of the citizens of San Carlos will express the appreciation of the entire community at a retirement dinner.

The word "retirement" is a misnomer in this circumstance because Tom is not, by any stretch of the imagination, "retiring." He is an active member of the prestigious law firm of Hanson, Bridgett, Marcus, and Jenkins. He also sits on the judicial counsel of the State of California, the board of directors of the American Association of Homes for the Aging, the board of approval for the American Hospital Association, the board of directors of the San Francisco Association for Mental Health, the board of

trustees of the United Bay Area Crusade and as chairman of Long-Range Planning for the State Bar of California.

I suspect Tom will use his well-deserved rest from active city management to spend more time with his lovely wife Anne, and their three children Thomas Mark, III, Jo Anne, and Dirk.

I join Tom's friends and associates in saluting a dedicated citizen in service to his community and wish him all of the luck and happiness of the future.

THE NEED FOR NEGOTIATING A RESIGNATION—NOW

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Don RIEGLE, has written a thoughtful article that appeared in the Los Angeles Times of June 10, 1974, which I am inserting in the RECORD for the interest of my colleagues:

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 10, 1974]

THE NEED FOR NEGOTIATING A RESIGNATION—NOW

(By Donald W. Riegle)

President Nixon is leaving for the Middle East and will soon be going to the Soviet Union for summit talks. But no matter how far he travels and no matter whom he meets, Mr. Nixon cannot leave Watergate behind.

For the pressure continues to build for some kind of resolution. The Democratic leaders of Congress have come out against a presidential resignation—their constitutional and political preference for the full impeachment process is understandable. Due process is proper.

On another level, however, America desperately needs a new President—now.

Urgent national difficulties compound themselves daily as we drift aimlessly with a crippled Presidency. In addition, I sense the gravest dangers in East-West summitry conducted by someone so disabled and distracted. Extremely serious foreign policy and domestic policy realities make the impeachment process much too slow and nationally incapacitating—despite its other virtues.

A carefully negotiated resignation arrangement seems the best of a deteriorating set of alternatives.

But as congressional attitudes harden on the impeachment issue, the practical option of such a negotiated resignation may be slipping away. Should it slip away, the loss of this option would, I think, ultimately prove very costly to Mr. Nixon and to the country. For Mr. Nixon, at the worst, impeachment and its aftermath could well mean time in federal prison, possible fines, enormous legal fees and the loss of handsome pension benefits. For the country, it would mean continued months of executive paralysis in which we would be hostage to possible future crises to which we could not properly respond.

Many of us in Congress would accept a negotiated resignation which would provide Mr. Nixon with immunity from future criminal prosecution. Presumably it could be done legislatively as Rep. Wilbur D. Mills (D-Ark) has suggested, with a newly sworn President Ford signing such a bill into law. Or it could be accomplished by means of a formal agreement between the President and the special prosecutor, sanctioned by congressional leaders from both parties.

But two crucial conditions would have to be met. First, the arrangement would have to be made soon—for the passage of time makes it less useful to the country, and protracted discussion would soon take on the appearance of political conniving and backscratching. The second condition is the most critical and—to my mind—non-negotiable: In any negotiated resignation, the whole truth must be made public about Watergate and all other matters presently under investigation by the House Judiciary Committee. That would mean that all presidential tapes and documents, without exception, would have to be turned over to the special prosecutor and his staff or to the House Judiciary Committee so that the full truth could be finally pieced together and made public.

From appearances to date, it seems that Mr. Nixon would never consent to paying the price of yielding the whole truth. Given the fragments of evidence already in hand, I can understand his reluctance. But no resignation arrangement can stand the test of time and justice—unless the full truth is finally known—and therefore no deal is possible that does not strip away the last vestige of the coverup. I hope Mr. Nixon will come to this realization—and soon.

I do not now sense a mood of vindictiveness toward Mr. Nixon, in the country or in Congress—although there is widespread disappointment, disgust and a feeling of national disgrace. The American people—and history—will be charitable to a fallen President who finally chooses to put nation ahead of self.

What we seek is not a pound of Mr. Nixon's flesh—but rather the full truth and a fully restored and functioning Presidency.

THE MIA DILEMMA: ONE FAMILY'S EXPERIENCE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in March of 1972, the son of a constituent family became a tragic statistic. Capt. Arthur H. Hardy, of Ipswich, Mass., then a lieutenant, was shot down over Laos. Since that day, the family of Captain Hardy, Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Hardy, have been waging a campaign to ascertain the fate of their missing son.

I suspect that my experience in trying to help the Hardy family, and in trying to believe the assurance of officials at the Department of Defense is all too typical. As much as I want to believe that every reasonable effort is being made to resolve the MIA question, I cannot help but doubt that enough is being done.

It was a tendency on the part of some Members of Congress, perhaps, to take the signing of the Paris peace accords as a signal that the long horror of the Vietnamese conflict was now over and that somehow the bitter residue of this war would instantly dissolve. Perhaps an attitude developed about the MIA's which would have banished this nagging question from the focus of our daily vision.

But some Americans—courageous Americans like the Hardy family—refused to allow the MIA question to die a quiet death. They have continued to make every effort, often at great sacrifice, to learn the fate of the hundreds

and hundreds of American servicemen listed as missing in action.

Over the months since the nominal end of the Vietnamese conflict, we have seen, understandably, growing frustration build over the MIA dilemma. Some Americans would blame the whole problem on the North Vietnamese and their southern counterpart, the so-called provisional revolutionary government. Other Americans would cast the blame on the Saigon government; still others on our own Government. The increasing frustration and bitterness has led to a polarization of the issue on which all Americans ought to be united—a polarization that infects the still-fester wounds of Vietnam.

It seems to me that the fault for the MIA dilemma lies with all parties. Very serious problems have been encountered in the efforts of our Government to account for the servicemen and civilians listed as missing in action. Efforts to obtain information, or access to the actual sites where the remains of American personnel may lie, have been repeatedly frustrated. To a large degree these difficulties and the attendant frustration can be blamed on the North Vietnamese and the PRG, who are sometimes intransigent and uncooperative. Other Communist nations, such as the Soviet Union, do not appear to have been helpful in resolving the MIA dilemma.

Yet, we must recognize that the Saigon Government bears some of the fault as well. The parts of any peace agreement must to some extent depend on the success of the whole. Frankly, the Paris accords have not brought peace to Vietnam. The fighting continues; only the direct U.S. presence is gone. And both sides are at fault. In this context of continuing strife, it is perhaps more understandable that the components of the "peace" agreement dealing with MIA's are not being fully complied with by either the South Vietnamese or North Vietnamese Governments, to the frustration of American effort. The MIA dilemma cannot but be affected by the general status of affairs in Vietnam, and today, this status is not good.

Just recently, it was announced that the North and South Vietnamese had agreed to reinstate the Geneva talks, and upon this announcement—made after months of conspicuously bad relations—it was hinted that the North Vietnamese might be more willing to allow U.S. inspection of sites where MIA remains may be.

Perhaps this is a lesson to us. It is the understandable by-product of the months—in some cases, years—of frustration that well-intended people should suggest harsh and punitive measures as a means to learn the fate of the MIA's. But we cannot force a resolution upon the North Vietnamese and the PRG. Even military involvement would worsen rather than better the situation. The best our country can do to resolve the MIA dilemma, it seems to me, is to actively encourage better relations between the various sides, to discourage hostilities between North and South, and to help in building the climate of peace that, we

can hope, will result in the trust needed on all sides for satisfactory resolution of the questions remaining on the fate of our MIA's.

I genuinely believe that the MIA dilemma is not a partisan concern. It is a human concern, one in which every American should share. I hope we will recognize the frustration and the suffering of MIA families, and I hope our country will take the positive kinds of steps required if we are to stand a real chance to bring light into the darkness of the MIA dilemma. We owe it to the families of our servicemen to do our best to learn their fate. We owe at least this much to the Arthur Hardys, and their families, of this Nation.

THE IMPORTANCE OF FETAL RESEARCH

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the House voted overwhelmingly to prohibit fetal research in federally funded medical programs.

In a recent article, the director of Babies Hospital in New York, pointed out how instrumental fetal research has been in developing cures for premature birth, cerebral palsy, metabolic disorders, multiple sclerosis, a variety of cancers and coronary heart disease, among many others. The article confirms the importance of considering proposed legislation in a calm, rational, and thoughtful manner, especially when it can affect vitally important medical research that can well be lifesaving.

It is apparent that many of those opposed to fetal research have confused the issue of fetal research with the abortion issue. In fact, fetal research should be of vital concern to those who purport to be committed to the preservation of human life. The great amount of emotionalism and rhetoric which have been expended on this matter has caused many to lose sight of the real issue involved here: fetal research is crucial to enable unborn babies to survive and to enable both children and adults to live healthy lives free of disease.

We have appropriated millions of dollars for advanced programs of medical research in a number of important areas, such as cancer and heart disease. Yet medieval attitudes have caused us to block off an area of research which could be of vital help in curing these and many other life-destroying diseases.

The article which appeared in the New York Times on June 9, 1974, follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF FETAL RESEARCH (By Richard E. Behrman)

Current efforts to prohibit or significantly limit research involving fetuses and infants seriously jeopardize the health and welfare of our children and of our children's children.

Senate and House conferees have agreed on legislation banning for four months research on the living human fetus, either in the

uterus or after abortion, unless the research is to save the fetus's life. The ban, to be limited to research supported directly or indirectly by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, would run from the time of establishment of a temporary commission for the protection of human subjects of medical experiments.

Instead of providing appropriate safeguards from real, though infrequent, abuses by a few investigations, these initiatives and recent court actions to prohibit fetal research are likely to severely limit our ability not only to protect children from serious illness but also to promote their optimum growth and development.

It may not have been sufficiently communicated to the public and people in positions of political responsibility that the prevention and treatment of diseases that threaten children's health and survival depend especially on fetal and infant research.

A substantial number of problems in young infants start in the uterus, and several important medical developments have been made possible only through research on the human fetus and on the newborn.

In the last decade, for example, amniocentesis, a technique used to remove fluid from the amniotic cavity—the sac of fluid in which the fetus floats—in order to detect diseases, has made possible the identification of more than fifty diseases before birth, many of which if not prevented or treated result in death or mental retardation. This technique was first used for the measurement of intrauterine pressure during labor and would not have been considered necessary to the survival of that particular fetus.

The development of the test for Rh-blood-group incompatibility and ultimately the preventive treatment for the mother would not have occurred without human fetal research.

Our ability to prevent premature birth and brain injury from asphyxia occurring during labor, both of which may lead to death or cerebral palsy, will be obstructed by prohibitions against fetal research. Our ability to increase the survival of healthy children who develop hyaline-membrane disease or Rh disease early in life depends directly on fetal and infant research.

Infections, which take such a large toll during the fetal and newborn periods of life, require at some stage the testing of new antibiotics on the human fetus and newborn infant; tests on animals and human adults that should be done first are not sufficient because of the enormous differences between an infant and adult.

There are over forty metabolic disorders that occur in childhood for which fetal research provides the greatest likelihood of decreasing sickness and death.

The health of adults may also be hurt by prohibitions against fetal research. Progress in the prevention and treatment of coronary heart disease may be compromised.

Our ability to prevent and treat certain disorders of the central nervous system, multiple sclerosis among them, as well as a variety of cancers of adult life, and even our ultimate ability to ameliorate the aging process, are likely to depend in part upon investigations of fetal life and early infancy.

Those who oppose legal abortions have been some of the major supporters of prohibitions against fetal research. However, the goal of fetal research is to preserve the right to life in its fullest sense by preventing and curing disease. In some instances, research may even eliminate the need for therapeutic abortion.

Ethical safeguards are essential in medical investigation. The preservation of life and the prevention and treatment of injury are the only ethical and legal bases for physician-scientists to carry out research on a human baby, premature infant or fetus who is de-

veloped enough to survive outside the uterus.

Investigation of a fetus outside the uterus who has no possibility whatsoever of surviving independently also requires certain ethical and legal safeguards to protect the fetus' own interests as well as those of its parents, society and future generations.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is now formulating regulations. They should be promptly made public and reviewed by Congress and the public to make sure that they provide necessary protection for fetuses, infants and children, both by preventing abuse by unethical research and by preserving every child's right to a life not limited by disease that research can eradicate.

We should not delay protection of fetuses and infants from disease by delaying badly needed research while we study these matters. We cannot allow critically needed research on behalf of our children and theirs to be severely compromised by a ban on fetal and infant research.

INEOA OPPOSES LIFTING OPIUM BAN BY TURKEY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House and concerned organizations throughout the country who are involved in narcotics control continue to urge that the ban on Turkish opium production remain intact. Our resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 507, calling upon the Government of Turkey to continue the opium ban or face a cutoff of U.S. aid, now has the support of 228 House cosponsors, over a majority.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the resolution that has been adopted by the International Narcotic Enforcement Officers Association in strong opposition to the lifting of the opium ban. INEOA is an organization dedicated to securing the cooperation of all who are engaged in the field of narcotics control and devising means for improving international, National, State, and local efforts to combat drug abuse. Its membership includes Harry J. Anslinger, U.S. member of the Narcotic Drug Commission of the United Nations, former U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics, Henry Giordano, former Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, John Ingersoll, and John Bartels, Jr., head of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

The complete text of INEOA's resolution, urging the Government of Turkey to continue the opium ban, follows:

RESOLUTIONS OPPOSING LIFTING OF BAN ON OPIUM PRODUCTION BY TURKEY ADOPTED APRIL 25, 1974, WASHINGTON, D.C., BY THE INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Noting that on June 30, 1971, the Government of Turkey took commendable action in deciding that the most suitable method of preventing diversion of opium into the illicit traffic was to prohibit all production of opium in Turkey;

Appreciating that this action was taken for international humanitarian reasons in

spite of certain economic and social considerations;

Believing that the Government of Turkey's ban on opium production has caused a significant shortage in the flow of opium to clandestine heroin laboratories thereby disrupting the supply of illicit heroin to victim countries;

Regarding the disruption of illicit traffic in Turkish opium as a major factor contributing to the reduction of heroin addiction in the United States;

Being deeply concerned by reports that the Government of Turkey is considering a resumption of opium production; and

Convinced that a resumption of production would make available sizable quantities of diverted opium thereby stimulating the illicit manufacture and distribution of heroin;

Recommends and strongly urges:

(1) That the Government of Turkey continue its humanitarian resolve in recognition of the serious consequences that the world community would suffer if the Government of Turkey were to abandon its present policy; and

(2) That the Government of Turkey continue its ban on the production of opium.

Be it further resolved that this resolution accompanied by evidence of its approval be forwarded to the Turkish Ambassador to the United States with a recommendation that it be respectfully transmitted to the Prime Minister of the Government of Turkey.

LONG-TIME FOREIGN AID OPPONENT SUPPORTS IDA

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been one of the Congress' strongest opponents of bilateral foreign aid. In the various voting records compiled by organizations that keep track of congressional activities I have found that conservative groups have raised their ratings of my performance and progressive groups have lowered their ratings of my job, because of my votes against almost all foreign aid measures to come to the floor of the House during the past several years.

Today, however, I rise to urge my colleagues' support for a foreign aid measure. The legislation in question is H.R. 15231, which Chairman GONZALEZ yesterday brought out of the International Finance Subcommittee for action by the full Committee on Banking and Currency. This bill is quite similar to H.R. 11354, which was defeated in the House on January 23 of this year. The measure provides for continued U.S. participation in the International Development Association, an arm of the World Bank, through an authorization of \$1.5 billion over a 4-year period as our contribution to this multilateral aid agency. This bill overcomes virtually every reservation that any of us here in the Congress may have about foreign aid measures.

That is quite a strong statement, but I will be happy to back it up. I intend, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of our colleagues in the near future a concisely worded statement dealing with all of the

most common arguments we may have against any particular foreign aid measure, and demonstrating that these arguments simply do not apply to this particular bill.

Today I would call our attention to another item. The current issue of *Psychology Today* magazine contains an article which examines the IDA from a perspective which I suspect few of us have adopted when analyzing our foreign aid expenditures. Subtitled "Foreign Aid That Works," the article was written by Kenneth J. Gergen—professor and chairman of psychology at Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania, Ph. D. in social psychology from Duke University, 4 years teaching at Harvard before joining the Swarthmore faculty in 1967—and his wife, Mary M. Gergen—M.A. in counseling from the University of Minnesota, teaches group dynamics at Swarthmore, author of numerous papers in the social science field.

Without any further introduction, let me urge every Member of the House to read this excellent analysis of foreign aid in general, and the IDA in particular. It is well worth every moment of attention we can devote to it. Mr. Speaker, I would like the article to be printed in today's *RECORD* immediately following my remarks:

FOREIGN AID THAT WORKS—WHAT OTHER NATIONS HEAR WHEN THE EAGLE SCREAMS

(By Kenneth J. Gergen and Mary M. Gergen)

We had been studying foreign aid and the psychology of receiving help for several years when the U.S. House of Representatives, on January 23 of this year, voted to withdraw America's financial support from the International Development Association (IDA). The surprise move by Congress was an enormous disappointment, in part because the overwhelming lesson of our research is that IDA is one of the best possible ways the U.S. can help millions of poor people around the world. Naturally, the disappointment will be far greater for those people who face starvation in the years ahead.

IDA, an affiliate of the World Bank, helps only the very poorest countries, the ones whose annual per capita income is \$375 or less. (In 1973, over 70 percent of IDA resources went to countries where the average income is less than \$120.) The organization provides monetary credits and technical assistance after conducting thorough studies of particular problems. Interest on these loans is virtually nil, and the recipients are allowed 50 years to repay them.

Malawi, an impoverished country in southeastern Africa, began receiving help from IDA in 1968 for a rural development project in the Shire Valley. Sixteen thousand farm families were able to increase their annual incomes tenfold by growing cotton and raising better food crops. The Shire Valley project was about to enter its second phase when Congress changed its mind.

IDA money doesn't build grand hotels, armies, or even much in the way of large-scale industry. Its chief aim is to help the small farm family, especially through agricultural and educational programs. IDA recently supplied funds to house 6,500 families left homeless by the earthquake in Managua, Nicaragua. It has funded a livestock development project in Afghanistan, a water supply system for Damascus, an irrigation project for 20,000 families in Nepal, and similar projects in dozens of other countries. Moreover, IDA engages in these activities in such a way that the rich, contributing nations gain friends and increase trust while they help ordinary human beings.

"WE HAVE GOT TO RETRENCH"

The Congressmen who voted against IDA argued that America's attempts at foreign aid have usually ended in corruption and ingratitude. For example, Libya, India, Algeria, and Chile all "bit the hand that fed them." Representative John H. Rousselot of California pointed out that the U.S. was providing loans without interest to foreign countries, "yet our own people are having a struggle to obtain mortgage money at home." Other Congressmen said: "they do not put the money where it belongs;" "we have got to retrench;" "the amount that trickles down to the poor is very tiny;" "we have developed mineral resources all over the world, and in so doing we have closed down our own mineral resources." Other opponents of IDA had less substantial things to say.

Nevertheless, many see the cutoff as a tragedy. It is likely that the other contributing nations will follow the lead of the U.S., reducing IDA to practically nothing by the end of this month (June 30). Some Americans view this as a moral disaster. We are remaining aloof while a large part of the world's population struggles for its bread. The poorest nations, already maimed by the oil price boost and the loss of oil-based fertilizers, face famine. From a more pragmatic standpoint, the friends of IDA argue that we're crazy to dismiss the developing nations that provide us with a third of our natural resources and an annual market for \$14 billion worth of American products. The dimensions of this country's error in withholding \$1.5 billion from IDA may turn out to be more extensive than Congress imagined.

One unfortunate aspect of the debate was that IDA's opponents frequently used arguments that referred to *bilateral* aid; they recalled scandals in which our nation gave assistance directly to other countries. But it is inappropriate to generalize from such instances to the very different world of *multilateral* aid.

The recent Congressional vote was also based on two questionable assumptions. The first is that the culprits in the case are the recipients. This assumption is supposed to account for the poor nations' growing hostility toward the U.S., their failures to cooperate with our programs, their pilfering of goods and funds, and their notorious "lethargy." Second, since aid is an economic matter, it is assumed that assistance programs should be evaluated almost entirely in economic terms.

INDIVIDUALS WITHIN NATIONS

As psychologists, we propose two counter assumptions to these traditional views. First, it's possible that the behavior of recipient nations is importantly shaped by our actions. Recipients are not by nature hostile, uncooperative or lethargic. Moreover, rather than viewing assistance in purely economic terms, we should consider its psychological implications. Dollars are not simply dollars; they carry a host of implications for the recipients' self-esteem, feelings of obligation, and evaluations of us as donors. If we broaden our perspective to include the psychological dimensions of aid, it might be easier to formulate more effective programs. As we shall see, IDA, whose economic reputation is already excellent, may also be the best psychological means of providing aid.

Our research on foreign aid and the psychology of receiving help has involved surveys, questionnaires, in-depth interviews and controlled experiments in several countries. Our focus of attention has been on individual rather than institutional reactions to aid. After all, much of foreign aid (like much of politics and international relations generally) is conducted among individuals. The people who make decisions about such matters are certainly individuals, and so are the people affected by those decisions. They react personally to the actions of others and hold

views of "national character"; they personify nations and think in terms of motive and human design. We believe, moreover, that our own research, some of which is presented here, supports the notion that there are significant, pancultural similarities in the quality of human experience.

Our research points to three major variables that influence people's reactions to aid from other countries: characteristics of the donor, characteristics of the aid itself, and the psychological state of the recipient.

One might suppose, given the poverty of most aid recipients, that the assistance itself would mean everything. But our research indicates that recipients are also extremely concerned about the intentions of the donor. Of the 56 foreign-aid officials that we interviewed, over 70 percent of them singled out the influence of the donor's motives in shaping reactions to aid.

If the donor appears to be giving primarily to serve his own ends, his help is neither appreciated nor are his programs likely to be supported. The recipient of self-serving aid feels the donor is deceitful; as a result, the recipient suspects that he himself will turn out to be the ultimate loser. One aid official characterized self-serving assistance as a "poison gift."

A laboratory study conducted with Phoebe Ellsworth and Magnus Seipel confirms the idea that recipients are hostile to self-seeking donors. Eighty young men in Sweden and the U.S. were placed in an experimental situation where they needed financial resources for an attractive investment. The experiment was a game involving chips and dice, but the final payoff was in real money. Each player got the resources he needed to play the game from what appeared to be one of his peers. Half the players, however, were given the impression that the gift-givers expected a share of the winnings in return. The other players suspected no such designs.

Later, the players evaluated their patrons. It seemed that the hint of exploitative intent evoked negative feelings toward the donor.

Questionnaire studies point to the same sensitivity to a donor's intentions. When asked what they would think of a donor who helped them for selfish reasons, respondents from Malaysia, the Philippines, South Africa, the U.S., and several other countries replied that they would surely dislike that donor. If the donor's intentions were unselfish, they'd like him.

When the U.S. gives aid directly to other countries (bilateral, as opposed to the multilateral aid of organizations like IDA) we tend to trap ourselves. Recipients dislike us because they suspect our motives.

The American people, surveys show, think of our aid as unselfish and humanitarian, and a picture of the clasped hands of brotherhood appears on our shipments overseas. Unfortunately, the recipients of these shipments don't necessarily believe us. Sophisticated recipients, including foreign officials and others whose opinions carry weight, are aware that direct American aid is usually given to secure economic, political and military advantage. Our aid has gained us votes in the U.N., the use of military bases, protection for American businesses overseas, and automatic markets for U.S. exports. These may be reasonable aims, but they're not exactly unselfish, and the recipients understand our intentions. They may even understand them better than the American people do, since recipients read the fine print. In any case, they react accordingly, and may come to dislike us and misuse whatever aid we give.

THE RELEVANCE OF NATIONAL CHARACTER

Other characteristics of the donor, aside from his specific intentions in giving aid, may have powerful effects on the success of the transaction. Most of us are continually evaluating the personalities of people we know. The recipients of aid are no exception.

Views of the "American character," for instance, seem to color recipients' opinions about aid from this country. There is a strong human tendency to see things in emotionally consistent ways, so that "bad" people can't be expected to engage in any "good" act, even if the act appears to be a helping hand. The psychological validity of this principle has been established many times—most recently, perhaps, by Charles Osgood's "psycho-logic" and by Leon Festinger's concept of cognitive dissonance.

Recipients of aid also feel judged by the company they keep. If the donor's character is admirable, it's an honor to be allied with him. If he's aggressive, ignorant or manipulative, then receiving his aid is demeaning.

Surprisingly, our research indicates that almost any characteristic of the donor, no matter how irrelevant to the transfer of resources, can influence the way a recipient perceives economic aid. Public-opinion research indicates that if an aid-giving country has a reputation for being technologically inferior, warlike, unfair to minorities, irreligious, or deranged in its family relations, then reactions to its aid prove negative. The aid appears as unnecessary, undesirable, ineffective.

America's image abroad, surveys indicate, has suffered recently. Our involvement in Vietnam seemed imperialistic to the vast majority of people in developing nations. Earlier, our race relations gained us a reputation for injustice and hypocrisy. The Watergate scandal has left other scars. Problems like these, which seem to contaminate foreign aid, may be reversible.

But the fact that we're a wealthy country is much harder to undo; and unfortunately, our wealth may create envy and a sense of injustice in the eyes of the have-nots. The U.S. has dedicated a much smaller percentage of its gross national product to IDA than several other countries, including Britain, Japan and West Germany. Many people in the poorest nations are aware of that fact, and apart from any possible envy, they realize that aid from the U.S. doesn't "hurt" us as much as, say, aid from Britain hurts the British. When you have everything, it takes a bigger gift to prove your feelings.

A laboratory study conducted in Japan, Sweden and the U.S. supports the notion that wealth can be a curse. Experimental subjects received help from two donors. One donor was rich, while the other gave from a small pool of resources. In each country, subjects evaluated the poor donor far more positively; the subjects also returned more of the poor donor's resources.

In short, the perceived characteristics of the donor exert a tremendous influence on the aid's success, not only in terms of good will but also, to some extent, in the aid's material impact. This point is often overlooked by opponents of foreign aid, who tend to assume that the source of aid is irrelevant.

TRUE AID AND FALSE AID

The nature of the aid itself is just as vital to the success of the transaction as the perceived characteristics of the donor. One might suppose "the more the better"—at least as far as the recipients are concerned. But aid officials whom we interviewed assigned minimal importance to the amount of the aid. They placed much more emphasis on how useful the particular aid was, on whether or not it allowed the recipients autonomy, and on the sort of obligations it entailed.

It's easy to understand that some "aid" isn't very useful. Surplus foodstuffs occasionally wind up in countries that don't eat the sort of food they receive. Worse, huge quantities of food may be delivered to a country that needs the resources to produce its own food—as Morocco once needed a milk-processing plant to handle its own raw milk, but got tons of powdered milk in-

stead. Everyone has heard of such absurdities. IDA has managed to steer clear of them better than most other donors.

Matters of autonomy are a more constant source of trouble for the aid relationship than even useless aid. Bilateral American aid programs tend to involve rigid restrictions; some of them are meant to insure that the aid is properly used, but other restrictions are less reasonable. Our technicians often oversee the projects, or set up systems of close surveillance. Any deviation from initial plans must be approved by our officials; many requests have to go to Washington for sanction. Moreover, most U.S. bilateral aid is not given in the form of money; if it is, the money must buy American products, which may not be the best or cheapest ones available.

Aid officials from various poor countries spoke vehemently of our inability to relinquish control over our gifts and loans. As one official put it: "If you give a man a piece of bread when he knocks on your door—don't tell him to eat a third of it, give a quarter to his eldest son and put the rest in the icebox." The maintenance of control tells a recipient that we don't trust him, that we think he's intellectually or morally incapable of making correct decisions. We're so anxious to insure that our resources are being properly used, according to our standards of propriety, that we jeopardize the success of the aid—again, both materially and in terms of mutual trust.

THE USES OF EQUALITY

Our most intriguing conclusions about the nature of the aid itself have to do with the kinds of obligation it entails. In essence, we found that, for the recipient, no obligation to repay tends to imply inferiority, whereas the obligation to repay with interest smacks of exploitation.

Many people achieve a sense of dignity from paying their own way. Free handouts not only suggest inferiority, but they also place the recipient under a constant tension of obligation: whenever the donor wishes, he can remind the recipient of his gift and demand his due. Recipients may also suspect the motives of someone who gives with no apparent thought of return. As one Indian spokesman observed, "Gifts without strings come either from fools or thieves."

On the other hand, there are obviously special advantages in receiving free gifts. Accepting disaster relief, for instance, doesn't really imply inferiority. Moreover, the total debt of the poorest nations is already very high, and increasing that debt beyond the possibility of repayment can do little for a poor nation's morale.

To explore this complex issue, Phoebe Ellsworth, Magnus Seipel, Christina Maslach and Kenneth Gergen conducted an experiment in Japan, Sweden and the U.S. A total of 180 males engaged in a competitive game of chance which could earn them a considerable sum of money. Six men participated at a time, and by experimental design, each one found himself losing badly while receiving information that the others were faring much better.

At a critical moment in the game, a moment when each participant was on the verge of losing everything, he received an envelope from what appeared to be one of the other players. The envelope contained additional resources, plus a note especially prepared by the experimenter. In a third of the cases, the note said that the funds were a gift and that the recipient need not repay it. Another third of the players got notes saying the note-writer wanted to be repaid when the game was over. For the final third, the note-writer wanted repayment with interest.

The funds proved to be very useful. Each player then evaluated his patron. First, as might be expected, the players expressed

hostility toward the donor who expected interest on his loan. The user has few friends. The critical comparison, however, was between evaluations of the donor who gave something for nothing, and the donor who asked for an equal return. The evaluations revealed that in all three nations people preferred the egalitarian donor. In this experiment, at any rate, something for nothing wasn't appreciated, and a relationship among equals proved most desirable.

Whether such experimental results can be easily applied to the arena of international aid remains an open question. However, it is worth noting that IDA does require repayment, plus a small administrative fee, but does not require interest.

SELF-ESTEEM

A final element in the aid relationship is the recipient and his characteristics, both real and perceived. At first, we assumed that questions of material need would be all-important—that the more needy the recipient felt, the more appropriate it would be to aid him, making the relationship tend toward success. But our subsequent interviews with aid officials convinced us we were naive on our thinking. It turned out that self-esteem was a far more important variable.

One of the many ambiguities of need is its relativity: what we consider poverty someone else might consider the normal state of affairs, and it's hard to say which view is "realistic." Americans might single out as instances of economic need conditions that the people of another culture view as part of the fabric of their cultural tradition, or part of some modern ideology they're unwilling to forgo. Another problem with aid based upon need is that the needy often feel they deserve help, when the help arrives they may be unaware of any particular generosity on the donor's part. Extreme poverty, then, doesn't guarantee a positive response to help either in mutual respect or in the creative utilization of aid.

Self-esteem, though, is another matter. The aid relationship necessarily casts its participants into a hierarchy: the independent donor has many resources while the dependent recipient has few. It's possible, in other words, that aid threatens the esteem of the recipient.

We expected to find tremendous cross-cultural differences in this regard. It is said, for example, that Western cultures are uniquely dominated by concern with self-esteem and pride, by notions of individualism and personal independence. On the other hand, Oriental and socialist societies are commonly said to be anti-individualistic and more interested in the common good. And we expected to find many other relative, cultural factors that would complicate our examination of self-esteem.

But our data so far suggest strongly that self-esteem is not only a kind of universal human value, but that foreign aid tends to succeed or fail, psychologically and materially, depending on whether the aid relationship strengthens or weakens the recipients' self-esteem. The aid officials we interviewed, over 90 percent of them, indicated that in one way or another the implications of aid for the recipients' self-esteem were of major importance. Some spoke of "loss of face"; others described the "humiliation" of waiting for handouts.

THANKS BUT NO THANKS

With the help of psychologist Stan Morse, we tested this hypothesis in a laboratory in Italy. Young men in our experiment worked on a difficult puzzle. In half the cases, they were told that their performance was a measure of intelligence; in effect, their self-esteem was at stake. For the other half, performance was not equated with self-worth. Later, half the participants in each of these

groups received help from the experimenter, who let them look at the right answers. The next stage of the test reversed the roles, and the participants were given a chance to help the experimenters.

The men's reactions were revealing. When self-esteem wasn't in question, those who received help were much more likely to reciprocate. They were grateful and wanted to help in return. Just the opposite proved true where self-esteem was at stake. When the experimenter's help suggested that the participants weren't especially bright, they were loathe to return the "favor."

Questionnaire data from different cultures demonstrate the generality of these findings. Respondents everywhere said they disliked people, even bearers of gifts, who made them feel inferior. In Japan, Taiwan and Korea, with their traditional emphasis on selfless devotion to hierarchies, the tendency to dislike such donors was less pronounced; but even the people of these traditional Asian cultures disliked aid which reduced self-esteem.

AMERICA'S INTENTIONS

For years, Congress has debated questions of foreign aid. We believe that our research has reduced the uncertainties of this debate. The evidence implies that the U.S. has either not known, or has disregarded, the psychological implications of assistance.

Bilateral aid, in which the U.S. gives directly to other nations, is a method surrounded with difficulties. It appears manipulative (which it is) and tends to be corrupted by our own domestic foibles and by our extraordinary wealth. The self-serving restrictions we put on direct American aid serve as another goad to conflict, and the esteem of recipient nations continues to suffer.

It is for these reasons that we consider the cutoff of IDA funds a tragedy. This organization, and other cooperative, multilateral organizations like it, constitute the greatest opportunity for successful foreign aid. As a participant in IDA, America's manipulative intent is minimized, our national foibles are less likely to interfere, and the humiliating and impractical grip on recipient nations loosens. Moreover, because IDA's recipients are all members of the organization, it does not cripple the self-esteem which everyone seems to need.

We have assumed throughout our research that the American people would like to reduce suffering in the poorest nations of the world, and in fact some survey data supports this assumption. The problem, according to IDA's Congressional critics, is that in spite of our generous instincts foreign aid has been a disaster.

We must add, however, that our prime assumption may be wrong. The truth may be that the American people have absolutely no intention of relieving some of the misery that burdens the greater part of the human race. America's support for international assistance has dwindled almost continuously over the past decade and is now only one 10th of what it was 25 years ago. Many Americans don't realize this. We tend to believe that America is inevitably the greatest giver, and that other rich nations—for example, the Arab oil states—give little or nothing. This belief is partly mistaken. The World Bank, IDA's parent organization, has recently borrowed \$624 million from the Arab states of Libya, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait—money that is spent entirely on aid, including the work of IDA. During the past two years, in fact, the World Bank has sold more fund-raising bonds in Kuwait than in the United States.

If the American people have no serious interest in helping the poorest nations, then our research becomes irrelevant, and we can stop worrying about the attitudes of others toward the U.S. What will remain instead are questions for us all about the humane character of the American people.

FISCAL FOOLISHNESS IN GOVERNMENT

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, an article in the June issue of Reader's Digest illustrates why many Americans today look upon those in Government with open distrust. The same Government which calls upon its citizens to sacrifice in the name of fiscal responsibility continues to romp on a madcap spending spree which can only be called ridiculous.

The article's author, Mr. William Schulz, cites several examples of foolish Federal spending and reveals the Government's solemn promise to curtail such squandering for what it really is—hot air. I will list some of the senseless expenditures noted by Mr. Schulz, which defy explanation, let alone justification.

A Department of Labor study costing \$180,350 on "bureaucratic predisposition," which concluded that a closer tie between an individual's predisposition and the nature of his job should increase satisfaction and reduce alienation where it exists. A remarkable deduction.

The sum of \$71,000 to compile a history of the comic book. Holy Moly.

The amount of \$50,000 for an analysis of our Nation's fur trade with Canada from 1770 to 1820. That should prove immensely helpful in solving our trade problems today.

The sum of \$5,000 for the study of "the evolution of the chin in Polish skeletal populations between 2000 B.C. and 1800 A.D." The money would have been better spent if we used it to study those who approved the expenditure.

The amount of \$30 million for the Postal Service's new headquarters, including \$3,671 for hand-carved walnut office doors and \$19,346 for furnishings in the Postmaster General's office—\$11,667 for carpeting and \$6,000 for remote-controlled draperies. There is nothing like working in comfort. It helps the bureaucratic predisposition.

The sum of \$15 billion to reimburse the beekeepers whose little pets are killed by pesticides. We should reimburse the taxpayer, he is the one who got stung.

A payment of \$66,500 by the OEO to persuade members of the American Indian Movement to leave Washington after they caused \$124,070 in damages to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Some people go to jail just for holding up a bank.

Mr. Speaker, Congress cannot escape the blame for this kind of foolish and irresponsible waste of taxpayer's funds. Congress controls the Federal purse strings. It should call upon the responsible agencies and departments to justify these wild expenditures. If they cannot, they should then be made to justify their continued existence.

I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Schulz's "Watch on the Potomac" and be prepared to answer to an outraged taxpaying public.

REAR ADM. JAMES W. WILLIAMS TO
RETIRE FROM COAST GUARD
AFTER NEARLY FOUR DECADES
OF SERVICE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1974, Rear Adm. James W. Williams, commander of the 11th Coast Guard District, will retire after nearly four decades of faithful public service to his country.

Naturally, we share with him the joy and satisfaction of having completed another successful assignment, but rather ambivalently for we shall miss "Tex," as we have learned to affectionately call him.

As commander of the 11th Coast Guard District, Rear Admiral Williams has been responsible for all Coast Guard activities throughout southern California, coastal areas, and harbors, Arizona, southern Nevada, and southern Utah, including all of the Colorado River complex.

We in southern California were impressed with his credentials when he first came to Long Beach, Calif., in July 1970, as the new commander; and we have learned to respect him for the professionalism and enthusiasm with which he has performed his duties.

A native of Farmersville, Tex., he attended the University of Austin for a couple of years prior to his appointment to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in 1934. Choosing to devote his time and talents to the Coast Guard, he quickly rose through the ranks becoming a rear admiral on May 1, 1967.

Even a partial listing of the varied and interesting assignments which he has accomplished throughout the years would be insufficient to reflect his versatility. However, some indication of his competence might be gained by stating that he has won numerous awards for achievements through activities on land, sea, and in the air, including the Secretary of Transportation's Legion of Merit Award for management excellence while serving as Deputy Secretary for Administration during the formative stages of the Department of Transportation; and that he received the Secretary of Treasury's Achievement Medal for initiating and developing a broad spectrum adult examination and education program known as Project Improve.

During his brief stay in southern California, Adm. "Tex" Williams has quickly involved himself in numerous community activities. He has served as chairman of the Los Angeles Federal Executive Board; served for 2 years as chairman of the Greater Los Angeles Field Coordination Group for the Department of Transportation; and has been made an honorary president of the National Defense Transportation Association. In addition, he has served well in numerous civic and professional organizations throughout southern California.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will certainly

miss a man of Rear Adm. James W. Williams' caliber, not only for his professional competence, but also for his ability and willingness to serve his fellow man, his community, and his Nation.

I join with his numerous friends in southern California in wishing Adm. "Tex" Williams and his lovely wife, Sandy, the joy of retirement they have so earnestly deserved.

THE BACKROOM ARM TWISTERS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the June 8 issue of the Nation contains an article on Federal advisory committees written by Prof. William Rodgers of the Georgetown University Law Center. It is informative and lively, and closes with this observation:

Secrecy in government is constantly repudiated. Its popular disguises—executive privilege, national security, the need for confidentiality—are by now laughing-stock excuses. But secrecy survives and thrives, despite well-meaning ventures like the Freedom of Information Act, the Advisory Committee Act, and strong Congressional oversight. The cure will not be quickly found. Sunshine may be the best of disinfectants, as Louis Brandeis said, but advisory committees root and flourish in the shade.

His article, "The Backroom Arm Twisters," follows:

ADVISORY COMMITTEES: THE BACKROOM ARM TWISTERS (By William Rodgers)

Government secrecy still rides high, despite Watergate and lesser embarrassments. Readers skeptical of that assertion need look no further than the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972.

The Act grew out of a few chance encounters that Sen. Lee Metcalf (D., Mont.) had with advisory committees a few years ago. These committees are established, usually by statute or Executive Order, to lend the support of their knowledge and experience to the work of various legislative and executive bodies. What the Senator couldn't understand, for example, was why a big business advisory group to the old Budget Bureau, innocuously named the Advisory Council on Federal Reports, was strong enough to postpone for six years an Interior Department inventory of industrial water wastes.

During 1970 and 1971 Metcalf's Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations held hearings to document the shambles that passed for policy among federal agencies overseeing hundreds of advisory committees. First were the procedural niceties—nobody knew how many committees there were, or what they did. They met in secret, excluded unfriendly faces, charged exorbitant fees for their minutes if they kept them at all. The Bureau of Mines' Underground Mines Advisory Committee, meeting to help write safety standards, won the brevity record by boiling down the minutes of an all-day session to a cryptic seven lines on a single sheet of paper. For an investment of a mere \$128.50 an interested citizen could gain access to the sketchy minutes of the Department of Commerce's National Industrial Pollution Control Council, a big business advisory

group with a big voice on pollution regulations.

More important than finding out who sat on advisory committees, where they met, and what they talked about was the disclosure that their power as policy makers often exceeded that of an assistant secretary. The Department of Interior's Joint Task Force on Eutrophication (whose minutes are to be found only in the offices of the Soap and Detergent Association) put the brakes on government moves to restrict phosphates in detergents. The National Air Pollution Control Administration's copper smelter liaison committee was in business principally to guide government anti-pollution research in "safe" directions. The Technical Advisory Committee to the Office of Pipeline Safety made its contribution by ambushing a government questionnaire designed to probe such pertinent subjects as the depth and age of the pipe in the ground.

The problem is that, beyond giving advice, these committees can and do make policy. Working from within, they shape regulations, hobble research, veto new drugs, approve nuclear reactor sites. They are a crutch for bureaucrats who don't want to decide, and a shield for bureaucrats who have been forced to do so.

The possible abuses of the advisory committee system were adroitly orchestrated by Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans when in 1970 he set up the National Industrial Pollution Control Council (NIPCC), which he later praised for "playing an increasingly important role in both government policy making and in industry leadership." In fact, Stans used NIPCC simultaneously to lobby against tough pollution standards distasteful to big business and to raise money for the President's re-election campaign.

After interviewing a campaign official who had worked closely with Stans, Frank Wright of the *Minneapolis Tribune* a few months ago quoted his informant on how Stans had berated a businessman who had the temerity to refuse an appointment to NIPCC:

"Just as the liberals have lobbying groups in government, we have to have lobbying groups in government, too, to keep the President on the right track on (William) Ruckelshaus [then the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency]. And you didn't join us when there were guys there giving up days in their business, going down to Washington to work on this thing." Stans confronted his target with another invitation to join the council, adding, "And your assessment is \$10,000." That was the word and the figure he used. I can still see the business guy's face. He paid.

It is bad enough for politicians to shake down big businessmen who deal with the government (as all of them must do). It is worse to extract the *quid* while at the same time offering the *quo* in the currency of government power shared through advisory committees.

NIPCC was the epitome of this practice. Altogether, considerably more than \$1 million in contributions flowed into the re-election coffers from individuals whose companies were represented on the council. At least fifty-one of the 200 members made substantial contributions to the re-election campaign, the Republican National Committee, or both. The 3M Company loaned NIPCC its chairman, Bert Cross, and gave the reelection committee an illegal \$30,000 contribution.

The Fluor Corporation won a slot on NIPCC, contributed more than \$10,000 to the re-election campaign by way of the "Fluor Employees' Political Fund," and coincidentally was the winner (through a subsidiary) of a \$2.3-million Department of Interior contract to study the effects of coal mining in the West. PepsiCo's chairman, Donald Kendall, chaired NIPCC's Beverage Sub-Council, contributed \$28,000 to the re-election com-

mittee, and was gratified when the Nixon Administration refused to take a tough stand against nonreturnable containers. Kenne-cott's chairman, Frank Milliken, chaired NIPCC's Mining Sub-Council, contributed to the campaign, and had his judgment vindicated when the Administration wavered on tough pollution rules for copper smelters. The Northrop Corporation's Thomas V. Jones, sat on NIPCC's Airlines and Aircraft Sub-Council, gave \$40,000 to the campaign, expecting it would not be publicly reported, and was pleased by the Administration's non-concern about the jet noise problem.

Last December, a CBS special, *The Corporation*, featured William Keeler, chairman of the board of Phillips Petroleum. Mr. Keeler was quoted on the benefits of serving on advisory committees: "Having gotten acquainted with so many people and knowing them on a personal basis it made it real easy for me to go into government and discuss problems with them." The program had a surprise ending: Keeler and his corporation pleaded guilty to making an illegal \$100,000 contribution to the President's re-election campaign. Mr. Keeler was advised by counsel not to talk any more.

Other oil and gas men gave more than \$5 million to re-elect Mr. Nixon. No less than eighty-seven of the contributors hold advisory positions on the National Petroleum Council, the American Petroleum Institute, or both.

The Advisory Committee Act of 1972 was supposed to come to grips with special access and undue influence typified by groups such as NIPCC and the National Petroleum Council. The Act requires that each agency account for its advisory committees and, more important, calls for "timely" notice of the meetings, which shall be open to the public and on which "detailed" minutes shall be kept. But there is a sizable loophole: a meeting may be closed if the agency head determines that it will consider matters exempted from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. Predictably, inventive bureaucrats spawned a host of evasive techniques.

One way for advisers and special-interest seekers to avoid going public is to assert that they are not an "advisory committee" with regular membership, periodic meetings and a fixed agenda, but merely a group of congenial spirits. One example: the FTC's rule making on phosphates in detergents was compromised after a series of secret meetings between members of the agency and representatives of detergent manufacturers and their trade association. Another example: the Civil Aeronautics Board recently invited consumers, members of the press and the airline industry to discuss problems of overbooking. The meeting was abruptly terminated by an agency official, who ordered consumers and reporters to depart so that discussions could continue with industry representatives alone. The courts will decide whether this was a meeting of an "advisory committee" or just an informal gathering of friends.

Groups calling themselves "private" reliably escape from the Act. Trade associations are in this category. Another example is the Business Council, an inspiration of sorts for NIPCC, which for forty years has been a pipeline for major industries into high government echelons. Back in the early 1960s the council severed its formal relationship to the Department of Commerce to avoid the limited disclosure obligations imposed on industry advisory committees by an Executive Order of President Kennedy.

Another powerhouse that prefers to work secretly is the National Academy of Sciences, described by D. S. Greenberg as the scientific community's "Established Church, the House of Lords, the Supreme Court, and headquarters of the politics of science." The

committees of this august body, which advise the federal government on everything from drug abuse to grizzly bear management, still meet in secret like the tradesmen they are not. The Academy's Committee on Motor Vehicle Emissions, which will pass judgment on the capabilities of automobile pollution-control technology, has repeatedly refused to open its meetings to outsiders or disclose the working papers upon which its studies are based. A lawsuit is pending to test this preference for secrecy.

Another dodge is for an advisory committee to conduct its important business through informal sub-groups that are arguably outside of the Act. Typical is the National Petroleum Council, which political science Prof. Robert Engler commends as a "case study" on how concentrated economic power is "capable of shaping or forestalling presumably public policies." The council's full meetings are largely ceremonial, while the serious work that shapes government policy is conducted in smaller subcommittees and task forces. It took the personal attention of Senator Metcalf to dislodge some of the minutes of these supposedly lesser entities.

Congress' decision to extend the Freedom of Information Act exemptions in the Advisory Committee Act has already proved a mistake. Within the Department of Interior the trade secret doctrine is invoked to bar the public from discussion of coal gasification research projects, while coal company competitors and their trade association, sitting as advisory committee members, absorb the information behind closed doors. Grants review committees at the National Institutes of Health are closed to protect the ideas of the applicant: he isn't asked whether he would prefer an open meeting to protect him from bias, cronyism and arbitrariness.

A gaping exemption allows nondisclosure of "inter-agency or intra-agency" communications. This evasion is inviting because all that's needed to close the doors is an unsubstantiated claim that the discussion will focus on internal agency matters. This is the preferred rationale, for example, for shutting the doors on the deliberations of the AEC's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS). In a recent hearing on the wisdom of siting Virginia Electric Power Company's North Anna Power Station on a series of geological faults, the ACRS took the position that its consultants' reports on the matter were confidential. Legal maneuvers eventually forced disclosure of the information, but the committee is free to erect similar impediments in the future.

The Cost of Living Council routinely closed each and every meeting of its advisory committees until ordered by a court to open them up except upon the "rarest occasions." Within a month the council closed a meeting of its labor-management advisory committee, ostensibly to talk about a staff paper containing views on such matters as the economic and fiscal outlook for calendar year 1974. Ron Plessner, attorney for Ralph Nader's Center for the Study of Responsive Law, took the council to court again to force disclosure.

A blizzard of procedural impediments has attended early administration of the 1972 Act. The "detailed" minutes of the meetings are lessons in brevity. The "timely" notice is sometimes issued after the meeting is held. Inaccessible sites are much in demand: government advisers have been known to meet in the executive suites of an oil company, at a local restaurant or on the chairman's yacht. Committee members still specialize in bias: a recent appointee to the National Advisory Board on Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros is a cattleman with experience in corraling wild mustangs.

Explanations for closing meetings are couched in the blather of officialdom. Why can't the public attend meetings of the Civil

Service Commission's Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee? Because the "meetings will be closed to the public under a determination to do so," reads the full explanation appearing in the *Federal Register*. The public should ponder Secretary of Interior Morton's reasons for closing all meetings of the big oil-dominated Foreign Petroleum Supply Committee and related subcommittees: "These discussions will be related to matters that are specifically required by Executive Order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy." Those who indulge in speculation that conspiracy against the public would be on the agenda along with national defense and foreign policy are denied the evidence to test their thesis.

Yet, Morton's notice is better than some, like that of the U.S. Advisory Committee on Information which has gone to the trouble of getting a Presidential determination to avoid giving any notice of its secret meetings. Mere disclosure of the fact that a meeting is held presumably would compromise state secrets.

Secrecy in government is constantly repudiated. Its popular disguises—executive privilege, national security, the need for confidentiality—are by now laughing-stock excuses. But secrecy survives and thrives, despite well-meaning ventures like the Freedom of Information Act, the Advisory Committee Act, and strong Congressional oversight. The cure will not be quickly found. Sunshine may be the best of disinfectants, as Louis Brandeis said, but advisory committees root and flourish in the shade.

PATCHWORK ISN'T ENOUGH TO SAVE THE MONEY BAG

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an article by Senator CHARLES H. PERCY that appeared in the Spring, 1974 issue of *Res Publica*, a public affairs magazine published by Claremont Men's College in Claremont, Calif.

With his extensive background in the business world, Senator PERCY offers a valuable insight into our Nation's economic dilemma. He discusses why controls on the economy have failed and offers suggestions on restoring economic stability.

I have found Senator PERCY's remarks to be most enlightening and I trust that many of my colleagues will share this opinion.

PATCHWORK ISN'T ENOUGH TO SAVE THE MONEY BAG: MAKESHIFT GOVERNMENT DECISIONS ARE KILLING OUR ECONOMY

(By CHARLES H. PERCY)

There are probably few who would not agree that our economy is in trouble. We don't need opinion polls to tell us that in the United States today there is a widespread and deep-seated malaise about our economic future.

Ironically, this malaise is not the result of economic recession; we are just now emerging from a period of full-blown economic boom. Instead, the pervasive dissatisfaction everywhere about the economy stems, not just from increased market-basket costs, but from a profound loss of confidence and trust—loss of confidence in policy planners,

a new skepticism about the viability of our economic institutions, and a lack of trust in the function of our marketplace economy.

We have seemed unable to find the proper mix of fiscal and monetary policies that will check inflation and yet foster high productivity growth and permit a rising standard of living for all our people. We must step back and freshly evaluate the entire range of economic policy before we go any further.

One thing seems eminently clear: We must make economic decisions on the basis of long-term objectives, not on the basis of day-to-day political pressures. We, as a nation, must make some hard choices. Are we going to tie our domestic economy to a makeshift system of governmental controls, or are we going to take positive steps to move our economy back toward the principles of the free marketplace? Are we going to close the doors of the United States and hide our economy behind a shield of protectionism, as the Burke-Hartke bill proposes, or are we going to accept the challenge of foreign competition and integrate our economy more fully with the greater world economy?

We must decide how to shape the institutions and structure of our economy. Are we going to toss the basic principles of a free economy aside and impose an ever-increasing patchwork of regulations and controls in our search for stability and continued prosperity, or are we going to build on what we have, work with it and constantly strive to make it better? What is our situation today and what basic decisions must we make? Are we going to continue to saddle our economy with controls, or are we going to try to free it?

During the past two years, the American economy has been dragged through five separate phases of the Economic Stabilization Program. It is hard to imagine that we could be any worse off than we are today had no controls at all been imposed in mid-1971. The Stabilization Program has failed mainly because economic policy has lacked consistency of purpose and direction. Day-to-day political pressures have formed the basis for too many alterations in the stabilization policy. Controls have not stabilized prices or wages and they have not stopped inflation. Instead they have encouraged production cutbacks, shortages and black markets, and have contributed to the confusion in the marketplace for producers as well as consumers. Too often controls have been shaped by day-to-day political pressures and thus they have produced two unanticipated and undesired results. First, by short-circuiting the price mechanism, they have created deep distortions in the allocation of goods and services. Second, and perhaps more important, they have created a crisis of public confidence in economic policy planners.

Perhaps the failure of controls will ultimately prove instructive. It may have served dramatically to remind Americans of some of the virtues of a free market system.

Take, for example, some members of the United States Senate. Less than a year ago, a group of 33 Democratic senators voted in caucus to support "a 90-day freeze on everything." When the Administration's controls on food prices were announced last June, many assailed the measure as "too little, too late!" It took less than two months for the senator's eyes to be opened. The freeze on beef prices created shortages, plant shut-downs, and black markets. Suddenly everyone saw the virtues of the free marketplace economy—including those 33 senators—and on August 2 the Senate voted 85 to five to end the freeze on beef prices altogether.

It is much clearer than ever before that we must scrap controls. There is no other acceptable policy. We simply do not know how to manage a controlled economy in peacetime; and furthermore, the American public does not want a controlled economy.

The American consumer has learned the lesson of the failure of the Stabilization Program. It has been the greatest adult education course in economics the nation has ever had, but the education of the American public must continue. The cold truth of the matter is that long before the Administration began its Stabilization Program, the economy was encumbered with controls of all kinds. Some of them, of course, are necessary, some are superfluous, but many others actually are harmful.

Over the years, the federal government and the states have enacted a variety of special-interest legislation—much of it at the request of elements of the business community itself—that has produced serious inefficiencies in important sectors of the economy. Examples of this range from Interstate Commerce Commission regulations that have actually contributed toward the bankruptcy of many American railroads, to state fair-trade laws that have produced inflationary rigidities in the retail sector by interfering with manufacturers' ability to offer volume discounts.

But perhaps the most notorious example is in the agricultural sector. In 1972, with food prices skyrocketing due to severe supply shortages, the United States government was subsidizing farmers to hold out of production 60 million acres of tillable farmland—that is, almost 20 percent of all the tillable farmland in the entire country. To compound this error, the Department of Agriculture—ignoring available economic intelligence data—negotiated a grain deal with the Soviet Union that made the tough Yankee trader look like a starry-eyed schoolboy. Last year with prices continuing to rise, the Administration finally initiated a production expansion policy and the senseless subsidies have been discontinued. Unfortunately, the fruits of this change will not be seen until this year.

Our abiding goal must be to get away not only from the cumbersome controls of the Stabilization Program, but also from the built-in controls that fall in the long run to serve the best interests of the economy. The challenge facing American policy makers is not merely how to get away from controls, but how to break out of the trend toward increasing government regulation of all kinds. If we continue to travel our present road, we will soon find ourselves at a dead end with an economy increasingly and irretrievably controlled by the government. Now is the time to change course before it is too late.

America stands at a crossroads in international economic policy as well. We are going to have to decide just what our economic relationship is going to be with the rest of the world. Do we throw ourselves enthusiastically into the competition of world markets? Or do we move to "protect" the U.S. economy from the fluctuations of international trade and money markets and adopt protectionist proposals, such as the Burke-Hartke bill, which seek to disengage our economy from those of other nations?

If there is anything we should have learned from our current food and fuel difficulties, it is that the economy of the world, like the economy of the United States, is not static and cannot be forced to fit any one pattern indefinitely. Protectionist measures that set fixed quotas for imports and sharply restrict freedom of U.S. investment abroad run directly counter to the marketplace economy system and should be categorically rejected. Protectionism reduces U.S. industrial competitiveness and eliminates incentives for cost-cutting and more efficient management and manufacturing practices. Protectionist legislation would lead to massive foreign retaliation striking hardest at U.S. export industries, industries that traditionally tend to involve higher pay and more advanced technology. And it would undermine the po-

sition of U.S. corporations' overseas subsidiaries and foreign investments, which last year added \$10 billion to the plus side of the U.S. balance-of-payments ledger.

We must begin to move away from controls on international movements of capital and commodities. Fortunately, the Administration is already advocating that the interest equalization tax and the mandatory controls on direct investment should be scrapped. While reaping the benefits of our own private foreign investment, we should not try to block foreign corporations that wish to invest in American industries and properties. This is a new experience for us, but it is a healthy experience. International investment promotes international interdependence. And an integrated world economy will prove to be an investment in world peace.

In discussing all the fundamental economic decisions that confront us today, we must bear in mind the astonishing extent to which the physical well-being of the nation's economy depends upon the psychological state of the nation.

Today, we in the United States seem seriously disturbed. We're disturbed by Watergate and the dark cloud hanging over the presidency, by the resignation of the vice-president, the handing-down of indictments against former Cabinet officers and high White House aides, by our inability to deal with our pressing social needs, and we are disturbed by our inability to stabilize our economy and halt rampant inflation. Opinion polls show that public faith in all our institutions has dipped to the lowest levels in years. The American people don't trust the Congress, the President, business, labor unions, policemen, the press; they don't seem to trust anyone.

We as a nation have to make a choice. Do we abandon our political, economic and social institutions, or do we accept our present situation as a challenge to work with the institutions that have been developed so painstakingly and make them better? There is no doubt that we—as men and women of intelligence, ideals, determination and resources—can renew and strengthen our institutions. To do so, we must regenerate the spirit of trust—trust between business and labor, between business and the consumer, between the people and their government.

Anyone who has ever been in business knows how crucial the attitude of its employees is to any business enterprise, large or small. If industry and labor are willing to work together—through job redesign, profit-sharing and worker stock-ownership programs, and incentive pay plans—the labor force will be better served and productivity can be raised as well. Just a slight annual increase in productivity growth rate would yield great increases in America's gross national product, relieving pressure on the economy and lessening the need for government-imposed wage and price controls. Cooperation and trust between business and labor can make U.S. productivity growth competitive once again. If only we could recreate today the thousands of productivity councils involving millions of labor and management personnel that worked so well together during World War II!

Business must also win back the trust of the consumer. Business must do more than advertise; it must act. It must take the initiative and use its resources to help clean up air and water pollution, to sponsor job-training and rehabilitation programs, to support day-care centers and other worthy projects within the community.

Government, as much as business, must recognize that to be respected one must be respectable. If the people of the United States no longer trust the institutions of their government, what value do the institutions have? The Vietnam War and Watergate have infected our country with doubt and

disbelief, two dangerous and highly contagious diseases. We have seen the damage they have done.

But in Washington and around the country, changes—changes for the better—are happening every day:

A Senate government operations subcommittee recently reported out a congressional budget reform bill that will go a long way toward ending the annual budget and appropriations logjam that hamstring government fiscal policy.

The archaic seniority system is giving way gradually in the Senate, and we have just passed overwhelmingly the most sweeping election campaign reform bill in congressional history.

Business is increasingly active in urban problems, civic and community projects and public affairs.

Many companies are studying ways of making work on the production line more meaningful and satisfying for the worker, and others are putting profit-sharing programs and incentive pay plans into effect.

American labor is successfully getting away from counter-productive strikes. Since 1971, the number of man-days lost because of strikes has dropped nearly 40 percent, to the benefit of labor and the nation.

If, as we approach the 200th anniversary of our independence, we can encourage this spirit of interdependence and trust, we will have gone a long way toward overcoming the problems that beset our economy and our society today. But the economy will not stabilize itself on its own. The American economy is indeed at a crossroads. We must decide whether we will bow to the pressures of devaluation and inflation and mutely accept a lower standard of living or work to bolster our national productivity growth rates. The second of these is the harder choice, but by far the better choice, and the choice now being made by both labor and management throughout the nation.

We can increase our national productivity growth rate through increased capital investment, through continued research and development and experimentation. Individually and corporately, we must eliminate the wastefulness that has unhappily become a trademark of American society. We must conserve our God-given resources wisely.

The lessons of the past two years make it clear that the problems of acute instability and lack of confidence will be worsened by too frequently resorting to regulatory and control mechanisms. To stabilize the economy, the government must follow a stated, rational policy that will carry us away from controls just as quickly as conditions allow.

As foreign economies expand and foreign consumers grow more affluent, this demand will grow even greater, to our benefit. We must do everything we can to encourage expanded farm production to meet the opportunities presented by foreign demand and to bring down high domestic prices. The name of the game for stabilizing prices in any field is either stimulating more supply or dampen down excessive demand.

We must retain the improved amortization and depreciation rates and the investment tax credit as permanent parts of our tax structure. We must encourage increased industrial efficiency and modernization, and we should consider increasing the investment tax credit rate to improve the United States' competitive position in world markets.

People in business can make the most basic contributions to our prosperity: They can improve the quality and value of their products to make them more attractive in domestic and world markets. They can increase their research and development efforts in order to retain, if not regain, technical superiority for U.S. producers. They must not be afraid of competition. They can create new world markets for their goods and ex-

pand their exports by taking advantage of the devalued dollar. It is a national scandal that only four percent of U.S. companies export at all. Aggressive search for markets and export expansion is a must. American farmers in recent years have increased their prosperity by expanding their exports. American industry can learn from the farmers' example.

Finally, we must all work together to restore stable economic conditions and to foster the confidence that will make non-inflationary behavior and smooth expansion of production possible once again. This means that businessmen must have confidence in the future of free markets. It means that workers and consumers must believe that price increases will not erode wage increases. It means that farmers must not fear the risk of ruinous market instability. It means that we must assure all Americans that the federal government will systematize and rationalize its outmoded budgetary procedures and live within its means. And above all, it means that we must assure all participants in our economy that the government won't tinker with economic controls with every shift of the political wind.

Out of such assurances, a solidly based confidence will spring, and with it, a new prosperity based on stable economic growth.

THE HOUSE IS LOSING ITS "CONSCIENCE"

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the magazine Nation's Business in its June edition carries a delightful story on our colleague, H. R. Gross. I believe author Vernon Louviere has done an excellent job of capturing the character and concerns of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

This article points out the great service H. R. Gross has done for his country and demonstrates how sorely we will miss him following his retirement at the end of this session.

At this time I insert the article in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE HOUSE IS LOSING ITS "CONSCIENCE"
(By Vernon Louviere)

Some years ago, when a bill creating the National Foundation of Arts and Humanities came up for debate on the floor of the House of Representatives, a somber H. R. Gross listened impassively to the preliminary discussion.

The bill, among other things, called for federal subsidies to promote such art forms as painting, creative writing and dancing.

Finally, Mr. Gross rose and spoke: "Mr. Chairman, I regret that I did not anticipate this bill would come up this afternoon or else I would have tried to appear in my tuxedo and my dancing shoes to be properly equipped for this further going-away party for the Treasury of the United States."

Then, Rep. Gross offered an amendment which he had drafted with the help of a fellow Congressman, a physician.

After the word "dance" in the bill he wanted these words inserted: "Including, but not limited to, the irregular jactitations and/or rhythmic contraction and coordinated relaxations of the serrati, obliques and abdominis recti group of muscles, accompanied

by rotary undulations, tilts and turns, timed with and attuned to the titillating and blended tones of synchronous woodwinds."

He let the words sink in, waited for maximum effect, and spoke again: "That means belly dancing." The House broke up.

With such wit, the diminutive Iowa Republican has for 25 years sought to scuttle legislation whose purpose he feels is to spend for the sake of spending or for some other unnecessary reason. On this day he lost. Still, his record of saving taxpayer money has been phenomenal.

As a self-appointed guardian of the public purse, it is conservatively estimated he has saved the taxpayer hundreds of millions of dollars. The total may even run into billions.

Now, Harold Royce Gross, the "Conscience of the House," is retiring at age 75.

Nothing is sacred to Mr. Gross if it calls for spending federal money. He has even questioned the taxpayers' picking up the tab for maintaining the eternal flame over the grave of President John F. Kennedy.

"FT. FUMBLE" CATCHES IT

In his folksy, blunt newsletter to constituents, "Uncle Sam" often becomes "Uncle Sucker" or "Uncle Handout." He dismisses the Pentagon as "Ft. Fumble."

He has consistently fought pay raises for members of Congress—including, of course, himself. Mr. Gross has voted against every proposed boost in Congressional salaries since they were at the \$12,500 level. (The lawmakers now are paid \$42,000 a year, plus extras.) He is not above embarrassing his colleagues, twitting their consciences, on the subject. Last February, attacking an abortive move to jump the Congressional salary level to \$52,800, he told the House:

"At a time when many segments of our nation and its people are faced with unemployment and belt-tightening, it is inconceivable that fattening the payroll of upper echelon federal executives, federal judges and members of Congress would even be proposed."

Mr. Gross has never accepted the advice of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn of Texas, usually offered to rookie Congressmen: "To get along, you go along."

He has always functioned in the House as though every federal dollar spent is his own, or at least his neighbor's. He'll take on a President with no less relish than a middle-level bureaucrat. More often than not, he votes against Presidential money requests and he doesn't care which party the President belongs to.

A Western Republican Congressman discovered how this kind of Gross bipartisanism works. One day he praised "good old H.R." for ripping into a Democratic bill. The next day he was overheard complaining about that "old s.o.b., H. R. Gross" after the latter had torpedoed one of the Westerner's bills.

"How much will this boondoggle cost?" is the way Mr. Gross generally kicks off his questioning on the House floor when he suspects a bill's sponsor is trying to put something over on the taxpayer.

READING THE FINE PRINT

Nothing seems to elude his hawk-eyed attention to fine print in the myriad of bills and resolutions which come up for House action. Few members of Congress will read every bill, as he does.

Take the time, for example, when Mr. Gross focused on a Foreign Service retirement benefits bill that emerged from the Foreign Affairs Committee. He seized on a phrase, "other purposes," and bore in. The "other purposes," it turned out, cleverly concealed the fact that the bill also would jump Congressional retirement benefits a whopping 33 1/3 percent. When H.R. Gross was finished with his attack, so was the bill. It was killed.

Anyone less skilled in the workings of the House, or who failed to do his legislative

homework, would not long survive in the role of Treasury watchdog in which Mr. Gross has cast himself. Even his detractors concede that few, if any, Congressmen know House procedure as well as he. If Mr. Gross has not memorized those documents which determine how all House business is conducted—the Constitution, the House rules, Thomas Jefferson's Manual and the 11 volumes of Precedents of the House of Representatives—he can put his finger on an applicable section in moments.

He has introduced relatively little legislation, has never been a committee chairman and serves in no other leadership role.

However, his influence is strongly felt, especially when it can be anticipated that the Gross scapel will be drawn.

"I attend many committee hearings in which the chairman will study a bill to make sure we can answer the knotty questions Gross will ask," one Congressman relates. "Many times, items will be dropped before the bill hits the floor because of him."

Except for party leaders, none of the 435 members of the House have assigned seats. But over the years no other member has tried to occupy the "Gross seat" located strategically in the third row, under the nose of the Speaker of the House, on the middle aisle which separates Republicans from the Democrats. Rarely absent, the Iowa Congressman arrives on the floor before the daily session starts, sits through the chaplain's prayer and the reading of the journal of the previous day's proceedings. Then the House starts to come alive. H.R. Gross sits and waits. Some days his questions come fast and furious. Some days he says nothing. But he's always ready to spring into action.

EYES ON CONSENTS

To appreciate Mr. Gross' dedication to his job one would have to be in the House gallery on the two days each month when the House takes up the Consent Calendar. On these occasions flocks of bills, sometimes numbering in the hundreds, are called up and passed, without debate, by "unanimous consent."

All the bills are presumed to be noncontroversial—none involves expenditures of more than \$1 million—and attendance on the House floor is sparse. But H.R. Gross is there.

A single objection stalls action on a bill, scheduling it for a second Consent Calendar appearance. Then, objections by three Congressmen can force it into the regular order of House business where it will get more attention, and from a more representative group of lawmakers.

Over the years, Mr. Gross has torpedoed countless bills on the Consent Calendar. If his first objection doesn't lead a measure's sponsor to abandon it, Mr. Gross is sure to find two allies for the second round. And the sponsor had better be prepared to defend the bill when it comes up in the regular order of business.

The peppery Iowan will fight to save a few thousand dollars with no less vigor than he will challenge a multibillion-dollar appropriation to run a super federal agency.

Some years ago, a fellow Congressman introduced a bill to create a special flag for House members—it could be used on their autos. Not much money was involved and no one opposed the idea. Except H.R. Gross, that is. Delving into the matter, he discovered that the bill's sponsor really wanted the flag so it could be flown on a yacht he owned. Revealing this didn't do the bill much good on the House floor, but a single question from Mr. Gross about the flag's use on cars was probably what killed the measure:

"Where would you fly the House flag, above or below the coon tail on the radiator cap?" Mr. Gross has been an implacable foe of foreign aid. Once, he told the House:

"I swear I think that what we ought to do is pass a bill to remove the torch from

the hand of the Statue of Liberty and insert a tin cup."

One day in September, 1967, he offered a series of amendments to that year's foreign aid bill. A total of \$588.8 million was slashed as a direct consequence.

TV'S IN THE JUNGLE

Mr. Gross wrote a March, 1968, Nation's Business article entitled, "We Certainly See Some Silly Spending." Here's an excerpt showing his use of wit to attack a federal program:

"Over at the Agency for International Development, which is skilled in getting rid of taxpayers' money on so-called foreign aid, somebody discovered that \$400,000 had been overlooked in the agency's customary spending spree."

"What to do?"

"Why, run out and buy 1,000 TV sets so that the natives in some jungle could be educated, a bureaucrat suggested. So AID bought 1,000 TVs."

"When the House Government Operations Committee looked into it, foreign aid officials had to admit they hadn't even bothered to find out which natives were suffering from a lack of television, how they were going to get the sets to operate in the jungle (the ones they bought wouldn't work on batteries) or what they were going to show the natives if they managed to get the sets operating."

"More recently, these same AID dispensers rushed around in a crash program to set up a TV propaganda network for South Viet Nam. As a sop, they told American taxpayers that our GI's would also benefit because the network would have two channels—one for domestic propaganda, the other for 'Gunsmoke' and 'I Love Lucy.'"

"You can imagine what happened. The Vietnamese took one look at the stuff on their channel and promptly switched over to 'Gunsmoke.'"

"Why not? Marshal Matt Dillon has been around a lot longer than Marshal Ky."

Rep. Bo Ginn (D-Ga.) says of his colleague: "Mr. Gross is more than a Congressman. He is a one-man investigating force dedicated to protecting the taxpayer's pocketbook. He is scrupulous, untiring, uncompromising and dedicated to the public good."

And from another House Democrat, Louisiana's Rep. Otto Passman, this appraisal: "Gross has slowed down the trend to socialism from a run to a walk."

SINKING THE "FISH POND"

For years, the late Rep. Mike Kirwan of Ohio, a powerful Democrat, sought Congressional approval to build a \$10 million national aquarium on the banks of the Potomac. Every time it came up for House consideration H. R. Gross poked fun at the "glorified fish pond." It was never built.

In the twilight of his Congressional career, Mr. Gross is deeply concerned about the fiscal posture of the country.

"I've seen the budget pass the \$100 billion mark, then the \$200 billion mark," he says. "Now we have a \$304 billion budget with a \$10 billion built-in deficit. Can we ever turn this thing around?"

The White House alone is not responsible, he points out: "Congress shares the blame for this. No President can spend money that's not made available to him by Congress."

Few things rankle Mr. Gross more than supplemental appropriation bills—measures which come up near the end of each session to enlarge funds previously appropriated to operate government agencies. He comments:

"They [the Executive branch] bring in a bill at the beginning of the year and swear on a stack of Bibles, 'This is it.' They know better, because they invariably come back in a few months and ask for more."

DOLEFUL ABOUT THE DEBT

The Congressman is doleful about the federal debt, now \$500 billion (interest alone is

\$30 billion a year) and going up. Where, he is asked, will it all end?

His reply: "It ends in a takeover and repudiation of some form or another—repudiation, devaluation or outright repudiation."

He adds: "We've been financing this government off the printing presses at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. This is printing press money and there is no productivity behind that kind of money."

Mr. Gross estimates the combined total of public and private debt in the United States at between \$2 trillion 200 billion and \$2 trillion 400 billion.

"We are the most debt-ridden country in the world," he asserts. "Our federal debt alone is more than the combined governmental debts of the rest of the world."

"What a paradox: Here is the most developed country in the world in debt up to its ears!"

Few people in or out of Congress remember a piece of legislation—no matter how important or historic—by its designated number. But mention H.R. 144 to any member of Congress and he is familiar with it. Since his early days in the House, Mr. Gross has introduced House of Representatives bill 144 (the number is keyed to his name—a gross equals 12 dozen, or 144) at the start of each session.

It has a simple objective: Balance the budget and gradually retire the national debt. Year after year, it is shunted off to the Ways and Means Committee and promptly forgotten.

Now, H.R. 144 probably will be retired—like Red Grange's legendary football jersey number, 77, at the University of Illinois—unless some other member of the House, with the same zeal for economy, takes up the Gross cause.

"DUTCH" WAS A COLLEAGUE

Born on a southern Iowa farm, H. R. Gross started out as a reporter with the old United Press after World War I service in France, moved over to the editorship of a National Farmers Union newspaper and, in 1934, signed on as news director and newscaster with radio station WHO in Des Moines. A young sportscaster and announcer on the staff was Ronald "Dutch" Reagan, now Governor of California.

During his six years with WHO, Mr. Gross was a frequent defender of the Iowa farmer. His name became a household word across the state.

In 1940, he decided to run for Governor against an incumbent Republican. But party leaders, whom he had not consulted, opposed him and he lost in the primary.

He went back to radio, this time in Cincinnati. In 1948, now living in Waterloo, Iowa, he got the political itch again and ran for Congress. And again Republican leaders opposed him in the primary, even branding him a "radical leftist." But he won the primary and went on to win the general election by 20,000 votes. Except for 1964, in the landslide Lyndon Johnson election (he was the only one of six Iowa Republican Congressmen to survive it), Mr. Gross has easily won reelection to 12 terms in the House.

He regrets only one of the votes he's cast in his quarter-century in Congress.

"That was on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution," he says. "I thought I smelled something. I didn't like to vote against the President of the United States so I voted present."

Mr. Gross says the resolution, which paved the way for President Johnson to broaden the war in Viet Nam, was "contrived."

"We were very badly misled," he adds. "Mr. Johnson said Asian boys would fight for Asian soil and later McNamara [former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara] promised to bring our boys back by Christmas in 1965."

THE SIMPLE LIFE

Mr. Gross and his wife, Hazel, live a simple life in Washington. They avoid the capital's

social scene—"I've never owned a tuxedo and my wife has no ball gown," he says. "We don't need them." Mrs. Gross often reads government documents, marking sections she feels her husband will want to read.

Perhaps, in a retirement for which he has no definite plans, Mr. Gross will travel abroad. But if he does, it won't be in the fashion of some of his colleagues. He has long fought, unsuccessfully, to curb what he and other critics call Congressional "junketing." Once, an Ohio Congressman facetiously sponsored a resolution to create a committee, consisting only of H. R. Gross, to inspect American foreign aid programs overseas.

The resolution, of course, went nowhere—and neither did Mr. Gross.

"I just might take a trip one of these days, but it'll be at my own expense," the Congressman explains.

Two signs in the Capitol Hill office of this man who has won many battles, but never the war, in an unrelenting campaign to eliminate wasteful government spending, succinctly spell out a message he has been trying to put across for 25 years:

"Nothing is easier than the expenditure of public money. It does not appear to belong to anybody. The temptation is overwhelming to bestow it on somebody."

"There is always free cheese in a mousetrap."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, June 15 is a day of great significance to all men who love freedom. This past February 16th marked the 56th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. Today I would like to commemorate the tragic end of this short-lived independence. Although recognized by the Soviet Union in 1920, Lithuania's independence and sovereignty was crushed by the Soviet occupation of June 5, 1940. Since then, the gallant people of Lithuania have been struggling to regain their freedom and the exercise of their human rights in the face of one of the most brutal occupations of all time. They have been faced with mass deportations to Siberia—most of the people never returning alive—and constant pressure against their national language, culture and heritage.

Their struggle continues to this day. Two years ago a riot broke out in Kuanas following the funeral of a young Lithuanian who was self-immolated in a dramatic protest against the Soviet enslavement of Lithuania. Also, 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics have petitioned the United Nations, charging the Soviets with religious persecution. And today, over 1 million Lithuanian-Americans are joining with Lithuanians throughout the free world to commemorate the brutal conduct of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that our Government, which has consistently supported the principle of self-determination, has to this day refused to recognize the illegal annexation of Lithuania. Furthermore I would like to call upon the upcoming European Security Conference to consider and support the restoration of freedom and the exercise of self-determination by the Lithuanian people.

Certainly the people of Lithuania are entitled to these basic rights, and I urge our Government to pursue all possible channels which might facilitate that achievement. We cannot let this beacon of freedom be extinguished.

A TRIBUTE TO REV. MSGR. JOSEPH A. SCANLAN ON THE OCCASION OF HIS GOLDEN JUBILEE ANNIVERSARY AS A PRIEST

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to pay tribute to the Reverend Monsignor Joseph A. Scanlan, pastor of Our Lady of Solace Church, who will be marking his golden jubilee anniversary as a priest on June 14. It is only fitting that as Father Scanlan reaches his most important milestone, we his friends and parishioners take the time to reflect and give praise to his long years of dedication and service to his fellow man in the service of our Lord.

Father Scanlan in addition to his own numerous personal accomplishments as a priest, has the added distinction of coming from a family which has produced three priests, all of whom are now pastors of churches in the Bronx. His two brothers, Rev. Msgr. Martin Scanlan of St. John's Kingsbridge Church, and Rev. Msgr. Arthur J. Scanlan of St. Helena's Church, I know join with me in paying tribute to their distinguished younger brother, Joseph as he celebrates his 50th year as a priest.

Father Joseph Scanlan was born on February 22, 1899 in Harlem. He attended St. Joseph's Prep in Philadelphia, as well as Brooklyn Prep and College. Following this he began his preparation for the priesthood at the prestigious St. Joseph's Seminary, where many fine priests have received their initial training. On June 14, 1924, he was ordained by His Eminence, Patrick Cardinal Hayes, and offered his first Mass the following day at the Church of the Holy Innocents in Brooklyn.

Father Scanlan began his illustrious career in the priesthood as a curate at the Church of Our Lady of Mercy in the Bronx where he remained until 1942. While here, he acquired the basic skills which were to serve him well in his pastorate years ahead. From 1942 to 1947 he served as the administrator of St. Agnes Parish in Manhattan, and from there became the administrator of St. Vincent's Hospital and Catholic Medical Center also in Manhattan.

His first pastorate was at the Church of St. Mary in Mt. Vernon, N.Y., where he served for 8 distinguished years. He provided the parishioners of St. Mary's with the highest caliber of spiritual leadership, and endeared himself to the hearts of all those he served.

In July of 1957, Father Scanlan began his pastorate at his present church, Our Lady of Solace. During these 17 years, Father Scanlan has dedicated his time

and efforts to assisting all his parishioners, as well as making Our Lady of Solace one of the finest houses of worship in all of New York. He has guided his parish through the tumultuous 1960's, a decade which saw major changes in the basic Catholic liturgy. Through it all, he provided the leadership which made these transitions smooth and effective. For this, and numerous other accomplishments on behalf of Our Lady of Solace, Father Scanlan has earned the lasting love and respect of the entire Bronx community.

Demonstrating his sense of involvement with the community, Father Scanlan, in addition to his time-consuming duties at Our Lady of Solace, also serves as the chaplain of Fordham Hospital. He truly represents the epitome of what a priest should be in today's society, a man who through his deeds spread the word and love of God to all men.

Spiritual leaders the caliber of Father Scanlan are rare. He possesses the kind of personal characteristics which have inspired people to him throughout his 50 years as a priest. His love of his fellow man, his unending patience and understanding, and his deep sympathy for all in need of help has etched him an eternal place among those men who have chosen to dedicate their lives to serving the Lord as a priest.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor for me to pay tribute to Father Scanlan, a man who represents the epitome of excellence in his chosen vocation. I am also proud to call Father Scanlan a friend, and had the pleasure of recently attending a dinner in his honor. At that dinner numerous tributes were paid to Father Scanlan, but the most moving and appropriate one was offered by one of his fellow priests at Our Lady of Solace, Rev. Arthur Welton.

He has pastured his sheep. He has brought back the lost, bandaged the wounded, and made the weak strong. He has made the name of God known to all he has met. He has prayed for every man and woman given to his care. Most importantly, he had made Our Lady of Solace the singularly distinguished parish it has grown to become.

Monsignor Scanlan, my prayer to you is continued faith, wisdom and strength. My prayer is a friendly morning, a peaceful night; and all the majestic splendor and beauty of God's creation. Much more, my prayer is God's peace and love for many years of years.

REPEAL OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS REVIEW ORGANIZATIONS GAINS ADDITIONAL SUPPORT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 1974, Congressman PHIL CRANE and I sent a letter to our colleagues seeking additional sponsors of legislation to repeal the PSRO section of Public Law 92-603.

At that time, we indicated that 84 Members of the House had sponsored repeal legislation.

The response to our letter has been en-

couraging and further indicates the continued interest in this effort.

As of this date, 11 additional Members have either joined us or introduced an identical bill, bringing the total in the House to 95 Members sponsoring PSRO repeal legislation.

I ask that our letter to our colleagues, which includes a list of the new or additional sponsors, be included in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1974.

Re: Repeal of PSRO—Professional Standards Review Organizations.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As of this date 84 members of the House have introduced legislation to repeal the PSRO section of PL 92-603.

The PSRO section of this law represents one of the most deliberate intrusions on the part of the Federal government into the right of privacy presently enjoyed by our people. It is a vicious, pernicious, and punitive law that cannot be effectively amended; it must be repealed.

We will be reintroducing this legislation on June 18th and urge you to join with us in this effort.

For your ready reference, we are attaching a single page fact sheet on PSROs and a four-point summary sheet on the PSRO repeal movement to date. The latter contains a list of sponsors by states, a list of the official positions of state medical societies on PSRO repeal, a list of state legislatures memorializing Congress to repeal PSRO, and a summary of court suits involving PSRO legislation.

If you wish to join with us in this very important effort, please call Nick, 53901 (Rarick), or Willa, 53711 (Crane), by the close of business Monday, June 17th.

With kindest regards, we are

Sincerely,

JOHN R. RARICK,
PHILIP CRANE,
Members of Congress.

FACT SHEET—PSRO'S

In the final hours of the 92nd Congress, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 1, the 989-page Social Security Amendments Act of 1972, which was subsequently signed into law (P.L. 92-603) by the President. One portion of this law, section 249F (commonly called the Bennett Amendment), requires the establishment of Professional Standards Review Organizations (PSRO's) to review medical services provided under Medicare and Medicaid.

It is essential to note that the House never debated or passed a PSRO provision when it voted on H.R. 1. The Senate installed PSRO's in their version of the bill after holding public hearings, and this section was accepted in conference. H.R. 1 was then brought to the floor of the House on the very last day of the 92nd Congress under a closed rule. PSRO's were railroaded through the House.

These are the negative aspects of the law:

1. The Secretary of HEW is authorized to establish "norms" of health care, which will inevitably mean standardization of medicine and a decline in quality medical care.

2. To assist the Secretary in the development of these "norms," the employees of the 193 regional PSRO's are permitted to enter physicians' offices and inspect the private medical records of ALL patients. This is an invasion of privacy and a violation of doctor-patient confidentiality.

3. These "norms" will then be used to determine the necessity of hospital admissions, length of stay, nature and number of medical tests, type of treatment, and what pharmaceuticals a physician may prescribe. This is clearly cookbook medicine and medicine by averages.

4. Payment to Medicare and Medicaid patients may also be denied if the PSRO determines that medical care was not "medically necessary" or might have been provided "more economically." This, in effect, amounts to the rationing of health care.

5. Doctors who fail to follow these "norms" may be subject to a \$5,000 fine, litigation, or may be forced to pay for the "unnecessary" treatment. This is unusually harsh punishment.

In summary, please note that PSRO is not peer review. It is, however, a cruel, pernicious, and punitive law that must be repealed.

SUMMARY OF PSRO REPEAL MOVEMENT, AS OF MAY 24, 1974

I. Congressional Repeal Legislation and Sponsors.

House of Representatives:

Alabama: Nichols (D).

Arizona: Conlan (R), Steiger (R).

Arkansas: Alexander (D), Hammerschmidt (R).

California: Rousselot (R), Talcott (R), Veysey (R), Lagomarsino (R), Ketchum (R), Goldwater (R), Burgener (R), Burke (D).

Florida: Lehman (D), Sikes (D), Bafalis (R).

Georgia: Flynt (D), Mathis (D), Blackburn (R), Brinkley (D), Landrum (D), Stephens (D), Ginn (D).

Idaho: Symms (R).

Illinois: Derwinski (R), Crane (R), Collier (R), Hanrahan (R).

Indiana: Landgrebe (R), Zion (R), Hudnut (R), Myers (R), Hillis (R), Dennis (R).

Iowa: Scherle (R).

Kansas: Sebelius (R), Skubitz (R).

Louisiana: Rarick (D), Treen (R), Waggoner (D).

Maryland: Holt (R), Bauman (R), Byron (D).

Michigan: Huber (R), Hutchinson (R).

Mississippi: Lott (R), Montgomery (D).

Missouri: Ichord (D), Taylor (R).

New Jersey: Hunt (R), Sandman (R).

New York: Kemp (R), Grover (R).

North Carolina: Rose (D), Martin (R).

Ohio: Ashbrook (R), Harsha (R), Powell (R).

Oklahoma: Camp (R), McSpadden (D).

Pennsylvania: Goodling (R), Ware (R), Williams (R).

South Carolina: Davis (D), Spence (R), Young (R).

Tennessee: Beard (R), Duncan (R), Kuykendall (R), Quillen (R).

Texas: Collins (R), Gonzalez (D), Casey (D), Burleson (D), Archer (R), Price (R), Fisher (D).

Virginia: Whitehurst (R), Daniel, Dan (D), Daniel, Robert (R), Broyhill, Joel (R), Parris (R), Wampler (R), Robinson (R).

Wisconsin: Froelich (R).

The following Members have either joined with us since we issued the Dear Colleague or introduced identical bills:

Abnor, South Dakota; Bray, Indiana; Jarman, Oklahoma; Madigan, Illinois; Runnels, New Mexico; Thone, Nebraska; Miller, Ohio; Roberts, Texas; Chappell, Florida; Joel Broyhill, Virginia; and Minshall, Ohio.

N.B. This brings the total to this date to 95 Members who are sponsoring legislation to repeal PSRO.

II. Official Positions of State Medical Societies on PSRO Repeal (based on the latest survey of the American Medical Association).

A. State Medical Societies that have passed resolutions for PSRO repeal only, and advocate total non-compliance:

Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, and Nebraska.

B. State Medical Societies that have passed resolutions for PSRO repeal, but do not advocate non-compliance:

Kansas, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia.

C. State Medical Societies that favor either

PSRO repeal or heavy amendment of PSRO legislation:

Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine,* Maryland, Massachusetts,* Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire,*

New Jersey, New Mexico,* New York, North Carolina,* North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont,* Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

III. State Legislatures Memorializing Congress to Repeal PSRO:

Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

IV. Court Suits Involving PSRO Legislation.

A. The Association of American Physicians and Surgeons (AAPS) has filed suit in U.S. District Court for Northern Illinois (Chicago) to have the PSRO law declared unconstitutional on the grounds that it violates the First, Fourth, Fifth, Seventh, and Ninth Amendments.

The Council on Medical Staffs (CMS) has joined the AAPS in the litigation as an *amicus curiae*.

B. The Texas Medical Association (TMA) has filed suit in U.S. District Court for Western Texas (Austin) to challenge the constitutionality of the PSRO legislation on the basis of the First, Fourth, and Fifth Amendments. The lawsuit also seeks an injunction to prohibit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from entering into any contractual agreement with specific groups in Texas.

COSTS OF ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, for the information of our colleagues, I would like to append material from Prof. Herman Schwartz' article entitled "A Report on the Costs and Benefits of Electronic Surveillance—1972":

EXCERPTS FROM "A REPORT ON THE COST AND BENEFITS OF ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE—1972"

II. NATIONAL SECURITY SURVEILLANCE¹

The Federal Government has been using wiretapping and bugging in so-called national security cases at least since 1940, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt approved it in the interests of national defense. The FBI, which began to develop an intelligence function of major proportions at this time, in addition to its efforts in investigating particular crimes, used wiretapping and bugging quite extensively. How much we do not know, but there are indications that it was quite extensive.¹

In the 1960's the Justice Department developed a great concern about organized crime. The FBI had apparently downplayed this problem until then, but the new Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy, went at

* Positions of these State Medical Societies are based on a preliminary AMA poll, since they have not yet held their annual statewide conventions.

¹ Detailed analysis of the history of national security surveillance appears in Theoharis & Meyer, *The "National Security" Justification for Electronic Eavesdropping: An Elusive Exception*, 14 Wayne L. Rev. 749 (1968) Navasky & Lewin, *Electronic Surveillance in Gillers and Watters (eds.)*, Investigating the FBI (Doubleday 1973).

it with truly religious zeal; the story is told in Victor Navasky's *Kennedy Justice*. There was still much uncertainty about the number of so-called "national security" taps and bugs, for the only information that was made available about this was in annual statements by Hoover before a friendly House Appropriations Committee in which he reported the number of telephone taps in operation on the day he was testifying. In a brief in the Supreme Court, in *United States v. U.S. Dist. Ct., E. D. Mich.*, 407 U.S. 297 (1972), the Government summarized the number of "warrantless national security telephone surveillances operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the past ten years . . . [as follows]: 1960-78; 1961-90; 1962-84; 1963-95; 1964-64; 1965-44; 1966-32; 1967-38; 1968-33; 1969-49; 1970-36," citing three congressional hearings. And in 1971, President Nixon declared:

"Now in the two years that we have been in office—now get this number—the total number of taps for national security purposes by the FBI, and I know because I look not at the information but at the decisions that are made—the total number of taps is less, has been less than fifty a year."

The figures in the Government's brief and in Nixon's statement have now been revealed to range from the disingenuously incomplete to blatantly false. Analysis of the excerpt from the Government's brief in the domestic security wiretap case, together with information obtained by Senator Edward F. Kennedy and made public in December 1971, discloses that:

(1) The figures submitted by the Government to the Supreme Court related solely to the number in operation on the day that Hoover testified—duly noted in the Government's brief in the Court of Appeals but inexplicably omitted from the Supreme Court brief;²

(2) The figure given by Nixon is far off the mark, despite his claim that he "look[ed]" not at the information but at the decisions³, whatever that means.

(3) The figures given by Nixon and in the Government's brief related solely to telephone taps installed by the FBI.

(a) They do not include microphone surveillances which, at least in the early 1960's, were as numerous as telephone taps. For example, Navasky's book contains a letter from Assistant Attorney General Herbert Miller to Senator Sam J. Ervin that on February 8, 1960, there were 78 telephone taps—the number given for 1960 by Hoover—and in addition 67 "electronic listening devices." See *Kennedy Justice* 88. Thus the total was really 145 on that date alone, and several times that for the whole year, if the 1969-71 figures for the relationship between the at-one-time and the annual total are an appropriate model.⁴

(b) They do not include surveillances made by other governmental agencies, federal and state. For example, New York Times reporter Seymour Hersh has obtained Army memoranda indicating that the Army engaged in electronic surveillance for national security purposes. (N.Y. Times, 9/1/72, p. 24, col. 1) Navasky and Lewin quote a former Justice Department official's statement that FBI "agents routinely inspired" bugs and taps by local officials. *Op. cit. supra* at 299-300. Moreover, they note that Hoover's testimony

"leaves open the possibility (indeed informed

sources within the department indicate it is a fact) that although he has neglected to mention it to Congress, Mr. Hoover is not referring to all of the taps in which the Bureau is involved. (1) He may be omitting the long-term embassy taps which were put on in the first place—some as long ago as during World War II—not at the instigation of the FBI, but of other agencies, such as the State Department, but which the FBI services. (2) He is omitting all of the taps requested by foreign intelligence agencies such as the CIA, which are not permitted to tap domestically yet have domestic intelligence needs. The FBI handles those taps and passes on the information (which it also absorbs). (3) He is omitting the interception of teletype messages." *Op. cit. supra* at 300.

The actual totals of national security surveillances by the FBI in operation between June 1968 and December 1970, reported by the Justice Department to Senator Kennedy were as follows:

June-December 1968—56 (50 taps and 6 bugs).

1969—94 (81 taps and 13 bugs).

1970—113 (97 taps and 16 bugs).

These much higher figures are consistent with the fact that every time a war resister or dissident has been prosecuted, national security taps popped up not merely on him, but on many people subpoenaed, or in some way connected with him—see, e.g., Spock, Ellsberg, the Berrigans, Abbie Hoffman, Bradford Lyttle, Leslie Bacon, etc., to say nothing of the earlier FBI taps and bugs on Martin Luther King, Jr. and Elijah Muhammed. The defendant's brief in the domestic security wiretap case contains a list of those known to date.

On the basis of classified data supplied by the Justice Department, Senator Kennedy's staff also calculated that on the average, the 1969-70 devices were in operation from 6 to 16 times as long as the average court-approved surveillance—i.e., from 78.3 to 209.7 days, the average federal court-approved installation lasting about 13.5 days.⁵ Since the average federal tap averaged about 56 people per interception over the period 1969-71 (491 installations and 27,299 people) or about 4 people per day of operation (56÷13) this means that from 312 to 840 people were overheard each year on each of the approximately 100 annual FBI national security surveillances, or from about 31,000 to 84,000 persons each year. Even if one discounts somewhat for duplication in people (though the 56 person average on court-authorized surveillance is supposed to be without duplication) this figure may still be conservative, since the national security surveillances were often on organizations where the telephone usage is much greater than on the private homes that were the targets of much of the court-ordered variety. For example, there were 9 telephones at the Jewish Defense League offices that were tapped for 208 days.⁶

From these figures it is also possible to extrapolate a very rough and conservative estimate of the number of conversations overheard. Again, using the 1969-71 figures,

⁴ The figure is likely to be closer to the upper part of the range. Not only was the Jewish Defense League tap in for 208 days, but of the six domestic security taps turned off as the result of the *Keith* decision (*U.S. v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*), one was operated for 21 months, two for 18 months, one for 4½ months, one for 3 months, and one for 2 weeks. See letter from Deputy Asst. Atty. Genl. K. Maroney to the Kennedy Committee dated 8/2/72.

⁵ That the figure is none too high is clear if one reflects for a moment on one's own business phone calls: it is more than possible to talk to more than 4 new people per day, especially if one includes both incoming and outgoing calls.

the daily average of conversations overheard on federal 1969-71 surveillances was about 70 per installation. (The 900 average per installation divided by the 13 day average.) Since the national security taps lasted on the average from 78 to 208 days each, the number of conversations overheard annually is between 5,460 and 14,560 per installation or between 546,000 and 1,350,000 per year for the approximately 100 installations.

These figures are staggeringly high. They may actually be understated in many respects since some or many of the 100 installations may cover more than one device, as the JDL tap did, or one location. Furthermore, these figures omit the previously mentioned possibility of surveillance by other agencies, such as the Defense Department, CIA, or state agencies tapping on behalf of the federal government's security programs; they omit teletype interceptions as well.

Because the whole business is so secret, we have no way of knowing the concrete results of this massive surveillance; this spying is allegedly only for intelligence purposes and not for criminal prosecution, though it seems to be around wherever there is a criminal prosecution of a noted dissident. But in congressional testimony this past June, former Attorney General Ramsey Clark testified as follows:

"I have tried to estimate—I do not know that it is possible—the value of the [national security] taps that we have. I know that not one percent of the information that we have picked up has any possible use."

And in response to a question from Senator Kennedy: "What would be the impact on our national security if the Executive Branch were to eliminate all warrantless tapping at the present time?" Clark replied:

"I think the impact would be absolutely zero." Hearings before Senate Admin. Prac. & Proc. Subcommittee on June 29, 1972, on the impact of *U.S. v. U.S. Dist. Ct., E.D. Mich.*, 407 U.S. 297 (1972), trsct pp. 62-63.

Last June, the Supreme Court dealt with one facet of this national security surveillance—the domestic variety, *United States v. U.S. Dist. Ct., E.D. Mich.*, 407 U.S. 297 (1972). In a unanimous opinion for eight members of the Court, Justice Powell writing, and Justice Rehnquist abstaining, the Court denied the Government the power to eavesdrop for purposes of domestic security without obtaining prior judicial approval, a power first openly sought in the Chicago Seven conspiracy trial and rejected by most federal lower courts. Unfortunately, the Court left open two possibilities for easy eavesdropping:

(1) it virtually invited the Government to seek legislation authorizing judges to apply even looser standards for domestic security wiretapping than the already less-than-demanding standards of Title III; (2) it explicitly limited its decision to "domestic aspects of national security," and to "domestic organizations," defined as a group of American citizens "which has no significant connection with a foreign power, its agents or agencies." (n. 11) The Justice Department's narrow construction of this latter category can be seen from the facts that: (a) Justice felt constrained to turn off very few installations as a result of the decision, and apparently left a couple in operation, N.Y. Times, 6/30/72, p. 17, col. 2; (b) it installed a tap on the Jewish Defense League and kept it in operation for 208 days—including a month after indictment—on the asserted justification that this tapping was for national security purposes; and (c) a conversation by one of Daniel Ellsberg's lawyers was overheard on a foreign national security tap even though, as Justice Douglas disclosed

⁶ Other long-term surveillance has come to light in national security cases. The Government's brief in the Supreme Court described the tap in a companion case as lasting 14 months. See also 22n.

² Fred Graham and Navasky and Lewin have raised the possibility that these figures were understated because Hoover turned off some of the taps the day before he testified, so his statement could be superficially accurate.

³ These probably included a certain number of organized crime surveillances, though that aspect of the FBI's eavesdropping was still minor at that time, before Robert Kennedy became Attorney General.

with some surprise, the tap was on the phone of a foreign national, and not on a foreign agency or in any other discernible way connected with national security. *Russo v. Byrne*, 409 U.S. 400, 93 S. Ct. 433 (1972).

When the Army was caught in its massive surveillance program, it agreed to cleanse its files. The Department of Justice told Senator Kennedy's committee that virtually no effort had been made to cleanse the FBI files of information obtained by this illegal wiretapping and bugging. Furthermore, since at least some of it had been disseminated to state agencies without disclosing to them the source of this information, cleansing of the state files is probably impossible. From all indications, nobody has ever tried.

A great deal of electronic eavesdropping for security purposes has taken place and will probably continue; such surveillance catches a great number of people in an enormous number of conversations. Because this eavesdropping is not usually aimed at criminal prosecution, it will rarely come to light—and that is probably as intended by the Executive. The only hope for some kind of oversight is from Congress. Unfortunately, this particular Administration has succeeded beyond any other in denying information to Congress. The result, however, is that except for the summary statistics obtained by Senator Kennedy, we are not likely to obtain very much more; as a matter of fact, virtually all of Senator Kennedy's questions that sought information beyond the overall annual totals went unanswered.

III. COURT-ORDERED SURVEILLANCE

The issues here are essentially three: (1) how great an invasion of privacy is taking place, in terms of people, conversations, lengths of time, and other factors; (2) how much is this costing, in purely monetary terms; and (3) with what results?

A. The extent and distribution of electronic eavesdropping

This can best be explored on an annual basis, with federal and state figures summed for each year.

1968

1. State surveillance:

In 1968 the Johnson Administration was still in office, and Ramsey Clark, the Attorney General, considered wiretapping and bugging both useless and dangerous. The only court-authorized surveillance was therefore by the states, and of this, almost all was in New York.

a. Authorizations and Installations.

According to statistics in Appendix A and B of the 1968 Report, some 174 authorizations were obtained, of which some 167 seem to have been installed, and operative (2 installations were on dead or dismantled phones). Subsequent summaries in the 1969-71 reports state that only 147 were installed but the individual reports show application grants for 174 and installations for more than that. The 147 figure seems clearly wrong; the Administrative Office seems to have erroneously assumed that the absence of data for people or conversations overheard meant that there was no installation. For example, with respect to a good number of those not included in the 147, extensions were granted, see, e.g., Albany, N.Y., Clinton County, N.Y., Queens, N.Y., Nassau, N.Y., etc., and apparently resulted in some very lengthy operations, e.g., 180 days (Albany); 160 days (Nassau). Extensions would hardly be granted on devices that were not installed. The 147 figure is thus clearly too low, and we have used the 167 figure.

b. Offenses:

The breakdown of these authorizations and installations by offense is extremely interesting:

Authorization

Gambling, 70; drugs, 71; homicide, 21; kidnapping, 1; and others, 60.

Installations

Gambling, 18; drugs, 69; homicide, 20; kidnapping, 1; and others, 60.

Drugs obviously predominate at this time, with homicide and gambling next; "drugs" can include marijuana. This pattern did not last very long.

c. Place:

As noted earlier, the overwhelming proportion of the installations were in New York State and this continues. In 1968, New York accounted for 167 of the 174 authorizations, or 96%. Although this figure has inevitably fallen, New York, together with New Jersey, still accounts for most state wiretapping. Within New York, 60% of the installations were in just two boroughs: Brooklyn (66) and the Bronx (33).

The other installations were in Arizona (2), Georgia (3) and Massachusetts (1 or 2).

d. People overheard:

Tables A and B show that on the 147 installations for which reports of persons overheard were made, 3,799 people were overheard, on an average of 25 people per installation, somewhat lower than the 29 average appearing in the 1969 and later Administrative Office reports. If some 167 installations were made, then the total would become approximately 4,250 people overheard, assuming that the average of 25 persons applied to the additional 22; this is roughly equal to the 4,312 derived from multiplying the 29 average by the 147 in the 1969-71 Administrative Office reports.

The average number of persons overheard per installation, broken down by the offense, is as follows:

Gambling, 59; drugs, 23; homicide, 20; kidnapping, 22; and other 21.

e. Conversations.

The 147 installations for which figures are reported also show that some 56,282 conversations were overheard, or an average of 373 per installation. Here too, the 1969 Admin. Office Report gives a much higher average—454—and hence a higher total—66,716. Multiplying the new average of 373 by 167 installations, produces 62,291 a figure close to the figure derived from the Administrative Office's higher average and lower installation.

The average number of conversations overheard per installation, broken down by offense, is as follows:

Gambling, 551; drugs, 369; homicide, 363; kidnapping, 24; and other, 332.

The 1971 ACLU report used the averages from the 1969-71 reports. If the 147 figure is correct, then both the total conversations and people overheard should be reduced. However, if the 167 figure is the correct one, then the totals in the 1971 ACLU report are quite close—somewhat lower on persons and a bit higher on conversations.

f. Duration:

Although the Supreme Court condemned electronic surveillance lasting 60 days in *Berger v. New York*, 388 U.S. 41 (1966), this has apparently had no impact on either state judges or prosecutors. Although it is not certain that all of the installations remained in operation for as long as the authorization period, it appears that 32 of the 167 were in for 60 or more days, with 3 in for 100-199 days; an additional 46 were in for 30 to 59 days, and 86 were in for 20-29 days. Of these long term surveillances, 20 were in homicide cases, and 69 were in drug cases, with 57 in the other category. As noted earlier, the "homicide" category is not limited to murder cases, however—many are marked simply "homicide" and it is impossible to know what is really involved. More detailed data in later years shows that this is a looser category than it seems, including such things as threats, conspiracies, solicitation to commit homicide, as well as a few consummated murders.

g. Miscellaneous:

Extensions were freely granted—126. In addition, it appears that no original applica-

tions were denied though two extension applications were; indeed, in the four years for which reports are available, only two applications have been denied, both in 1969.

GEORGE MITCHELL ON PRIVACY

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, in looking over the results in yesterday's primary election in Maine, I could not help noticing the success of a candidate who had taken a strong stand on an issue which many of us here in the Congress believe to be very important.

George Mitchell, the Democratic nominee for Governor issued a series of position papers in spite of what some commentators have said about this being a "non-issue" year. His position on the right to privacy interested me greatly as I believe it will all serious advocates of insuring the rights of our citizens to their precious right of privacy. I would also like to add that it is reassuring to me to know that issue oriented candidates like George Mitchell are successful and that people running for office in the various States are as concerned with the question of the right to privacy as we are here in Congress.

I would like to share Mr. Mitchell's comments with my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY GEORGE MITCHELL

ON THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY

The need to preserve the privacy of each individual has become acute, because as government at all levels seeks to accomplish more, and as it attempts more sophisticated tasks, it needs more information. Some of that information is the type which most citizens rightly regard as private matters—matters which they do not want made public, or even to be freely available to those in government.

Yet, most will agree that the answer to this problem of personal information in the hands of government cannot be simply to refuse to give such information to the government. For example, most citizens would object to having their income tax returns—with their income, their contributions to charities, and other matters—made public, although they surely concede that the government needs this information. This is true of many areas.

Nor would many of us be willing to give up government programs which could not function without such information.

Rather, we must insure that personal information provided to the government is needed for legitimate and authorized government purposes, that it is used only for those limited purposes, and it is seen only by those few government employees who must see it to accomplish those purposes.

Of course, this whole issue of privacy has taken on a new aspect due to Watergate. The Watergate Affair, and all the immoral and illegal activity associated with it, is not primarily a matter of privacy. But it does demonstrate that a great threat to our privacy exists from political leaders who are willing to manipulate the power of government to serve their own ends. In Watergate, not only did the Nixon Administration or the Nixon Re-election Campaign use private individuals to spy upon and wiretap others; just as harmful, they used information which the government legitimately possessed, such as

tax returns, for totally illegitimate purposes. This was a flagrant violation of the responsibilities of office and remains a potential threat to the privacy of every American.

One answer—the most obvious one—to this problem is to elect principled leaders. Of course, this must be done. But the experience of the past few years teaches us that we also must try to restrict access to and limit the private information which the government has in order to protect our privacy. Only with institutions and laws which are sensitive to and meet the threat to privacy, as well as leadership committed to preserving privacy, will the privacy of our citizens be adequately protected.

In this statement, I offer several proposals which I feel meet some of the problems in these areas and which represent a program to ensure that the privacy of our citizens is respected by our state government.

1. LIMITED ACCESS TO INFORMATION

First, access to personal or confidential information submitted to state government should be strictly limited to those "who need to know" that information in order to carry out a specific, legitimate government function. This policy should be contained in state regulations, and where appropriate, agencies should limit access to such information to a list of certain government employees.

I believe this policy, firmly embedded in our government's procedures, will aid in keeping confidential what should be confidential, whether it be tax information, confidential business information, state medical records, or other categories of information which deal with individuals' personal lives.

Not only should this information be restricted to those who have demonstrated a bona fide need to know, but also non-government agencies should never receive such information without the consent of the individual involved. Private parties, whether they are potential employers, credit agencies, insurance companies, or private investigators have no business receiving such information without the explicit approval of the person involved. This principle should also be contained in our agencies' regulations.

THE RIGHT TO CORRECT

In many instances, government files may contain incorrect or derogatory information about an individual, and these errors, unknown to that person, go uncorrected. In many instances this can be remedied by allowing each citizen to inspect the government file dealing with him or her and allowing that person to add a statement to the file and to request the government to correct any errors. This is the surest and the easiest way to eliminate inaccurate or harmful material and to let our citizens know what about him or her is in the government's files.

Such a proposal has been made on the federal level, where bipartisan legislation has been introduced in Congress. I believe we should apply it immediately at the state level.

Of course, certain files, by their very na-

ture, would have to be excluded from this "right to correct" category. For example, current criminal investigative files cannot be made available to the subject of such an investigation while it is taking place. Also, certain medical files may have to be kept to an absolute minimum.

Indeed, as also suggested at the federal level, we should, where appropriate, apply the "right to correct" rule to non-governmental agencies which keep files on individuals such as credit bureaus, utilities, insurance companies and certain other businesses. These files, in private hands, can cause serious economic harm or humiliation to individuals. And of course, access to these files is not restricted. It seems only fair that people have a right to look at these files to correct mistakes which they may contain.

The "right to correct" principle will serve to do more than just correct errors. By knowing that individuals will have access to these files, both government and business will be more careful in collecting information and will restrict the information which they collect to that needed for legitimate purposes in order to avoid embarrassment and complaints.

3. STATE PRIVACY RULES TO CONTROL

Recently, it has become clear that even carefully drawn state regulations to protect privacy can be undermined by federal programs seeking state data. For example, Massachusetts is now battling the federal government to maintain the confidentiality of its criminal justice records in the face of a massive, federally sponsored, national computer program for all such information which has much weaker safeguards for privacy.

I believe that when a state government collects private information—whether it is tax information, health records, court records, or whatever—and the state promises to keep that information confidential, then the state should oppose any federal efforts to obtain that information unless equally stringent guarantees of privacy are imposed. I would oppose Maine's participation in any federal program which involved sharing such information without protecting the privacy as well as Maine does.

The Massachusetts example brings up another area of privacy that must be guarded: our police and court records. In this area, there is necessarily much derogatory and unsubstantiated information about people, whether it be an arrest report or investigative files. Such information should be kept closely guarded and strictly confidential from those outside the state criminal justice system until an innocent person is proven guilty by proper procedures. Just as a man should remain free until proven guilty, so too should his reputation remain free of accusation until he is found guilty.

4. PRIVACY IN OUR SCHOOLS

Privacy is especially important for our children. Our schools and, at times, other agencies of government deal with our child-

ren and with confidential information about our children. Because of this added access to such private information, there must be added vigilance to preserve its privacy. This has been done in many juvenile court systems, where many proceedings are not made public. I believe such special protection should be extended to other areas.

For example, it has recently come to public attention that certain federal government agencies, and in particular, the Office of Education, has been giving questionnaires to children in order to evaluate certain programs. These have contained questions about social background, family life, and other matters which many people find offensive and intrusive. While I believe we must be careful to evaluate any such allegations, and we must not cripple government programs by unreasonably restricting the information they seek, we must also be vigilant in opposing federal or state efforts to gather facts from us or our children which intrude too far into our privacy.

What is particularly disturbing was the fact that these questionnaires were presented to the children by teachers—authority figures whom the children obeyed—without any consent or knowledge by the parents.

And more important, I think we must guard zealously records involving our children. Here the main issue is school records, which often deal with disciplinary problems, emotional difficulties, and family matters. In high schools and colleges, where counseling is often available, health or mental health records may be involved. With these files, which are needed for the proper functioning of our school system, we must exercise special care. For students do not and cannot maintain the privacy of their lives, and there are many outside parties, such as employers, who naturally look to such records for information.

To protect our children, I believe that school records involving personal matters should not be released to anyone outside the school system without the informed consent of the parents of the child involved. This simple protection will guard against any possible abuses of these records. Of course, once a child reaches 18, he or she would make the appropriate decision on release of these records.

I make these proposals knowing full well that they do not completely solve this difficult problem. But I believe they should be taken, because our privacy is so important that we should take reasonable steps to protect it.

At the national level we have in the past few years seen illegal wiretapping, surveillance and burglary by government agents. As government at all levels continues to grow, so does the need to restrain it from invasion of our privacy.

For these reasons, I believe we must act promptly to protect our citizens and to reassure them that their right to privacy will not be invaded or eroded.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 13, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Paul J. Ascioia, assistant administrator, Villa Scalabrini Home for Italian Aging, Northlake, Ill., offered the following prayer:

I was a stranger and you welcomed me.—Matthew 25: 35.

Almighty God, today the world is in a state of turmoil, blinded by its own prosperity. Man feels exalted by his conquest over matter and lords it over nature as its master, tearing the lifeblood out of its soil, taming the lightning, bringing confusion among the waters of the oceans.

Nations fall, rise, and renew themselves once more. Races reach out and intermingle. Through the noise and clatter of our machines, beyond all this feverish activity of work, in the upsurge of these gigantic achievements, Your sublime plan is maturing * * * the union of all peoples.

It will be a joyous day when all voices, be they in different tongues, will be lifted up in a single hymn of praise to You. Amen.

(Based on a prayer of Bishop John Baptist Scalabrini (1839-1905), founder of the Congregation of Scalabrini Fathers, Missionaries for Migrants.)

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.