

So we come to the Mid-East. The results are definitely not in. We do not know yet, both sides of the deal—our side and the Soviet side. We know that the Soviets have some participation, for Dr. Kissinger took care to see Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko three times in the course of the recent negotiations. Israel and the Arabs both become pawns, mere counters, in the international game. The price they will have to pay for Soviet acquiescence is not yet revealed. In fact, the price the United States will have to pay is not yet revealed, although there are hints lying scattered through the Soviet-United States trade agreements, and in the pre-summit gossip.

Meanwhile, Dr. Kissinger cools an international hot spot by pouring nuclear power even-handedly on both sides. Of course, there will be controls; but for every lock, there is a key, and if not a key, a locksmith. Will the Israelis trust the Arabs, and vice versa? Will each in turn trust us?

No, I am willing to wait for the super-resolution of Dr. Kissinger's super-diplomacy. If it works, I will congratulate him; but I am not willing to pay the bill, because his costs are always high. His style is to ignore the security interests of our Nation when he chooses his men; that is his defense against the charge that he took precautions for our national safety. One hopes that his substance exceeds his style.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and

ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to call off the quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene tomorrow at 10 a.m.

After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BARTLETT) will be recognized for 10 minutes; after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes; with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each; at the conclusion of which the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, Senator ALLEN will be recognized at that time.

Mr. President, I have been asked to suggest the absence of a quorum with the understanding, as heretofore, that I will be recognized following the quorum call. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to and, at 5:07 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 18, 1974, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 17, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Francine Neff, of New Mexico, to be Treasurer of the United States.

Gerald L. Parsky, of the District of Columbia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

U.S. TAX COURT

Richard C. Wilbur, of Maryland, to be a judge of the U.S. Tax Court for a term of 15 years after he takes office.

(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.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BIG OIL-TO-COAL SWITCH IS FEASIBLE IN NORTHEAST; FEO ADMINISTRATOR SAWHILL THINKS SIMPLER POWERPLANTS WOULD ASSIST UTILITIES WHOSE MONEY CRISIS IS "A MATTER OF UNPROFITABILITY"

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, last week's Weekly Energy Report, edited in Washington by Llewellyn King and Richard Myers, gives cogent attention to energy and financial problems mainly faced by the country's electric utilities. This June 10 issue gives prominent attention to an item indicating that there could be a big oil-to-coal switch in the Northeast of the United States; it quotes a finance expert as having told Edison Electric Institute convention delegates that the utilities' money crisis comes down principally to a matter of unprofitability; and points out that Federal Energy Administrator John Sawhill thinks simpler powerplants would be helpful.

The report quotes Donald Sinville, vice president of Public Services of New Hampshire, as having said that—

Twenty-five percent of oil-fired generating capacity in New England—some 3,100 mega-

watts—could be converted to burn coal. And, with residual oil at current price levels, the fuel switching would save \$160 million annually in fuel costs to consumers, assuming a 60 percent load factor at all plants.

Through the New England Power Pool, New England utilities have been pressing for some equalization in fuel costs. East coast power generation is heavily dependent on higher priced imported residual fuel oil which, 2 months ago, was selling for about \$14 a barrel, then dropped to the \$11 a barrel range, and is now edging back up. Coal, under long term contracts, is in the \$23 per ton range and is expected to reach the \$27 bracket some time this year. Residual oil at \$14 a barrel equates roughly with coal at \$56 a ton.

New England utilities feel a way should be found to move some lower-priced domestic oil into New England, displacing foreign oil into areas not presently using it. Mr. Sinville suspects such a plan would level the price of oil at around \$7 a barrel, about even with anticipated coal prices.

LESS WIRING, FEWER PIPE WELDS

According to another item in the report, FEO Administrator John Sawhill expects initiative, particularly from the electric utility industry. He told the utility industry delegates to the Edison Electric Institute's recent convention to "provide the standard for the rest of the business community to follow in developing new energy supply and in cutting the energy waste from our economic system."

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD

the balance of the article on Mr. Sawhill's admonition, as well as excerpts from remarks to the convention on the subject of the utility money crisis by Eugene Meyer, vice president of Kidder, Peabody & Co.

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

EXCERPTS FROM ARTICLES

John Sawhill told delegates that the nation's utilities have four major tasks, as follows:

Setting up committees of small industrial and commercial customers to develop their own energy conservation plans. "Utilities serving businesses too small for their own R&D programs can—and must—become focal points for a comprehensive energy conservation program in their area," he said.

Sawhill called on the utilities to set up their own energy efficiency goals and follow through on them. "I know it will be tough to make major improvements in conversion efficiency, but an improvement of just one percent each year could yield an equivalent savings of four million b/d of oil by 1985. That's twice the expected daily yield of the Alaska Pipeline."

He called for improvements in plant reliability. "We just can't afford to keep building large plants that are available only three-fourths of the time, or less. I'd like to see the Edison Electric Institute undertake a thorough review of plant design and maintenance to find measures that improve reliability—and then implement them throughout the industry."

Finally Sawhill turned to the problem of

construction delays and design changes, saying he'd "also like to see design improvements in new power plants—both nuclear and fossil ones—that make them easier to build." He feels a lot of the blame for plant delays can be laid to designs that are unnecessarily complex. "For example, we could standardize plant equipment from simple valves to an entire boiler, and cut out months of construction time. And while we've heard plenty of talk about getting more skilled construction workers, why not just reduce the requirement for them with a simpler plant design? Why couldn't a design for a new fossil or nuclear plant require far fewer pipe welds or less wiring? Or prefabricate large components of new plants? We just cannot continue to design power plants as if we had all the welders, pipefitters, and electricians we might like to have."

IT'S A MATTER OF UNPROFITABILITY

Eugene Meyer, vice president of Kidder, Peabody & Co., in speaking on the subject of the utilities money problems:

Everything I say is going to be very basic and simple. When you go home from this convention (Edison Electric Institute), why not talk to the people you know about the word "profit." Tell them that the people who have been investing their savings in your company's common stock have lost so much money that that won't do it anymore.

The problem is the people are focusing on fuel shortages rather than the reason for the shortages, Meyer said. And by people, he did not mean just the average man on the street, for he spoke of "the probability that all of the people in this room don't really understand what the problem is and, furthermore, are waiting for someone else 'up there' or 'over there' or 'down there' to do something about whatever it is that's going wrong." What's going wrong is that many do not understand the cost of developing the coal, oil, uranium, steam, sunlight, natural gas—"and yes, even garbage"—that can meet global energy needs "for more years than we need to think about." Such development will cost labor and brainpower and "the investment of enormous amounts of the nation's capital, especially risk equity capital. The people can understand paying for the labor but they can't understand paying for the capital and therein lies the crux of the energy shortage problem and the utility financing problem," Meyer said.

For the last eight years, the electric utility industry has found it more and more difficult to attract capital except at ever higher interest rates and ever lower common stock prices. "Why should this be?" Meyer asked. "Our entire economy and all of our opportunities to continue our improvement in the standard of living are inextricably tied to energy. With that kind of demand, capital should readily flow to the industry. But, after several years of being battered, American savings no longer attracted to this area because government interference, intentional or not, has chosen to set rates at such a level so that the new equity capital invested is not permitted to earn an adequate rate of return. In other words, the American people are saying to us that energy development is not a wise use of capital, a wise use of their savings despite the necessity of energy. It's not a wise use because it isn't profitable enough."

Meyer expects all sorts of new ideas to finance utility construction and get the industry over the hump will come "out of the woodwork," most of them bad ideas because they do not squarely address the problem of unprofitability. "I haven't heard one yet which wouldn't further weaken utility credit and, in the long run, perpetuate and even accelerate the ripoff of the common stockholder, the provider of risk capital. A federal government guarantee of utility debt has been suggested," Meyer said. "Now, just

imagine how that will help securities salesmen sell your stock to back up that debt." Or project financing, in which the cost of capital is measured on the project itself, "with the inevitable result that the equity position of the sponsoring companies will be further weakened not to mention the position of the existing debt holders." Or the Consolidated Edison solution to the capital problem: "that is not attracting capital but, more accurately, conscripting it," Meyer said.

LITHUANIAN ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on June 15 Lithuanians throughout the free world will commemorate the forcible annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union 34 years ago. Since that time, the Lithuanian people have been denied their basic human rights, severely limited in exercise of religious beliefs, and completely unable to engage in the most fundamental political activity. Additionally thousands of Lithuanians have been sent to concentration camps in Siberia.

The Lithuanian people have had to struggle to remain free throughout their long history. In 1795 the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was annexed by the Russian Empire. Russian domination came to an end in 1915 when Lithuania was overrun by German armies. The cost of the First World War to this country was great: first, the retreating Russians and then the advancing Germans seized or destroyed everything of value. Three years later, on February 18, 1918, Lithuania proclaimed itself an independent republic. A peace treaty was signed with Russia in 1920 which signified the beginning of a newly formed democratic society. They made significant achievements in the arts, made agriculture their primary occupation, and built many institutions of learning. Their independence, however, was short-lived.

Unfortunately, Lithuania was one of the first countries to experience the aggression of both Hitler and Stalin. When the outbreak of World War II seemed imminent, Lithuania tried to maintain her policy of total neutrality but once again was occupied by Russian armies. On June 15, 1940, the Soviets occupied the country and established a new "friendly" government. The final act in the tragic drama of forced annexation took place on August 3, 1940 when the Supreme Soviet in Moscow declared Lithuania a constituent republic of the Soviet Union.

Repeating the history of World War I, a German occupation replaced the Russian. Nazi forces overran Lithuania only a few days after the German attack on the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941. During the time of Nazi occupation, several thousand German families resettled in Lithuania and practically all Lithuanian Jews were executed by the Nazis.

When the Germans retreated in the closing days of the war, Lithuania did not regain its independence, but once again fell to Soviet domination. Within a short

time, all of Lithuania was occupied. The Soviet Union has seen to it that the borders of Lithuania as well as those of Latvia and Estonia are kept sealed against the outside world and each other. Today, Western visitors are allowed only into the ancient Lithuanian city of Vilnius.

On July 27, 1922, the United States recognized Lithuania as an independent government and has never acknowledged the nation's incorporation into the U.S.S.R. We have continued to maintain diplomatic relations with the representatives of the free Lithuanian Government, which has a legation in Washington and major cities throughout the United States.

Because I believe it is imperative that the United States continue to play an important role in the plight of the Lithuanian people, I have cosponsored House Concurrent Resolution 394 with the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, which seeks to insure continued U.S. recognition of Lithuanian independence. The resolution reads as follows:

H. CON. RES. 394

Whereas the three Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been illegally occupied by the Soviet Union since World War II; and

Whereas the Soviet Union will attempt to obtain the recognition by the European Security Conference of its annexation of these nations; and

Whereas the United States delegation to the European Security Conference should not agree to the recognition of the forcible conquest of these nations by the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (The Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States delegation to the European Security Conference should not agree to the recognition by the European Security Conference of the Soviet Union's annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and it should remain the policy of the United States not to recognize in any way the annexation of the Baltic nations by the Soviet Union.

LYNN CAROL SMITH: HER STAKE IN THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, someone has sent to me a clipping from the *Galax, Va.*, *Gazette* of June 4, 1974, which I feel merits the attention of all citizens who sometimes wonder if the free enterprise system in America has any chance of survival.

The system will survive, Mr. President, if we can somehow transmit to our young people the truth that the hope of continued freedom rides on the survival of the free enterprise system.

Sometimes all of us, I suppose, wonder if anything is being done to emphasize this fundamental aspect of the miracle of America. Then we run across an item such as the one I saw, published in the *Galax, Va.*, paper.

Interestingly enough, it concerns a private project by a remarkable citizen

of my home town of Raleigh, N.C. Mr. A. J. Fletcher, now 87, all his life has worked to promote an understanding of, and a respect for, the free enterprise system.

Each year, he offers cash prizes to high school seniors who write the best essays on the subject, "My Stake in the Free Enterprise System." Over the years, scores of young people have been presented plaques and cash awards as a part of their high school commencement exercises. The cost of the project is borne by Mr. Fletcher and the business enterprise which he heads.

I was one of Mr. Fletcher's associates before I came to the Senate, Mr. President. He remains one of my dearest friends, and a man whom I shall always admire.

The newspaper article to which I referred earlier, Mr. President, includes the essay written by just one of the recipients of the awards offered this year, as in previous years, by Mr. Fletcher and his company. This essay happens to have been written by Miss Lynn Carol Smith of South Boston, Va. It is excellent, and it is typical of the inspiring messages prepared by so many young people in connection with the project conducted and financed by Mr. Fletcher and his associates.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the *Galax (Va.) Gazette*, June 4, 1974]

OAK HILL STUDENT PICKED AS ESSAY AWARD WINNER

Lynn Carol Smith, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Frank D. Smith of South Boston, was selected by a faculty committee of Oak Hill Academy as the 1974 recipient of the award for the best essay on "My Stake in the Free Enterprise System."

As a Senior this year, Lynn Carol was also a member of the National Honor Society and earlier in the school year was selected by the faculty as a "Student of the Week." Her essay was chosen for its merit as based on its originality in style, creativity, research and comprehension of the subject matter.

The award is presented by A. J. Fletcher of Raleigh, N.C., and includes a cash prize of \$100. The contest is open each year to all Senior government students who submit a personal essay of at least 1,000 words under the title of "My Stake in the Free Enterprise System." Fletcher, a former resident of this area of Virginia, established the contest as a means of encouraging young people to critically consider and evaluate their roles in the American economic way of life so that they could better enter society as productive citizens.

Lynn Carol's essay follows:

MY STAKE IN THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

A housewife pushes her overflowing cart down another aisle. Hundreds of products line the shelves screaming out with their varied labels. "Buy me, I give you more for less." She has the freedom to compare products and buy the one she wants. The producer produces the goods and offers them to the consumer. Then the consumer determines the fate of the product. It is like the old saying that "You can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink..."

A young boy has his heart set on getting that new bicycle on display in Vaughn's

Hardware Store. He makes an agreement with a neighbor to mow grass, rake leaves, pull weeds and do other errands every afternoon when he gets home from school. He has a goal and the freedom to pursue it. The boy is performing a service to earn money, to buy the bicycle he wants.

Two men raise money to start their own business. One of the men who is just released from the Army pursues the enterprise to earn money to support his wife and growing family. They open up the Smith's Frozen Food Locker, providing the service of cutting and storing meat for the public. There was no question as to their freedom to start a business. The motivation of profit helped plant and nurture the seed of enterprise.

General Motors Company may make a new model car to sell on the market. Then Ford Company comes out with a better quality car at a lower price. The General Motors Company competes with the Ford Company and thus produces an even better car. This type of competition between companies creates better products at more reasonable prices. Competition of any nature encourages a man to want to improve himself and his usefulness in society.

What a producer manufactures depends greatly on the demand of a product by the consumer. The recent gas crisis in the United States is an excellent example of this. Since it was a mild winter, there was not a great demand for heating fuel. The companies began to convert to gasoline to meet the growing demand of gas by car owners. However, the government found it necessary to step in to control and balance the amount of each type of fuel produced. Although the government does exercise some control, it is very limited.

It is human nature to have the desire to want to become financially secure. Even in some strictly governed countries there are traces of capitalism. Man has an innate desire to make a place for himself in society and gain wealth. In the United States man has the freedom to satisfy this desire.

Throughout most of his childhood and adolescent years a person knows automatically what he will be doing year after year attending school. During this time more industrious persons take upon themselves various responsibilities. Many boys have paper routes to earn money of their own. Often girls will babysit to make money, or do housework. This is the drive of enterprise to earn money of their own. Earning money gives one a feeling of pride, accomplishment, and independence. It is a good feeling to be able to support oneself.

Also, at the consumer level there is much competition to buy at the lowest prices available. Everyone wants to be economical. Those pennies saved by having the freedom to shop around for the best deal could be used for a night on the town or maybe for a steep college tuition.

Everyone in the United States is involved in the free enterprise system. However, not everyone realizes or understands the meaning of this wonderful economic system. The largest and most important element of this system is that of the consumer. The consumer determines the product or service offered to the public, the quality of the product and the price. The producers depend on the consumer to understand his role and exercise his freedom to choose and pay for wants.

The free enterprise system is taken for granted by most Americans. Those who have never been to another country cannot appreciate our freedoms as greatly. If one is deprived of certain freedoms he has known all his life, then he is forced to realize these freedoms and respect them.

The full impact of one's freedoms is not felt until graduation from high school. After high school, life is wide open to the graduates to pursue further education, ca-

reers of their choice or whatever their goals for life may be.

I am a part of the free enterprise system and my stake is to use the system to achieve my goals and find self satisfaction and feel personal accomplishment. I feel fortunate to have been born in a country where I have so many freedoms and because of this I must respect what I have inherited. This is my birthright and my stake in our system of freedom of enterprise.

LYNN CAROL SMITH.

RIDE WITH A ROACH

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, a new plague is assaulting courageous bus riders in New York City. In the past, New Yorkers had to fear only the ordinary discomforts of an aging and outmoded transit system, too long denied State and Federal financial aid.

Now, our graffiti-covered buses—a scandal and an eyesore in themselves—have been invaded by hordes of cockroaches. This annoying and repulsive insect has left the comfort of the home and the gourmet delight of greasy restaurants to add to the aggravation of public bus riders. According to a recent report, roaches by the millions now ride buses. And when their snuggeries in the motor compartments became uncomfortable in the blazing heat of summer—as happened one recent recordbreaking hot day—they came out and joined the passengers.

According to busdrivers, passengers spend as much time brushing the bugs off their clothes as they formerly spent reading the papers. That is not healthy. And it is enough to really bug a hard-working person already driven to distraction by prices that are too high and salaries that are too low. And that is not a healthy sign, either. This latest indignity, really the unkindest cut of all, is inflicted upon the long-suffering New Yorker in the wake of countless exhortations by national, State, and local leaders for city residents and commuters to leave their cars at home and ride public transportation.

We are urged to be urban patriots by conserving energy and by cutting down on pollution, noise, and accidents. The urgent need for America to reach these goals in order to survive as a nation makes the Nixon administration's failure to provide us with a viable mass transportation plan inexcusable.

Those patriotic pleas have a phoney ring when uttered by a President who lives like a potentate in three seaside summer houses while New Yorkers forsake the simple comfort of a mortgaged car for a ride to work with a million cockroaches.

It just ain't right.

New Yorkers are frustrated in their pursuit of an honest living by a mass transportation system that is coming apart at the seams for the want of a little Federal aid—money that is avail-

able, but that is being held back by the Nixon administration. A congressional plan to infuse millions of dollars into mass transportation right now is being cut by about 75 per cent by the President.

The nation's largest mass transportation system—New York's—faces a disastrously costly fare increase if the President succeeds in holding down the mass transportation appropriation. His program will not even maintain fares at their presently high rates.

From the far reaches of his kingly, tax-supported estates, he asks New Yorkers to climb aboard. Ride with a roach.

Nothing would make a greater contribution to Nixon's understanding of the problems of real people in a real world than a rush-hour ride on a roach coach in New York. I can arrange the trip at his convenience.

Well, Mr. Speaker, New Yorkers are a special breed. They can make wonders happen, but they will not buy the phoney pleas of an administration that has lost touch with reality. Our people would willingly ride clean buses that arrive on time at a price they can afford. But they will not ride with a roach when the whole thing could be changed with the stroke of a President's pen.

I know that my constituents are outraged with the administration's refusal to come to the aid of mass transportation. And they have every right to be.

MOUNTING DIFFICULTIES FACED BY RANCHERS

HON. PETE V. DOMENICI

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have taken the floor today to participate in a colloquy with several of my distinguished colleagues to discuss the disastrous economic circumstances faced by beef producers. In those remarks I concentrated primarily on conditions adversely affecting the market situation and I suggested some extremely vital Government actions required to help correct some of those conditions.

I also indicated that I would extend my remarks to give my colleagues a vivid glimpse of some of the other problems faced by ranchers. For that purpose I request unanimous consent that a letter in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this letter is from a constituent rancher family, a family composed of a husband, wife, and two young sons who own and operate a rather typical ranch near the ranching community of Corona, N. Mex. The wife in this case happens to be secretary of the local chapter of the New Mexico Cowbelles Association. Most of the members of the Cowbelles Association are wives of ranchers who belong to

the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association.

Mrs. Nalda, at the direction of the local chapter and in her capacity as secretary, has called to my attention some of the mounting difficulties faced by ranchers as they strive to continue in their production of red meat so vitally essential to this Nation's well-being.

Mr. President, I am extremely impressed with the quiet and factual manner and tone of Mrs. Nalda's presentation. I hope that my colleagues will avail themselves of the opportunity to learn more of the complex problems faced by ranchers, particularly those Senators who do not have the good fortune to have as a substantial part of their constituency, such fine and robust Americans as the ranchers of New Mexico.

EXHIBIT 1

BAR JN RANCH,
Corona, N. Mex., May 29, 1974.

HON. PETE DOMENICI,
U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOMENICI: My husband, two young sons, and I own and operate an average size ranch near Corona, New Mexico. We are rather typical of most ranch people in our life-style, traditions, and in the problems that we face day to day. Also typical are many of my fellow Canyon Cowbelles members and their families. Canyon Cowbelles is a local chapter of the New Mexico Cowbelles Association. Most of us are wives of ranchers who are themselves members of the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association. I have been directed by our membership to act in my official capacity of secretary of our local chapter and write to you in regard to some matters which are of grave concern to us.

A few days ago we all learned through the news media that the nation's largest maker of steel had announced a price increase. Knowing that steel is used in the manufacturing of automobiles, appliances, furniture, and numerous other products, we are certain that it will only be a short while before the makers of these other products will one by one announce their own price increase. We will be told by these manufacturers that they are forced to pass on to the consumer the increase in their production cost. Those of us who ranch for a living have been faced with rises in production cost year after year. Despite this fact, we have never been able to pass on to the consumer any part of our cost increase by announcing a higher price on our own product. We wonder how many consumers can really appreciate the fact that the livestock producer has never announced his own price. The packer and supermarket name their own prices, but not the producer. We have never been "price setters"; we are "price takers". Yet each time we shop for the innumerable goods and items necessary to operate our ranch and raise our children, we must pay the "set" price—be it a windmill tower, a tractor, or a toothbrush.

We find through conversations with people of other professions that the average consumer today seems most concerned about high prices, inflation, the energy crisis, and the deplorable conduct of some of our country's high government officials. The rancher shares all of these very real concerns, but because of the nature of his business, he is equally as anxious about droughts and blizzards; insects and predators; livestock diseases which destroy a few head or kill a whole herd; poison weeds which also kill; parasites; ever-rising grazing fees and interest rates; the prohibitive cost of hiring laborers; cattle rustling; astronomical feed prices, and the scarcity of many products essential to his operation. As for high prices, this is not a new problem for the livestock producer.

Each year the rancher has been faced with paying higher prices for most of the goods he must purchase. Yet, except for last year, the rancher for the past twenty years has sold his livestock for the same price that he received twenty years ago, or only slightly higher, or in some cases he has received less than he did twenty years ago.

The financial squeeze on livestock producers right now is driving some near bankruptcy. Cost increases in our business hit 19 per cent last year and are predicted to climb at least 14 per cent more this year. As of now, livestock prices have collapsed. Many cattle feeders are losing up to \$200 a head. Some of us will suffer financial losses from which we will not be able to recover, thus making it necessary for even more families to leave the land which they have worked and been a part of for generations. Small independent farmers and ranchers cannot survive years of huge financial losses, and so we find tax-subsidized conglomerates and non-agriculture corporations buying up the lands which we can no longer afford. And so right now, as we livestock producers find ourselves in one of the worst loss periods in history, we also find that we are confronted with yet another very real problem, the consequences of which could prove disastrous. Disastrous not just to the producers, but to the nation and even to the world. I am referring to the law suit brought by the Natural Resources Defense Council and others against the BLM and the Secretary of the Interior. The litigation involves livestock grazing permits on about 140 million acres of Public Lands in the Western United States, of which 13.6 million acres are in New Mexico.

This law suit and the possible harmful effects it might have on the rancher is in fact the reason for this letter. It is to this matter that Canyon Cowbelles most respectfully wish to direct your attention. Our members have a great common concern for those who use the land for raising livestock. Most of us who are Cowbelles live on the land with our families. We love the land and the homes we have made on it; we love our work with the land; and above all, we love our special kind of life in which the family unit is the most important element.

In the Introduction of their Complaint, Plaintiffs state, "Livestock grazing and the attendant management practices have had significant adverse environmental effects on the Public Lands, including reductions in types and populations of fish and wildlife, accelerated erosion, deterioration in soil quality and water quantity and quality, fundamental changes in plant ecology, and the impairment of aesthetic and recreational uses." Plaintiffs further state, "... defendants and others acting under their authority have issued and will continue to issue and renew permits for the grazing of domestic livestock in numbers and circumstances which have significant and adverse environmental effects on the Public Lands."

We whose livestock graze the lands are not at odds with the environmentalists who want to protect the land. For the most part, livestock producers in general respect the land too much to abuse it. It is, after all, the basis for our livelihood and so would be to our disadvantage to use it unwisely. Many of us are second and third generation ranchers whose fathers and grandfathers grazed the land before us. Our roots are deep in the soil, and we do not abuse that which we love. We are guided, as were many of our pioneer ancestors, by the philosophy, "You take care of the land and the land will take care of you."

Experts everywhere are predicting a global food crisis. United Nations Secretary General Waldheim has listed food as the third crisis in his list of great world crises. He has said that never in recent decades have world food reserves been so frighteningly low. Others in government refer to "large-scale disaster", "world famine", "the millions who

will die of starvation". . . For years it has been the American farmer and rancher who have provided the food to make theirs the best fed nation of the world, and at the same time also supplied much of the food for the rest of the world. Those of us who supply these foods already number less than 4 per cent of the population. In view of the present food shortage as well as predicted shortages of even greater magnitude, the USDA has asked our nation's agriculture people for all-out production of crops and livestock in 1974. At the same time there are those, the Natural Resources Defense Council among them, who would cut livestock production by decreasing the amount of Public Lands available for grazing purposes. This would seem to us greatly inconsistent with the needs of our nation and the world.

It is our view that our country's priorities must be realistic. . . . World food shortages, starvation of millions, great imbalances in population and food supplies must be given their proper place in our nation's concerns!

Canyon Cowbelle members and their families are understandably distressed at the prospect of having some or all of their grazing rights revoked. There would be those among us who would lose part of, or in some cases most of, their means of income. Our concern is not confined to our own individual situations, for we feel just as strongly for all the other farmers and ranchers who find themselves faced with this same prospect. This law suit involving our grazing rights presents us with a new challenge, both as individuals concerned for the welfare of our families and as members of farm and ranch organizations who wish to protect our livelihoods. While meeting to determine how to best face this new challenge, Canyon Cowbelle members suggested that when writing this letter I should emphasize the following points.

One: We contend that grazing the Public Lands is not necessarily incompatible with preservation of wildlife—quite the contrary. In our part of the country, the ranchland supports a large population of deer and antelope. Most of us are not fortunate enough to have natural streams, in which case the only water is from the wells which we have drilled. The deer and antelope water at the same wells as our cattle and sheep. The ranchers constantly watch for sickness or disease in the wildlife, and if they detect any such signs they immediately inform the Game and Fish Department. During hunting season, the ranchers help protect the deer and antelope population by doing what they can to insure that no hunter kills illegal game, and to see that no hunter kills more than his permit allows. It is a fact that during severe winter storms when deer, elk, and other wildlife find it impossible to eat the natural forage, some ranchers put out hay for them to eat. In the Teton Valley of Wyoming near Jackson Hole, some ranchers leave parts of the land ungrazed so that the elk can winter upon them when they are driven down from their high summer range by the snow and cold. Such generosity toward the wildlife is not uncommon among livestock growers.

Two: We very strongly take issue with the charge that grazing impairs the aesthetic and recreational use of Public Lands. The landowner who pays for grazing rights on land that is adjacent to or intermingled with his own property acts as a protective agent and a policing force for the Public Lands. It is sad but true that there are some people who demonstrate a complete lack of respect for the property of others—be it privately owned or government owned. This is made evident by the vandalism which occurs daily. We ranchers are very often confronted by vandals who would destroy landmarks, precious trees, wild game and such, as well as our own storage tanks, windmills, fences, and domestic livestock. We make no distinction between private land and Public Lands in

our efforts to discourage such abuses. We believe that without the rancher acting as a controlling force, some of our Public Lands would indeed be ruined and would therefore have no aesthetic nor recreational value.

Three: Grazing permits have already been discontinued in an area on the eastern side of the Manzano Mountains near Mountainair, New Mexico, in order that the land could be used for recreational and camping purposes only. There has been no significant increase in the number of campers and hikers in the area, and the land that used to be grazed by livestock is sitting idle, not being used by livestock nor humans. The grass is quite tall and in fact creates a definite fire hazard.

Four: During the last twenty years there has been an appreciable change in the amount of rainfall in New Mexico. This can be verified by Dr. Marx Brooks, Dr. Charles Holmes, and Dr. Marvin Wilkening, all professors in Weather Research at the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology. With any substantial decrease in moisture to the soil, there of course follows a decrease in natural forage. During such times the affected lands support a smaller number of livestock, thus making it necessary for the rancher to either decrease his herd or lease additional land in order to maintain his normal herd. It is therefore imperative that we not lose grazing permits which are absolutely essential if we are to remain in the livestock business and if we are to continue in our efforts to meet the increasing demands for more food.

Five: Through the years ranchers have made many improvements on the Public Lands on which their livestock graze. Fences, corrals, pipelines, dirt tanks, storage tanks—all have been built by the rancher at his own expense with no financial aid from the federal government. If at any time the rancher's grazing rights are revoked, he receives no compensation whatever for any of the costs of such improvements. He is allowed to remove from the land any of the improvements he built, but in some cases removal is impossible. In other cases the cost is prohibitive. Therefore whatever the rancher cannot remove from the Public Lands becomes a total loss to him.

Finally, we know it to be a fact that proper grazing practices are good for the reproduction and condition of plants and soils. When we use the land wisely there are benefits not only for us but for the land as well.

At the present time the ranchers in our area are suffering severe drought conditions. Because of the extreme dryness, we are called upon almost daily to fight grass fires and forest fires which threaten to destroy our ranches and our homes. Our struggle to survive is one comprised of many such battles with nature and the elements. Blizzards, ice storms, lightning, poison weeds, dry wells, insects, parasites and the like are all dictates of nature, and not man-made. Only the Lord controls such things. But price squeezes, meat boycotts, truckers' strikes, inflation, and law suits are also a part of our struggle, and all these things are controlled by the men and women of our nation. We seek your support and any assistance you might be able to give in this latest battle in our struggle for survival—the battle for the right to continue our grazing of Public Lands.

We who produce the meat for America's tables see a need right now as never before for more effective communications between agriculture people and the consumer. Just as important is the need for a better understanding of our industry on the part of legislators and government officials who are in a position to pass laws and make policies which affect our business. Therefore, Senator Domenici, we would be most grateful if you would share with your distinguished colleagues the facts, statements, and opinions set forth in this letter. Perhaps this might be a step toward correcting some misconcep-

tions and developing positive attitudes toward the livestock producers of America. Thank you very much for your interest.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN NALDA,
Secretary, Canyon Cowbelle.

THE INSECURITY OF SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been concerned about the operation of our present social security system. As prices continue to skyrocket, the benefits paid are not sufficient to provide an adequate standard of living to those who have invested in the system over the years.

However, this week, an old friend of mine, Leslie N. Speck, drew my attention to an article "The Insecurity of Social Security" which appeared in several newspapers around the country. I, like "Coach" Speck, found the facts revealed in this article alarming and a cause for immediate action. Beginning today, I would like to share this article with you in the RECORD:

[From the Memphis, Commercial Appeal, June 2, 1974]

THE INSECURITY OF SOCIAL SECURITY (By Warren Shore)

The Federal government prints a little blue booklet entitled "Your Social Security" which begins:

"Nine out of ten working people in the United States are now building protection for themselves and their families under the Social Security program . . ."

Do you believe the little blue booklet? The truth is that Social Security can cost you more than \$200,000 and wipe out your chances for a secure future.

For the generation of American workers under 40 Social Security no longer works. Rather than adding to the financial future of the young wage earner, Social Security is steadily tearing it down.

Consider the following:

During the last 20 years the taxes we pay for Social Security have grown a staggering 800 per cent—more than 10 times the cost of living rise for the same years.

During the same period, while the taxpayer's bill for Social Security grew from \$5 billion to \$40 billion annually, the average monthly benefit check went from \$55 to \$140—less than one-third the tax rise and never above the poverty level.

It is now possible to pay as much as \$14,602 in Social Security taxes and not be eligible for any retirement benefits at all—whether you work or not after 65.

The household in which the husband earns \$11,000 and his wife \$9,000 annually must pay \$32 per month more in Social Security taxes than the household of a \$100,000-a-year executive.

During the last ten years Social Security payment checks have averaged half the maximum amount possible in any benefit category. The same amount of money, during the same years, paid to a private fund would have paid for twice the maximum in any benefit category.

The Social Security restrictions against earning more than a poverty wage (\$2,880 per year) while drawing benefits remain in full force until age 72—when more than 99

per cent of Americans are either fully retired or dead.

More than half of all American taxpayers pay more to the Social Security Administration than they pay in income tax—and the percentage is growing.

How could the system, called "a ray of hope" in 1937 when it was enacted, have become what University of California economist Peter Somers recently termed "the biggest single roadblock to the security of the American wage earner"?

The answer is that Social Security has not done any of what it set out to do?

Designed to act as "financial cushion which would encourage saving to supplement it," the opposite has resulted. The system now takes so much from the American paycheck, saving is discouraged.

Intended to help the low-income worker, Social Security is instead paying maximum benefits to those who can afford not to work and a reduced benefit to those who must work.

Consider savings first. During the 1940s, when Social Security was first underway, the amount collected in taxes represented only a small percentage of what Americans could afford to save out of their pay.

For instance in 1942 the average American household, after all tax deductions and living expenses were paid, could afford to put \$767 in the bank.

During that year, for every \$100 that Americans could afford to save, \$3.70 was being taken out of U.S. payrolls by the Social Security Administration for the retirement fund.

Then began the silent squeeze. By 1945 Americans were earning more but Social Security was taking more and taking it faster. Average household saving dropped to \$740 a year. Now for every \$100 we could afford to save \$4.30 was taken from payrolls.

In 1948 Social Security took \$12.60 for every \$100 we could save. By 1950 the payroll bite had grown to \$20.40 for every \$100, and by 1955—\$36.20 for every \$100 in household savings.

The tax that was supposed to encourage saving continued to grow faster than Americans could afford to save. In 1960 average yearly household saving in the richest country in the world had slumped to \$240—a dismal 140-percent drop in 18 years.

That year Social Security took \$63.90 for every \$100 we still had left. And still the tax was growing bigger.

Last year was the worst in history. Even though the average American household was saving at slightly above 1945 levels, the Social Security Administration took \$84 for every \$100 we saved.

University of Chicago economist Milton Friedman has termed the last 20 years of Social Security "a crushing defeat for the average wage earner."

"Where is the incentive to save," asks Friedman, "when such a huge proportion of that saving is confiscated for a retirement plan a younger worker could buy for one-third the price?"

All the examples cited include only the amount of Social Security tax earmarked for retirement checks and death benefit. Billions more are taken to finance other federal insurance plans.

What have we bought for an increase in "premiums" equal to six times private insurance increases?

"Pitifully little," says a spokesman for the Illinois Department of Insurance. "If a private insurance company attempted to sell a plan in Illinois which cost so much and paid so little, we would drum them out of the state as frauds."

Nor is Social Security going to stand still. Beginning this year, no more congressional votes are needed to raise Social Security taxes. The hikes will come automatically from now on—tied each year to cost of living increases.

Today's young workers can look forward to:

Paying at least \$1,000-a-year to Social Security during the next five to six years.

Seeing the insurance value of what he buys grow steadily lower.

Paying the most during his middle years when his federal insurance is worth least to him.

A retirement plan which will pay him less than half than a plan he could buy on his own—if he can afford to take the benefits.

UNDER-40 LOSERS

For the American earner under 40, today's Social Security is a \$262,000 mistake. If you don't think you have that much money to lose—keep reading.

The current generation of workers is getting the bill for political promises made as long ago as 1936 and as recently as 1970. They will pay dearly with losses including:

A pension worth less than half what is paid into it.

Discrimination against women which can cost more than \$10,000 in cash or \$5,000 a year in benefits.

A disability protection plan costing more than any private insurance and worth less than \$10 a month.

A more-than-\$100,000 retirement bonus they'll never get.

These kinds of losses will be sustained by young couples like Jeffery and Eva Alfred of Chicago. Jeff Alfred is 23 years old and has just finished a two-year technical course in office machine repair. His present job pays \$215 per week.

Jeff, like a lot of Americans working for a salary, doesn't think he has a quarter of a million to lose. But losses should be measured in terms of what Jeff could do with his money if he had the right to keep it.

Last year, at age 22, Jeff had \$676 taken out of his pay by the Social Security Administration for "disability and retirement protection." His employer paid another \$676 for the same purpose.

That's a total of \$1,352 paid in one year for Jeff's protection. How much protection should that buy? By normal industry standards the money would provide more than enough for a \$100,000 insurance policy on Jeff's life, including full cash benefits.

In other words, if Jeff Alfred never got another raise in his life (i.e. his Social Security contribution remained the same his whole working career) just the amount of money paid in his name last year would continue to pay for \$100,000 insurance coverage.

There is considerable difference between \$100,000 private insurance coverage and the plan Social Security offers Jeff for the same money; the kind of differences that could change the Alfreds' life style.

If Jeff Alfred were to die today, under Social Security protection, his wife, Eva, would receive less than \$300 in "burial benefits." As a widow with no children Eva Alfred would get nothing until she was 62—40 years from now.

"But if Jeff died," says Eva, "I would certainly have to work to support myself, wouldn't I?"

Of course she would. But if Mrs. Alfred does go back to work, she will lose even the small widow's benefits—now 40 years away. The law says that if a woman is entitled to both widow's benefits and retirement benefits, she can only draw the larger of the two checks. Jeff's money would be lost.

Under private insurance of the same cost, if Jeff Alfred died today Eva would receive \$100,000 to use as she saw fit. The money is virtually tax free except for a small estate tax. There would be no income tax to pay on the amount.

Mrs. Alfred could create a fund which would pay her more than \$600 a month for the next 20 years. Of course the fund, or any other way she chose to use the cash,

would continue in full force whether Eva Alfred works or not—or even remarries. The money is hers.

If applied to even the most conservative of corporate bonds, the money would produce at least a \$7,000-a-year income for Eva Alfred over the next 20 years and still be available, in full, in 1994 to be used again.

"That's the nature of money," says Brookings Institute economist John Brittain, "but most people simply don't realize it. If more young people knew what Social Security meant to them, more would be upset."

Let's say that Jeff Alfred doesn't die. Let's say he goes on working and getting normal cost-of-living raises in salary. Since the new Social Security law demands raises in premiums for every cost of living increase, Jeff's Social Security bill would go up every year.

By age 26, even with a minimal cost of living rise (3 per cent), Jeff and his employer would be paying \$1,634 a year in insurance taxes.

Since private insurance costs would have remained the same, Jeff Alfred would then be paying \$309 more per year for Social Security than he would need to pay for better coverage.

If we look ahead until Jeff is 36, the difference between Social Security and private insurance grows more glaring. Under Social Security:

Jeff and his employer would be paying \$2,268 a year.

His insurance costs would have risen 61 per cent.

Without children, his wife still could not collect on his death.

Without children, his wife still could not collect on his full, permanent disability.

He would not have accumulated any cash value.

Compare this with the same amount of money spent on private insurance. By the time Jeff is 36, the following would be true: His life insurance coverage would have grown to \$151,400.

The cost would have been so much less than Social Security that Jeff could have accumulated \$2,487 while still paying for the higher private coverage.

The death benefit would be enough for a 20-year, \$1,000-a-month income for Eva without ever depleting the \$151,400. (It would remain intact after the 20 years.)

The policy, even with Jeff alive, has an accumulated cash value of more than \$20,000.

The comparisons, in short, are the difference between effective protection and meaningless tax collecting. For Jeff and Eva Alfred and 30 million others in their age group, the "security" in Social Security is a hoax.

"The biggest reason we can't afford any more than a small private insurance policy," laments Jeff, "is that they dock my pay \$60 bucks a month for Social Security insurance that's almost useless to me."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, just 2 days ago, Lithuanians all over the world united in spirit for the sad remembrance of the takeover of their country by the Soviet Union in 1940. I think it is vital that we, in the U.S. Congress, constantly remind ourselves of the oppression of the freedom-loving people of Lithuania and several other Baltic nations which have been forced into the Soviet Union.

To serve as a reminder, I would like to

share with my colleagues, a portion of a letter I recently received from Juozas Gaila, president of the Lithuanian American Community of the U.S.A.

The letter follows:

Hon. WILLIAM F. WALSH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WALSH: On June 15, Lithuanian-Americans will join with Lithuanians throughout the free world in the commemoration of the forcible annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union in 1940, and the subsequent mass deportation of thousands of Lithuanians to Siberian concentration camps.

Currently, the people of Lithuania are denied the right of national self-determination, suffer continual religious and political persecution, and are denied their basic human rights.

The Soviet Union is now seeking détente, as well as a Most Favored Nation Status with the United States. This desire on the part of the Soviet Union presents the United States with a unique opportunity to ease the plight of the people of Lithuania and the other Captive Nations.

The United States should adopt an official policy for the current European Security Conference in accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 394 of the first session of the 93d Congress submitted by Mr. Derwinski to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. . . .

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives (The Senate concurring), that it is the sense of the Congress that the United States delegation to the European Security Conference should not agree to the recognition by the European Security Conference of the Soviet Union's annexation of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and it should remain the policy of the United States not to recognize in any way annexation of the Baltic Nations by the Soviet Union."

While steadfastly maintaining the United States policy of non-recognition of the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, the United States should insist that the following policy changes are made by the Soviet Union:

1. Lowering of excessive tariffs imposed on gifts to relatives and friends residing in the Baltic States.
2. Increase the current five-day tourists visa to Lithuania to a more reasonable limit.
3. Elimination of unreasonable travel restrictions on tourists to Lithuania.
4. Provisions for Lithuanians to immigrate to other countries as provided by the Charter of the United Nations signed by the Soviet Union.

Sincerely,

JUOZAS GAILA,
President.

COAL'S FUTURE: DEEP MINING, NOT STRIP MINING

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, within the next week or two, the House will be considering H.R. 11500, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1974. One of the principal issues surrounding this bill is whether the deep-mining industry in the East will be maintained as a viable means of mining coal. Some people have claimed that only the vast coal deposits in the West can supply

our country's growing demand for coal, that deep mining is unsafe, inefficient, and unprofitable. I think this is a defeatist attitude, one that deliberately ignores the tremendous strides the deep-mining industry has made in recent years. If mined at capacity, the Nation's strip-minable reserves, which constitute only 3 percent of our coal reserves, will be depleted by the end of the century. And if we abandon the deep-mining industry now, the cost of rebuilding the industry many years hence will be enormous and the task may well be impossible.

I would like to bring attention to an excellent article which appeared in the magazine *Fortune*, titled "It's Back to the Pits for Coal's New Future." The article explains the problems facing the deep-mining industry and the ways in which the industry is solving them. It also points out that the Nation's 1,400 underground coal mines represent one of the relatively rapid ways to increase the Nation's energy supply—with the backlog of orders for strip-mining machinery, it now takes 4 years to open a strip mine. Furthermore, geography favors underground mining, because most of the good coal that is close to major cities is too deep to strip.

The following is the text of the *Fortune* article.

[From *Fortune* magazine, June 1974]

IT'S BACK TO THE PITS FOR COAL'S NEW FUTURE (By Edmund Faltermayer)

When the Persian Gulf countries doubled the price of crude oil last December—ending at a stroke the postwar era of cheap energy—one of their leaders lectured the affluent countries on the virtue of toil, in tones worthy of a seventeenth-century New England preacher. "If you want to live as well as now," declared Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi of Iran, "you'll have to work for it." Nothing symbolizes better the new era of working for it than helmeted men riding down dark shafts in the dusty and dangerous pursuit of coal.

Thanks to the worldwide scramble for energy, underground coal mining is destined to be an essential and growing part of American economic life until the end of this century, if not longer. Cheap oil and plentiful natural gas are things of the past, and strip-mined coal cannot fill the gap. Local opposition and tough reclamation laws promise to delay and limit the exploitation of the vast reserves of strippable coal and lignite in the West even if shortages of railroad hopper cars and mining equipment can be overcome. (See "Clearing the Way for the New Age of Coal," *Fortune*, May.)

THE NEW ANARCHY

To many Americans a revival of deep coal mining will seem like a turning back to Dickensian times, and deep mining indeed has many drawbacks. It is, among other things, one of the most hazardous of human occupations. Some 107 men died while helping to extract nearly 300 million tons of coal in 1973; surface mines matched this output, with only one-sixth as many deaths.

By current U.S. standards of productivity, deep mines seem thoroughly retrograde. As a rule they require three times as many workers to produce the same tonnage as a strip mine. Productivity underground has actually fallen in recent years. Deep mining is concentrated in Appalachia and the Middle West, where historic labor-management antagonism still smolders and where the workers these days are increasingly prone to absenteeism and wildcat strikes.

The declining discipline is partly due to

a state of transition in the United Mine Workers union, in which a reform regime under President Arnold Miller has been striving to establish itself by slow, democratic methods following the ouster of Tony Boyle late in 1972. Few coal operators lament the departure of Boyle, who was recently convicted of ordering the murder of his late rival, Jock Yablonski, but most of them miss the long decades in which the union curbed wildcat strikes by exercising tight control over its locals. Says Chairman Donald Cook of American Electric Power, which operates many mines: "The new democracy is the new anarchy."

FIRE IN THE "GOB" BANKS

The public furor over strip mining's ravages has diverted attention from the environmental effects of deep mining, and in some ways these can be even more serious. Billions of tons of "gob," or rock separated from coal in preparation plants, have accumulated over the years to form ugly mounds that loom over coal communities. Since these waste banks contain coal particles missed in the sorting process, they can catch fire. About three-quarters of all acid drainage from coal mines seeps out of underground mines, past and present. Strip-mine operators can bury acid-forming materials under benign dirt and rock, but deep mines leave permanent caverns. If pyrites (iron sulfide) are present in the coal left behind and are exposed to a combination of air and water, acid can form, and may drain into streams for a hundred years.

Many of the country's newer underground mines are below the water table, and the caverns become flooded after the coal is taken, keeping out the air that is necessary for acid formation. But most of them are also creating another problem for posterity, namely subsidence. According to a controversial 1968 study of the environmental effects of deep mining, carried out by the Bureau of Mines but never endorsed by the Interior Department, some six million acres of the U.S.—an area larger than Massachusetts—have been undermined in getting coal. As the "pillars" of coal left behind have weakened or the overlying rock has fractured, about one-third of this enormous acreage has caved in. Even if deep mining ceased tomorrow, another one-eighth of the surface over old workings could collapse by the year 2000. While subsidence has occurred mainly in rural areas, it has also wrecked buildings and streets in cities, most notably in Scranton and Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania.

THE GOOD COAL LIES DEEP

Nevertheless, for all its aggravations and hazards, deep mining still makes sense. The nation's 1,400 underground coal mines represent an enormous investment and have the reserves to keep running for decades to come. Deep mining also represents one of the relatively rapid ways to increase the energy supply. For years it was axiomatic that strip mines could be opened faster. But with today's great backlog of orders, there is a four-year wait for the giant draglines that remove overburden. That is longer than it takes to bring new deep mines into production.

Geography clearly favors underground mining, because most of the good coal that is close to major cities is too deep to strip. West Virginia, for example, has over 40 billion tons of underground coal containing less than 1 percent sulfur, many times the amount that can be torn from the surface of its hillsides. The East and Middle West contain even vaster deep deposits of medium- and high-sulfur coal that could be used for centuries, once methods for curbing sulfur dioxide emissions are perfected. "The country's coal reserves are preponderantly deep," says Howard W. Blauvelt, president of Continental Oil Co., the parent of Consolidation Coal. "The proportion of strip-

mined coal may increase for a time, but eventually deep mining will regain a dominant position."

Even now, deep-mined coal is a better economic proposition than simple comparisons of productivity at the pit might suggest. It is true that some of the new western strip mines extract up to fifteen times as much coal per man-hour as Appalachian deep mines, profitably producing fuel for as little as \$3 a ton. But by the time that coal has traveled a thousand miles by unit train to the Midwest and is subsequently transshipped by barge, as is necessary in many cases, transportation costs can balloon the delivered price to \$12 a ton. And the western coal moving east these days is a low-energy subbituminous coal; a ton of it has only three-fourths as many British thermal units as eastern or middle-western coal. Thus a customer could pay \$16 for a delivered ton of the richer coal and come out the same in the end.

In the new world of costly energy, deep-mined coal is a bargain. Even coal from a brand-new mine, developed at today's high capital costs, could be sold profitably at an initial price of \$18 to \$22 a ton under a long-term contract, with suitable escalation provisions. At that price, Conoco's Blauvelt estimates, the company could earn a profit margin sufficient to attract equity financing. Even a price of \$18 a ton works out to only 75 cents per million BTU, half the cost of the energy contained in Persian Gulf crude oil, and only a fifth as expensive as oil that has been shipped, refined into gasoline, and taxed to sell for 50 cents a gallon at your neighborhood pump.

Several utilities are going ahead and committing themselves to underground coal to fuel new generating plants, in some cases signing up for coal good enough to make coke. It has always been possible to burn metallurgical-grade coal under boilers to make electricity, but this use was derided, in one energy expert's words, as "feeding fillet mignon to your dog." Nevertheless, Southern Co. has signed long-term contracts for five million tons a year of low-sulfur coking coal from three new mines being developed in Alabama by a subsidiary of Jim Walter Corp. The coal will initially cost \$19 a ton, and two of the mines will be 1,900 feet below the surface, making them the deepest yet sunk for solid fuel in this country.

CLAUSTROPHOBES NEED NOT APPLY

If the U.S. is going to send men underground for coal in the space age, it will have to send them first class. As older miners retire, many of their youthful replacements will expect standards of amenity and safety now found only in showcase mines. While providing these improvements, coal companies will also have to find ways to reverse that slide in productivity. All this will require huge investments by an industry still living on the margin—still selling a lot of fuel at prices established when coal was desperate for customers.

While a mine is no place for anyone with claustrophobia, recruiting miners is no problem when working conditions are good. "There is a good number of young men who want to work in the mines," says a state employment official in eastern Kentucky, though he adds that a far larger number "are dodging the mines, and concern about safety is a big factor." The current U.M.W. pay scales, ranging from \$42 to \$50 a day, overcome a lot of misgivings; except for construction, mining is the best-paid blue-collar occupation in the region.

Keeping workers has proved easy at Consolidation Coal's Robinson Run mine, a "drift" mine that tunnels horizontally into the northern West Virginia hills and supplies a mine-mouth generating plant with 2.4 million tons a year from the famous seven-foot Pittsburgh Seam. (This is the

mine depicted by the blueprint on page 136.) Union men rate the seven-year-old mine a good one, if not quite a showcase. Turnover among the 500 hourly employees is quite low, according to superintendent Gene Shockey, and there is a one-year wait for jobs.

To anyone steeped in literature about the mining hell-holes of old, Robinson Run seems almost salubrious. Seated in an electric train powered by an overhead trolley wire, workers career three miles underground from the portal, through tunnels that are white, rather than black, because a limestone coating is sprayed on the walls to keep down explosion-prone coal dust. Once you disembark and follow the light from your miner's lamp toward the place where coal is actually being cut, the main sensation is one of profound peace and quite, with a muffled roar of distant machines and coal trains.

You are in the midst of the compressed compost laid down by the decay of unimaginably dense swamps during the Carboniferous era 250 million years ago; human beings have never been here before. A faint man-made breeze brings a flow of fresh air and prevents the buildup of combustible methane gas, and the temperature stays comfortable the year round. "It never goes below fifty on the coldest winter days," boasts Woody Shaver, a young mining engineer who is the mine's assistant superintendent, "and it's air conditioned in the summer."

THE SOUND OF A CREAKING ROOF

For all the labor-intensiveness of deep mining, remarkably few workers are encountered at Robinson Run. Several miner's lamps glint in the darkness and the whine of machinery grows louder as you approach a "section crew" of six workers and a foreman at a coal face. Nine other crews are at work in other sections, but the nearest of them may be a quarter mile away in the labyrinth, unseen and unheard. Pacing the section crew's work is the \$200,000 continuous-mining machine, a yellow mechanical corn-borer with headlights, whose spiked metal mandibles move up and down, gnawing coal loose without need of picks, shovels, or explosives, as an operator manipulates twenty-three different levers.

Introduced in the 1950's and usable only in the level coal seams that predominate in the U.S., the continuous miner has helped revolutionize deep mining. After its introduction, the work force in the nation's underground mines shrank from 400,000 to only 120,000. The high point in productivity was reached in 1969, when the average output in U.S. underground mines reached an astounding sixteen tons per manshift. Since then productivity has slipped seriously, to eleven tons in early 1974.

Several factors brought the downtrend. For the first time in years, the coal companies began taking on new, inexperienced men in the late 1960's as demand for coal rose. Meanwhile, Congress in 1969 passed the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, which introduced a host of new operating restrictions to which the industry has only now adjusted. Every twenty minutes, for example, the continuous miner must shut down while the air is sampled for its methane content—a wise precaution, since gas freed as the coal is extracted can be ignited by a spark when the cutting teeth hit hard rock above the coal. The miner must also pause so that the newly dug footage can be coated with limestone and the newly exposed roof can be secured with long metal bolts driven by a special machine up into the overlying strata. This, too, is prudent. Occasional overhead creaking sounds at Robinson Run are a reminder that about 40 percent of last year's underground-mine fatalities were due to roof falls.

Even without safety restrictions, the coal could not be conveyed to the surface as fast as the continuous miner can cut it. At ten tons per minute, the machine could theoretic-

cally churn out 4,000 tons per shift if it operated without interruption. But the wide-bellied "shuttle cars" that haul the coal back through the network of tunnels to a moving belt linked to a rail line are restricted in their movements by corners and ceilings, and can convey only two or three tons per minute. The term "continuous miner" is thus a misnomer; the expensive machine sits idle 80 percent of the time or more, waiting for other operations to catch up. Even at Robinson Run, a fairly efficient mine, a section produces only 350 tons of coal per shift.

SUBSIDENCE BY DESIGN

A faster method of haulage could bring a prodigious jump in productivity. Consolidation Coal has been testing a radical hydraulic system at an experimental section of the Robinson Run mine, where coal from the continuous miner is fed to a crusher that breaks it into chunks four inches in diameter or less, small enough to be flushed with water through a ten-inch pipe and moved to the surface. The new system can pump coal at ten tons a minute, as fast as it is cut, though its efficiency until now has been limited by the shuttle cars that bring coal to it. But the underground belt and rail line, with their attendant costs and hazards, are eliminated, and Consol is in the process of doing away with the shuttle car by putting the crusher directly behind the continuous miner. The hydraulic system, the company says, could eventually reduce the manpower required underground by a fourth.

The grand solution to a lot of underground problems, enthusiasts say, is so-called "longwall" mining. "That's where the emphasis should be placed," says Joseph J. Yancik, who is in charge of mining research at the U.S. Bureau of Mines. The longwall method is a total departure from the prevailing "room and pillar" system, in which as much as half the coal is left behind as a support. In a longwall "panel," which may measure several hundred feet on a side, all the coal is taken and the roof is deliberately allowed to cave in gently behind a coal "shearer" that planes back and forth across the broad coal face. The men operating the shearer are protected by a thick steel canopy supported by hydraulic jacks that advance by remote control with each pass of the shearer.

Even when allowance is made for coal that is left along the edges of the panel, the longwall method can remove more than 80 percent of the coal in a mine. Within the panel, the need for roof bolting, which ordinarily absorbs 15 to 20 percent of the manpower in a deep mine, is eliminated. So are worries about future subsidence, since the entire overlying terrain collapses quickly and evenly. Manpower at a coal face is drastically reduced, and production can easily run as high as 1,000 tons per shift; many crews have cut 3,000 tons or more.

Longwall mining was developed in European mines where safety and productivity problems are particularly severe. It has caught on very slowly in the U.S., accounting for only 3.5 percent of last year's underground coal production. About fifty-five longwall units of various types are in operation in the U.S., and President James W. Wilcock of Joy Manufacturing, which makes some of the equipment, sees a potential market for 150 units in existing mines. A complete longwall installation can cost \$2 million.

A BINDER FOR THE ROCK

Longwall has several drawbacks, however. That large investment in equipment may be idle half the time; setting up a panel can take weeks. To minimize the investment, many American companies have developed a variation called the "shortwall" system, involving a narrower panel and fewer jacks, and employing a continuous miner instead of a shearer. Even the narrow panels cannot be set up everywhere. The strata overlying

American coal seams do not always lend themselves to neat, predictable caving. Roof conditions may also be unsafe; rock may fall in the narrow interval between the coal face and the advancing steel canopy. To remedy this problem, the Bureau of Mines last year found it could drill holes in the roof in advance of shearing and inject a glue that binds the rock together. The agency is eager to test another solution: a supplementary overhead shield developed in Hungary and improved by the Germans.

The Bureau of Mines hopes in the near future to put together estimates of the proportion of U.S. coal deposits that might lend themselves to the longwall method. While most existing mines are laid out for room-and-pillar mining, one coal-company executive hazards a guess that "30 to 40 percent" of the coal in future deep mines could be removed by longwall and its variants. Interestingly, the system offers promise in underground seams now considered too thick to mine economically by the room-and-pillar method, particularly the very thick seams found in the West. As a rule, the thicker the coal bed, the larger the proportion of coal that must be left behind for support. Some thick seams in Poland are mined completely in a succession of longwall "lifts."

Another way to mine thick seams, according to William N. Poundstone, an executive vice president of Consolidation Coal, may be to settle for a very limited amount of conventional tunneling, "leaving behind something that would look like Swiss cheese." All that burrowing would create spaces that might later facilitate *in situ* mining, which is actually a form of underground gasification. A controlled fire is fed by air or oxygen, which converts the coal into usable methane, carbon monoxide, or a combination. While the Bureau of Mines reports encouraging results at a test site in Wyoming, most coal men believe that commercial *in situ* extraction is a long way off.

HOW TO PREVENT BLACK LUNG

During the energy-scarce years that lie just ahead, deep mining will require thousands of additional underground workers, each of them exposed to danger. The fatality rate has been halved since the 1969 safety law was passed, but the rate of disabling injuries has remained stubbornly high—far higher than in construction for example and three times the rate at which manufacturing workers are injured.

The drive to raise productivity could increase deep mining's hazards unless precautions are stepped up. As machines cut coal faster they raise more coal dust that can explode or more insidiously slowly blacken workers' lungs. They also liberate methane faster, raising the specter of more disasters like the 1968 fire and explosion at Consol's No. 9 mine at Farmington, West Virginia, which killed seventy-eight miners.

The dust problem appears on its way to being solved, thanks to the development several years ago of air-suction hoses that can be installed at a negligible cost, right at the cutting head of continuous-mining machines. The hoses, which catch invisible dust particles that previously eluded water sprays, should "knock hell" out of the black-lung problem in years to come, says J. Davitt McAteer, safety solicitor of the U.M.W. Meanwhile, the Bureau of Mines is experimenting with "bleeding" methane from coal seams by drilling into them before deep mining gets under way, instead of blowing the gas out later with mine-ventilation systems and losing its energy value. Most deep coal seams, in effect, are low-grade natural-gas deposits.

Actually, most deaths and injuries in the last few years have come not in major

catastrophes but in scattered small incidents. In an effort to protect the most vulnerable person in a mine, the man who operates a mechanical roof-bolter, the Bureau of Mines has experimented with a protective metal cab. The federal government is also preparing rules that would require extensive lighting underground to improve visibility, and is working with industry on several new systems that would enable trapped miners to communicate with the surface and to direct rescuers to them.

The principal hope for mine safety, however, lies less in new hardware than in good management. The rate of disabling injuries varies enormously by company. While companies can fudge their accident figures somewhat, this alone cannot explain the fact that miners at U.S. Steel's coal mines were only one-sixteenth as likely to be hurt in 1973 as the men who worked for the company with the highest accident rate among major producers, Eastern Associated, a subsidiary of Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates. Eastern recently launched a drive to reduce accidents 10 percent a month, and claims to have met that goal in February.

For years the "captive" mines owned by steel companies have been known for their relatively good safety records, perhaps because safety measures in the mines add proportionately less to the cost of a steel company's end product—steel—than to coal sold as fuel. "You have to be willing to pay for safety," says Latham B. Gray Jr., Bethlehem Steel's general manager for coal. Under the company's Job Safety Analysis program, every accident—which can include any unplanned event in the mines, even one that causes no injury—is carefully studied in an effort to prevent its recurrence.

One key ingredient in safety, says gruff-talking Woods G. Talman, chief inspector of U.S. Steel's coal operations, is a vigilant foreman concerned with safety as well as production. Talman likens the foreman's role to that of a bomber pilot. In manufacturing, he says, "a shop foreman is generally able to watch most of his workers at one time or easily move around and see the others. At most, a coal foreman sees only three miners at once, like the pilot who sees only the copilot and maybe one other member of the crew. He has to move a lot to see the rest."

Another ingredient is training, needed more than ever as inexperienced men enter the mines in large numbers. Before a new miner goes underground at U.S. Steel, he is given a week of training above ground, followed by up to a year of apprenticeship below. The Mine Enforcement and Safety Administration, an arm of the Interior Department that enforces the 1969 law, is preparing recommendations for mandatory training program throughout the industry. The state of West Virginia, where new recruits are six times as likely to be killed and injured as older hands, is not waiting for federal rules. Recently the legislature passed a law requiring new miners to be trained and certified by the state before they can begin work.

SAFETY—OR NOT AT ALL

During coal's long lean years, management had to reckon with cruel trade-offs between safety and economic survival. But this dilemma will fade as coal becomes generally profitable. Even before that happens, the coal companies will be up against strong pressures from the new leadership of the United Mine Workers. Says U.M.W. President Arnold Miller: "Coal will be mined safely—or not at all!"

Ever since last summer the union has been training its own safety-committee men, and hopes eventually to have one full-time on every shift. James M. Day, who heads the federal enforcement agency, believes that

active union participation "could do more for mine safety than an act of Congress." If so, the union would be backing up, with deeds, some of its rather demagogic new talk. "Coal miners in West Virginia and Kentucky and Pennsylvania," Miller told the U.M.W. convention last fall, "are tired of dying so that men in the boardrooms of New York and Boston and Pittsburgh can get rich."

The new U.M.W. leadership is out to convince the rank and file that it has put an end to the union-management coziness of pre-1972 days—when, in Miller's words, "you couldn't tell the union from the coal companies because the officials of both were living off the coal miners." When the Miller slate took over the U.M.W. eighteen months ago, it ordered the president's salary slashed from \$50,000 to \$35,000, and sold off three limousines. A new informal atmosphere at the union's Washington headquarters reflects the personalities now in charge. The top officials are lifelong miners—some of them, like Miller, afflicted with black lung—advised by a group of youthful intellectuals who came out of the Appalachian antipoverty programs, the Miners for Democracy movement that unseated Tony Boyle, and Nader's Raiders.

JOHN L. WOULD NEVER HAVE TOLERATED IT

The U.M.W.'s long list of demands for this year's contract negotiations, for all the radical rhetoric, is thoroughly in the spirit of conservative "business unionism." Wages are certainly a key issue; the miners know they are already well paid, but they want more money on the table and an escalator clause to protect their standard of living. Other demands, in addition to safer mines, include better fringe benefits such as sick pay and a substantial increase in pensions from the present \$150 a month. Some coal men are aghast at the prospect that those pensions might require a trebling of royalty payments to the union's welfare fund, from the current 80 cents a ton.

What worries the operators even more, however, is the possibility of a long strike when the present contract expires November 12. Under a recent change in the U.M.W. constitution, the entire membership must vote on the package won at the bargaining table—an exercise in democracy that would never have been tolerated by the late John L. Lewis. Negotiations could be dragged out, in part, because Miller does not enjoy undisputed control. His supporters have won elections in less than half the U.M.W.'s twenty districts, though the other district heads are not necessarily anti-Miller. Another worry is that the contract will do nothing to curb absenteeism and wildcat strikes. "Without a resolution of these problems," says President John Corcoran of Consolidation Coal, "the contract will not be worth a damn."

Corcoran and other coal executives were dismayed when the U.M.W. convention voted down a proposed new grievance procedure, worked out with industry's cooperation, that was designed to avoid wildcat strikes, which cost the industry fifteen million tons in lost production in 1973. They were dismayed less by the defeat of the plan—it will almost certainly be revived—than by the inept manner in which it was presented to the delegates.

Coal executives profess to wish the new U.M.W. team well, and clearly a good contract will help Miller. But some companies may balk at great generosity while their profits remain low or nonexistent. Right now hourly wages, fringe benefits, and the union royalty total between 10 and 20 cents per million BTU of deep-mined bituminous coal, depending on the size and efficiency of the mine. From a miner's standpoint, that leaves room for a very generous contract indeed.

DOWN IN THE HOLLOWS, RECOGNITION AT LAST

As this year's negotiations progress, many Americans will become aware for the first time that coal miners are still important to the economy. That will bring a lot of satisfaction, after thirty-seven years in the mines, to Carl Burgess of Decota, West Virginia. Burgess works at an underground mine owned by Carbon Fuel Co., and lives at the head of Cabin Creek hollow near Charleston, where gob piles tower and mud slides from abandoned strip mines encroach on roads. In approaching Burgess's home, you pass hamlets of row houses, company stores, Baptist churches, and men with rifles off deer hunting.

A short husky man bulging out of a tight-fitting sweater, Burgess has the resigned eyes of one who has known hardship. Like most miners, he is proud of his occupation but, paradoxically, still on the defensive about it. "Most people today just don't know what a coal miner is," Burgess says calmly, seated in his living room with a cross and Bible in one corner and a big color television set in the other. But the world energy crisis is starting to change this, he says, particularly in Britain where the miners recently won a big pay increase after a long slowdown and strike. "Certainly the British people have just learned a lot about miners."

Burgess began his career in the 1930's when the fatality rate in the mines was ten times as high as now. His first mine was "a real low one, about thirty-five inches. You carried your lunch pail in your teeth, did a lot of work on your back. It was all pick and shovel, manual work." In those days far more men were crushed by rock falls because the old wooden roof beams weren't as effective as today's steel bolts. Ventilation at the working face was terrible. "Only little fans brought in some air. When I came out of the mine, I'd be so tired it was three hours before I was ambitious enough to take a bath."

Burgess believes coal mining has "changed 75 percent since those days, but not 100 percent. There is still room to improve the safety, and we've got to make the job more attractive. I've seen the day when men begged to work in the mines. Now it's the other way around." Burgess's new spirit of independence pales when compared with that of his younger colleagues. A nation that wants to keep its lights burning and its motors humming will have to reckon with this new fact of life.

BALANCE THE BUDGET

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 13, my distinguished colleague from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE) introduced House bill 15375 modeled after H.R. 144. This legislation is aimed at curbing the rampant inflation which is spreading throughout our country and I am glad to have the support of my friend, the gentleman from Ohio. On Friday, June 14, there appeared in the Columbus Dispatch an article entitled "WYLIE Launches Bill To Restrain Inflation." I commend Mr. WYLIE who is one of the most hard-working Members of Congress and is genuinely concerned for the future of our country.

The article follows:

WYLIE LAUNCHES BILL TO RESTRAIN INFLATION

(By Roulhac Hamilton)

WASHINGTON.—Hardnosed legislation aimed at curbing rampant inflation through rigorous restraints on federal spending and mandatory national debt reduction has been introduced in the House by Rep. Chalmers P. Wylie, R-Columbus.

Wylie's bill would prohibit federal expenditures in excess of federal revenues and would require use of a portion of those revenues be allocated annually to national debt reduction.

The 15th District lawmaker's bill represents the "Painful surgery" he said last week would be necessary for an effective cure for the "disease of inflation" which, if allowed to continue, "will destroy the national economy and perhaps the nation itself."

The measure, which Arthur F. Burns, chairman of the Federal Reserve System's board of governors, has told Wylie he would support if it can be brought to a committee hearing, would provide that:

"Expenditures of the government during each fiscal year, including reduction of the public debt . . . shall not exceed its revenues for such year except (1) in time of war declared by the Congress; or (2) during a period of grave national emergency declared by the Congress by a concurrent resolution which has passed each house by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the authorized membership of that house."

"The public debt limit . . . is hereby reduced as follows:

"Effective Oct. 1, 1974, by an amount equal to 2 percent of the net revenue of the United States for the fiscal year ending Sept. 30, 1975; "followed reductions of 3 percent of revenues in fiscal 1976, 4 percent of revenues in fiscal 1977, and 5 percent of revenues in each fiscal year thereafter."

The bill also would require that the budgets submitted annually by the president "be prepared, on the basis of the best estimates then available, in such a manner as to insure compliance with the first section of this act."

Section 4 of the bill would prohibit the Congress from passing appropriations which would result in expenditures by the government during any fiscal year in excess of its revenues (as such revenues have been estimated in the budget submitted by the president), except in these cases:

"(1) to the extent of any additional revenues of the government for such fiscal year resulting from tax legislation enacted after submission of the budget for such fiscal year; or

"(2) In time of war declared by the Congress; or

"(3) During a period of grave national emergency declared in accordance with the first section of this act," with the proviso that such excess expenditures may be made "only during" the actual period of grave emergency.

Wylie conceded that his proposed program of fiscal responsibility cannot be put into effect overnight. But he believes introduction of the legislation now is timely because of the imminence of congressional action aimed at recapturing the legislative branch's constitutional authority over appropriations.

"This legislation will have a much better chance under the new system," Wylie said, "because it is right in line with what the Budget Reform Act proposes to do."

It was because of that that Wylie dated his fiscal years from October 1 of one year to September 30 of the next year—a step Congress is planning to take in connection with budget reform.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, June 15, marks the anniversary of the Soviet takeover of Lithuania. The takeover which occurred in June 1940, followed a period of more than two decades of independence. During these years of independence, the Lithuanians developed their own unique political, economic, and cultural life. Now, under Soviet rule, the people of Lithuania are denied the right of national self-determination, suffer continual religious and political persecution, and are denied their basic human right. Ideology has replaced folklore and Lithuanian nationalism has been subjugated to the larger power of communism.

In this era of "détente," I think it is important to keep in mind the basic difference between the United States and the U.S.S.R.: the right of the people to freely choose their government. The struggle that the Lithuanian people are waging to regain the independence they once possessed is inspirational. Throughout their history, the Lithuanian people have transmitted from generation to generation their national identity, their cultural identity, and more important, the knowledge of what it is to be free and the desire for this freedom.

I concur with the sentiments expressed in House Concurrent Resolution 394, which states:

Now, therefore, be it RESOLVED by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that it is the sense of the Congress that the United States delegation to the European Security Conference should not agree to the recognition by the European Security Conference of the Soviet Union's annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and it should remain the policy of the United States not to recognize in any way the annexation of the Baltic nations by the Soviet Union.

In addition, I believe we should impress upon the Soviet Union that if they wish to be granted most favored nation status in regard to trade, they should consider the following changes in policy toward the people and friends of Lithuania:

First. Lowering of excessive tariffs imposed on gifts to relatives and friends residing in the Baltic States.

Second. Increase the current 5-day tourist visa to Lithuania to a more reasonable limit.

Third. Elimination of unreasonable travel restrictions on tourists to Lithuania.

Fourth. Provision for Lithuanians to emigrate to other countries as provided by the Charter of the United Nations signed by the Soviet Union.

I am sure that the freedom-loving people of the world can sympathize with the plight of the Lithuanian people. No country should be forced to subjugate its own language, religion, and culture to the

brute force of imperialism. The American people understand the importance of the right to self-determination. History has proved that no dictatorship has ever succeeded in holding a people in bondage forever. The time will come once again when the Lithuanians will live in a free nation. Until that time, I can assure Americans of Lithuanian descent that America will not forget their plight and that we will continue to support and pray for that moment when justice and freedom reign and the people of Lithuania again have their independence.

WHERE DOES IT HURT?

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the essential key to health care reform is a fundamental shift in emphasis from crisis medicine to preventive medicine. The more we do today to prevent illness and keep the population healthy, the less we will have to spend tomorrow on cures and treatment.

Last year the Congress enacted the Health Maintenance Organization Act of 1973. These organizations, providing full medical services for a prepaid annual fee, encourage subscribers to go to their doctors without having to worry about the cost of the visit. In fact, knowing the visit is already paid for discourages them from ignoring or putting off treatment.

The new health maintenance organization created by this act could turn out to be precisely what we need: "sensible and humane institutions that offer us a genuine alternative, at last, to fee-for-service foolishness." However, since too often they will be owned by the same organizations that preside over the larger health care system—the big hospitals and the big insurers—they could end up protecting the system rather than challenging it.

A special issue of the New Leader, from which I submitted an excerpt earlier this week, also contains an article offering a worthwhile explanation of health maintenance organizations. I recommend this article to my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the New Leader, Apr. 15, 1974]

ALTERNATIVE REMEDIES

Last December 29, President Nixon signed the Health Maintenance Organization Act of 1973—"another milestone in this Administration's national health strategy," he remarked at the time—authorizing the spending of \$375 million over five years to create new HMOs in cities across the land. The Act is far from adequate and in fact signals a considerable cooling down of the White House's formerly warm commitment to the proliferation of HMOs. Nevertheless, the new legislation may add some 300 new organizations to the 115 already operating, and hence constitutes the strongest challenge yet made to our fee-for-service health care system.

HMOs are health care associations that provide full medical services for a prepaid fixed annual fee. At no further charge, enrolled families are entitled to all the health care they need, ranging from regular check-ups to major surgery. Physicians who agree to deliver this service usually forswear traditional pay-as-you-go arrangements in favor of either a straight salary or a "capitation" fee, an amount based on the total number of subscribers. If, for example, an association has 10,000 members, each participating doctor's annual income might equal \$5 per member, or \$50,000.

Although the term "health maintenance organization" is relatively new in medical nomenclature (it seems to have been coined in 1970 by Dr. Paul Ellwood Jr., of the American Rehabilitation Foundation in Minneapolis, in a paper called "The Health Maintenance Strategy"), the organizational technique has been around for more than 40 years, and nearly 9 million Americans already receive prepaid health care from the prototype plans. Some of the older programs took shape soon after World War II, around the time that Truman's fight for national health insurance was failing in Congress. The whole concept can therefore be viewed as another invention born of necessity, but unlike Blue Cross, and commercial health insurance, its reliance on group practice—and, in many instances, on salaried doctors—violates at least two AMA commandments: *Thou shalt not combine and Honor thy fees and emoluments.*

The AMA has strenuously opposed prepaid group medicine ever since 1929, when it tried to expel Dr. Michael Shadid for the sin of organizing a prepayment health cooperative in Elk City, Oklahoma. In their beginning years, all subsequent plans endured boycotts and lockouts by local medical societies and hospitals, winning a toehold in the health care establishment only after long and costly court battles. Indeed, in more than half the states the AMA succeeded in pushing through legislation that expressly prohibited prepayment health plans and certain other forms of group practice.

But by 1971 the AMA was in trouble, its historic opposition having been seriously challenged by an old friend, Richard Nixon. In his health message to Congress that year the President said: "Studies show that [subscribers to HMO-like plans] are receiving high quality care at significantly lower cost. Patients and practitioners alike are enthusiastic about this organization concept. So is the Administration." The President went on to describe the HMO idea as "a central feature of my national health strategy."

The passage of an Administration-supported bill to channel massive Federal subsidies into new HMOs in communities from coast to coast seemed in the offing. HEW Secretary Elliot L. Richardson spoke of "1,210 operative HMOs" by 1980, giving 90 per cent of the population the opportunity to participate. It was generally assumed at the time that the model had proven its validity and merited—in the jargon of the day—"full implementation."

Nonetheless, the AMA argued that HMOs were still in an experimental stage, full of dimly understood imperfections, and what was needed was a small Federal subsidy for "demonstration" projects to gradually smooth out the wrinkles. This was the position eventually taken by Congressman Paul G. Rogers (D.-Fla.), who as chairman of the House subcommittee handling health matters was sponsoring an HMO bill of his own. "The philosophy of the House bill," he said, "is demonstration of the HMO concept. We want to see if it works before making a wholesale Federal commitment to the idea."

Rogers' bill, which authorized only \$335

million for HMOs, was competing with two others: an Administration measure calling for expenditures of more than \$2 billion, and one sponsored by Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D.-Mass.) carrying a price tag of \$5.1 billion. Both of these proposals, moreover, included provisions to override the 22 still-extant state laws prohibiting prepayment or other group medical practice, a matter Rogers was silent on. At this juncture, most observers were predicting passage of strong HMO legislation along the lines recommended by the White House. But they had not reckoned with the AMA, or with the fact that an election year was approaching.

The AMA quickly mounted a campaign aimed specifically at the White House. It was guided by Dr. Malcolm C. Todd, a surgeon in Long Beach, California, who was then a member of the society's house of delegates and is now its president. Todd had been dispensing political aid and comfort to Nixon since his 1950 Senate race against Helen Gahagan Douglas, and he served as chairman of a group known as Physicians for the Re-election of the President, a position that under the circumstances looked a lot like the catbird seat.

Todd has told John Iglehart, a reporter for the authoritative *National Journal*, that he wrote the President "several times" about HMOs and received replies. He would not reveal the content of his letters, but it seems likely that he emphasized the difficulties of raising campaign funds from doctors worried about HMOs. "As chairman of the Physicians' Committee," he said at the time, "I have a problem in raising money for Nixon because of this HMO thing. . . . They say, 'I don't know about this HMO thing' when they are approached for contributions." Todd also argued that people who wanted to change the health care system through such a program were not likely to vote for Nixon anyway.

It wasn't long before HMOs ceased to be "a central feature" of the President's "national health strategy." HEW officials stopped speaking of massive subsidies and began talking instead about "demonstrations" and "experiments," adopting the language of Congressman Rogers and the AMA. In the spring of 1972 the Administration withdrew its support from any measure that would preempt state laws barring group practice—thereby ruling out the creation of HMOs in at least 22 states. At a House hearing in August an uncomfortable Secretary Richardson was asked how the committee should deal with such prohibitions on the state level. "We think that you should go as far as, in effect, you think the traffic will bear," he responded.

As it turned out, the traffic bore considerably more than the Administration was prepared to admit, and the legislation that was ultimately enacted—a compromise between the Senate Kennedy bill and the House Rogers bill—contains a strong preemption clause overriding state law. It also contains a "dual choice" provision requiring any employer of more than 25 persons to include HMO coverage, if it is available, among the health insurance options submitted to his workers. That will make HMOs competitive with traditional fee-for-service packagers like Blue Shield and the commercial insurance companies. On the other hand, the law defines HMOs so rigorously—it insists upon a full offering of dental services, for example—that some of the older plans, like Kaiser, fail to qualify as HMOs under its standards.

Although not everything health reformers had hoped for, the HMO Act goes far beyond what either candidate Nixon or the AMA intended. And the original prepayment plans the AMA tried so hard to destroy, even if technically denied official HMO designation

for the moment, have come to be recognized as the developers of the concept endorsed by Congress and grudgingly blessed by the President. Perhaps the best way to assess and savor this victory—a rare event in health reform—is to examine those few gnarled heroes that have for so long fought the basic battles.

THE PROTOTYPES

The largest of the HMO prototypes is Kaiser-Permanente, launched in 1945 by the late shipbuilder and industrialist Henry J. Kaiser. Its 23 hospitals and 58 clinics serve 2.5 million families, most of them on the West Coast. In the San Francisco Bay area, one out of every five persons gets his medical care from a Kaiser plan.

Two other well-established and highly regarded HMO-type programs are Seattle's patient-owned Group Health Cooperative (GHC) of Puget Sound, with 68,000 family memberships, 7 clinics and a 302-bed hospital, and the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York (HIP), with 275,000 subscribing families and 28 medical centers. Like Kaiser, both GHC and HIP started in the late 1940s, the former an offspring of the strong cooperative tide that had been running in the Northwest for three generations; the latter, a creation of various labor unions, foundations and Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, who was a friend and patient of one of HIP's founders, Dr. George Baehr.

These three pioneers in the HMO approach together represent more than 80 years of experience, and they have compiled a remarkable record. Though they differ from one another in their forms of ownership and management, all of them depend upon prepayment schemes that entitle participants to comprehensive medical care, and all have found ways either to abolish or dilute traditional fee-for-service practice.

The evidence suggests that President Nixon was right the first time: The quality of medicine being practiced by these plans is generally superior to that being offered by private physicians and by conventionally organized hospitals. They have taken a giant step toward eliminating some of the weaknesses that have long plagued our health care system—the patchwork insurance coverage, the exaggerated dependence on hospital care, and the uneven availability of medical services (seldom on Wednesday, never on Sunday).

By fixing patients' premiums and doctors' incomes in advance, the plans give both parties an added incentive to engage in preventive medicine. Patients with early symptoms need not delay in seeing a physician—the bill has already been paid; physicians with healthy patients need not worry about where their next fee is coming from. In effect, this approach to medicine is similar to that of the ancient Chinese, who paid their village doctor an annual sum only if the village had enjoyed good health that year.

The emphasis on prevention has lowered the cost of medical practice. In 1972, for example, when the national per capita cost of health care was \$274, the figure for Seattle's Group Health Cooperative was \$100 less. The biggest savings were in hospital expenses, which averaged \$137 nationally but only \$47 per GHC member. Proportionately, GHC subscribers spend 60 per cent less time in the hospital than do other Americans, in part because the cooperative has a policy of providing out-patient treatment whenever possible. At the GHC hospital the incidence of tonsillectomies and hysterectomies—operations Denenberg puts at the top of his "needless surgery" list—is about half the national rate.

The other plans can cite equally impressive figures. Since 1960, Federal employees have had their choice of several types of health benefit programs, including prepay-

ment, wherever they have been available. (About 5 per cent have elected the latter.) A HEW study of these government workers indicates that in 1968 Blue Cross-Blue Shield subscribers spent twice as many days in hospitals as plan subscribers, endured twice as many appendectomies, mastectomies, hysterectomies, dilatations and curettages, and had almost three times as many tonsillectomies.

Another study, published in the *American Journal of Public Health*, compares such crucial indicators among Federal employees as premature births and mortality rates. Here is a portion of its findings (expressed in percentages):

Indicator	Prepayment	Fee-for-Service
Premature births:		
White	5.5	6.0
Nonwhite	8.8	10.2
Infant mortality:		
White	2.27	2.73
Nonwhite	3.37	4.38
Annual mortality of the elderly (18 months or more after joining a plan)	7.8	8.8

In general, then, it seems fair to say that prepayment subscribers receive more health care for their money than they could get in the open medical market. The premiums are not cheap, however, and except for a few instances where the Federal government contributes subsidies, they are beyond the reach of poor people. Annual rates for a family of four run from \$500-750. HIP charges less, but its members must obtain their hospital coverage through Blue Cross, placing it in the same range. In most cases, the payments cover all surgery, hospitalization, clinic visits, drugs, X-rays and house calls by doctors or nurses. Maternity and postnatal care (except at HIP) cost extra, as do eyeglasses and psychiatric therapy. At the GHC, for example, the first 10 psychiatric sessions are free; further sessions are \$5 each.

In other words, subscribers do not invariably pay less than fee-or-service patients; it depends on a family's medical luck. As a rule, though, they are less hesitant about summoning help. "If one of my children has a bellyache," says a HIP member in New York, "I just trot her down to the medical center. But I'd think twice if I knew each visit would cost us \$20." More important, perhaps, HMO families need not fear bankruptcy from a major illness—the coverage is complete, and there is seldom a ceiling.

Still, a certain number of subscribers regularly stray outside their plans for additional medical assistance—some because they wish to verify their group physician's findings, others because they want an appointment sooner than some specialist as their plan can provide. About 10 per cent of Kaiser subscribers see outside doctors. At HIP, where most specialist work only part-time for the plan, the figure is somewhat higher.

In emergency situations, the plans seem superior to conventional health care arrangements. Had he belonged to one, Governor Harold Hughes probably would have found a physician ready to come to the aid of his ailing son-in-law. The plans are organized to provide around-the-clock service, and if house calls are not their favorite activity, physicians will make them when necessary.

"We never turn down a patient," says a Kaiser administrator in Los Angeles. "When a subscriber calls at 3 A.M., he won't get an answering service telling him to call back at 9. He'll get help." Mrs. Henry Low, a GHC member, recalls that late one night her baby woke up with a temperature at 104 degrees. A nurse at the Seattle clinic told her over the phone to soak the baby in a tub of warm water. Then the nurse called a

GHC pediatrician. "He telephoned us three times that night," says Mrs. Low. "I was very impressed."

CHANGING DOCTORS

One reason the AMA says it is skeptical about prepayment plans is that they prevent subscribing families from freely choosing their physicians. It is true, of course, that members are limited to those doctors who work for the association; yet the selection remains reasonably broad—about the same, say, as that available to the average resident of a medium-size city. Families with children are usually assigned their own general practitioners and pediatricians as regular family doctors, but a family can always change physicians, and many do. A mother in Los Angeles recently asked Kaiser to assign her another pediatrician because the first one could never remember her name. It may actually be easier to switch doctors within this framework, where there are no difficulties of transferring records, than within a fee-for-service framework.

Prepayment plans do have their problems and ambiguities, mainly deriving from the fact that they must operate within the larger medical body politic. They sometimes find it hard to attract and keep doctors, particularly high-priced specialists like orthopedic surgeons who may be reluctant to abandon fee-for-service practice. As a result, a few specialists are paid more than \$100,000 a year and these salaries tend to drive up the price of premiums. At Kaiser, through a complicated system of separate regional legal entities, physicians become partners in profit-seeking enterprises and divide net income among themselves.

The standard doctor-patient ratio in the existing plans is 1:1,000, relatively low for health care organizations. This improves the quality of care, but it also shuts the door on hundreds of thousands of applicants. In southern California Kaiser has barred new groups of subscribers since 1965. A few months ago GHC, too, announced it would accept no more members, thus violating the nearly sacred open-door principle of cooperativism (introduced by the Rochdale weavers of England in 1844).

THE HIP APPROACH

HIP, like Kaiser-Permanente, is divided into quasi-independent doctors' groups—28 in all—that operate their own medical centers, to which subscribers are assigned according to geographic convenience. But only 300 of HIP's 1,100 participating physicians currently work for the plan full-time, a situation that perpetuates their free-lance, entrepreneurial status. This has frequently prevented HIP from imposing its own policies and standards upon the doctors' groups, and it is now offering the groups a bonus of \$12,500 per year for every additional full-time physician they bring in.

For most HIP subscribers the plan probably remains the best, and least expensive, way of obtaining health care. Yet because it does not offer hospitalization coverage, participants are at the mercy of Blue Cross' escalating prices. HIP officials are asking Blue Cross to reduce rates for their members, on the grounds that their utilization of hospitals is lower than the community average. They are making no effort, however, to persuade the association to reform hospital practices—that is, to do for hospitals in New York City what Denenberg made Blue Cross do for them in Philadelphia.

From the experiences of HIP and the other plans, it is evident that health care programs function best when their control is centralized, so long as there is room for a strong consumer voice. Seattle's GHC most closely resembles this model, since it is owned by

the patients (who elect the board of trustees), it manages its own clinic and hospital facilities, and all its physicians work full-time for the organization. Both Kaiser and HIP have elaborate consumer complaint machinery, as well as various consumer advisory panels, but their patients do not assist in making policy decisions. The critical difference between the two lies in Kaiser's superior administrative control of its constituent parts.

THE GHI STORY

Indeed, it may be argued that any tightly managed organization can provide HMO-type benefits. An example is Group Health Incorporated (GHI), an imaginative insurer that has been accomplishing wonders in New York City and environs since 1938. Its director, Dr. George W. Melcher Jr., sees the plan as "a champion of fee-for-service medicine." GHI's 3 million group subscribers—most of them labor union members in the metropolitan area—can receive services from any of 4,000 participating general practitioners or 6,000 participating specialists, all at previously agreed-upon rates. (A subscriber may also go to a nonparticipating physician, but that doctor is free to charge him more than what GHI has agreed to pay, and the patient must make up at least part of the difference.)

Although GHI does not pay hospital bills, it was the first insurer in the nation to cover in-hospital doctor services, and it also pioneered payments for X-rays, laboratory tests, dental work, and psychiatric care. Its group insurance contracts sometimes carry more extra charges than do HIP contracts—for example, GHI may impose a surcharge on the subscriber for house visits made at night—yet its overall premiums are comparable to those levied by MIP and the other plans, and in some instances they are slightly lower.

By and large, then, GHI has competed successfully with both HIP and conventional medical insurers like Blue Shield. Moreover, its participating doctors are committed by contract to providing subscribers with the same comprehensive, 24-hour medical service offered by HIP, Kaiser and GHI. And all this is being accomplished under the tattered banner of "free choice." As one of its brochures explains, "Early experience convinced GHI that medical care of high quality requires close rapport between physician and patient, such as is available only when the patient may choose his physician. GHI subscribers may select any physician, anywhere in the world" (but they shouldn't expect full compensation).

Withal, what GHI's success seems to prove is not the expendability of prepaid group practice but the indispensability of tight controls. Since until recently GHI owned nothing—no hospitals, no clinics, not even a thermometer—its controls derived from the most part from its accounting methods. "Basically," says Dr. Melcher, "we're record-keepers. We know what the patterns of practice are."

Knowing the patterns of practice, and possession of a highly sophisticated data processing system, has enabled GHI to closely scrutinize the thousands of bills it handles each day. GHI not only takes precautions against overcharges, it also questions bills that reflect excessive services: charges for several different blood tests, for instance, in connection with an examination that normally requires only one; apparent overuse of X-rays or drugs; too many vitamin injections; or even, in certain cases, too many office visits. In addition, GHI encourages subscribers who are slated for surgery to get a second, independent diagnosis to reduce the incidence of needless operations. Dr. Melcher's axiom, if intentionally overstated, nevertheless has a point: "The less time a doctor spends with a patient, the more he does for that patient."

When GHI watchdogs spot a billing discrepancy—a straying from "patterns of practice"—they point it out to the physician. There is seldom an argument, and hardly ever a repetition of error. The upshot of these indefatigable procedures is that the plan saves millions of health care dollars. Blue Cross and Medicare could do as well if they but had the incentive (they already have the computers). In fact, under a separate contract with Medicare, in which GHI serves as an "independent carrier"—processing all the Federal program's bills in Queens County—the company claims to have cut costs 50 per cent!

Curiously, GHI is beginning to look more and more like a health maintenance organization. It now owns a 250-bed hospital in Queens (where it has reduced costs by 30 per cent), it operates a network of dental clinics, and it has purchased an optical service. "We're no longer just an insurance company," says Dr. Melcher, "we're a health service corporation." The new ventures have been launched in response to expressed consumer needs, GHI's board of trustees consists of 15 doctors and 15 laymen; the laymen are vocal and, having learned a lot about health care management, they are practically professionals.

The new HMOs that will be created by the Health Maintenance Act of 1973 could turn out to be precisely what we need: sensible and humane institutions that offer us a genuine alternative, at last, to fee-for-service foolishness. But since in many instances they will be owned by the same organizations that preside over the large health care system—the big hospitals and the big insurers, or their nonprofit "spin-offs"—they could also end up making the customary accommodations, protecting the system rather than challenging it.

That is the lesson of Medicare and Medicaid: The system takes care of its own. Just as Dr. Harvey Cushing warned President Roosevelt in 1935 that nothing could be accomplished "without the good will of the American Medical Association which has the organization," so the health insurance industry now reminds us that nothing can be accomplished without its support. "People aren't standing in line to enroll in HMOs," a Blue Cross official told me, "Somebody has to sell the concept." And what better salesman than Blue Cross?

In any event, no one now believes that the health care riddle has been solved. The ink on the HMO Act was barely dry before President Nixon announced yet another scheme, this one a baroque blend of public and private insurance subsidies. The Administration's latest bill goes to the top of an astonishingly high stack of Congressional proposals for health reform, at least two of which are likely to be debated this year. In aggregate they represent not necessarily the best thinking of our health care experts—though there is some of that in them, too—but rather the best survival strategies of our present health care institutions. Everyone, it seems, is convinced that American medicine is slated for reform; and everyone wants a piece of the action.

SOME 40,000 HANDICAPPED ASSURED OF \$120 MORE SSI BENEFITS

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is to be commended for his decision to postpone consideration of H.R.

15124. This postponement allowed time to correct a technicality by which some 40,000 residents of New York would have been deprived of food stamp benefits. The correction in supplemental security income will enable these 40,000 aged, blind, and disabled persons to receive an additional \$120 annually in food-stamp benefits or cash-out value. In this time of exorbitant food costs, this money is not a gift of the Government, but an absolute necessity.

Those of us who are accustomed to something more cannot imagine what it is like to spend days trapped in a small, inadequate apartment, worrying about the source of our next meal. To be elderly, blind, or disabled in such conditions makes the situation even more desperate.

Employers are by no means eager to hire these people. Special education for the blind and disabled is costly. The aged, blind, and disabled often lead isolated lives, battling hunger, illness, and loneliness. It seems reprehensible that their Government will not take better care of them.

SSI recipients spend the bulk of their income on food and rent. We are all aware of food prices these days: families accustomed to steak and roast beef are "dining" on hamburger. So what is to become of those who are accustomed to hamburger? Even that is beyond their grasp; millions of elderly Americans are slowly starving to death. Life in this land of opportunity becomes a bleak hardship for so many of those who labored to make it strong.

The President is willing to pour millions of the taxpayers' dollars into nuclear aid for Egypt. He is willing to pay farmers not to grow much needed crops. He gladly sells wheat to Russia while pursuing détente, but at the same time he insists on billions for defense research to protect us from new-found friends. But he impounds funds for domestic causes, and dismantles agencies whose purpose was to aid the average people of this Nation.

I hope that you, my colleagues, will steadfastly follow the goals of such programs as SSI, expanding them, strengthening them, and making them a reality for those who face adversity at every level of their existences. Food stamps for SSI recipient is one small step; I hope there are many more.

I urge your firm support for this measure.

EAST CHICAGO BRANCH OF LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY, INC.

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania is but one of several nations, including Latvia, Estonia, and others of the Baltic group, which enjoyed free and independ-

ent government until enslaved by the Soviet Communist tyranny.

Millions of citizens of Lithuanian descent throughout our Nation and the free world are continuing to fight so that, some day in the near future, free and independent government will be restored to the citizens of these enslaved nations.

Mr. Speaker, I insert with my remarks a letter from the Lithuanian American Community of East Chicago, incorporating unanimous resolutions adopted by that branch of the Lithuanian American Community, Inc.:

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY
OF EAST CHICAGO, A BRANCH OF
LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY, INC.,

June 2, 1974.

HON. RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

On June 15, Lithuanian American will join with Latvians, Estonians throughout the free world in sad commemoration of the forcible annexation of Baltic States by the Soviet Union in 1940, and subsequently mass deportation to Siberian concentration camps.

Currently, the people of Lithuania are denied the right of national self-determination, suffer continual religious and political persecution, and are denied their basic human rights.

The Soviet Union is now seeking detente, as well as a Most Favored Nation Status with the United States. This desire on the part of the Soviet Union presents the United States with a unique opportunity to ease the plight of the peoples of Lithuania and other Captive Nations. That is the sense of the Congress that the United States delegation by the European Security Conference should not agree to the recognition of the Soviet Union annexation of Baltic States and insist that the following policy changes are made by the Soviet Union:

1. Lowering of excessive tariffs imposed on gifts to relatives and friends residing in the Baltic States.
2. Increase the current five-day tourist visas to Lithuania to a more reasonable limit.
3. Elimination of unreasonable travel restrictions on tourists to the Baltic States.
4. Provision for Lithuanians to immigrate to other countries as provided by the Charter of the United Nations signed by the Soviet Union.

We are seeking your assistance in the observance of June 15, and your remarks in support of this sad commemoration on the floor of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

PETER INDREIKA,
Chairman.
VYTAUTAS KALTUNAS,
Secretary.

LITHUANIAN NATIONALISM IS STRONG

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, for more than a generation the world has all but written off Lithuania. A plaything of the world's great powers, it was annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940, overrun by the Germans during World War II, and re-

taken by the Russians at the end of the war. Since then, Lithuania, along with neighboring Latvia and Estonia, according to Soviet propaganda has been totally incorporated into the U.S.S.R., and Moscow has made every effort to stamp out any lingering traces of Lithuanian nationalism. But although the Kremlin has sent thousands of Lithuanian intellectuals into Siberian exile, continuously persecuted the people of Lithuania both religiously and politically, it has never succeeded in stifling the nationalistic spirit of this proud Baltic State.

Saturday, June 16 marks the anniversary of the forcible annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union in 1940 and the subsequent mass deportations and persecutions. This is an appropriate time to reaffirm the U.S. position on this most outrageous crime against humanity and justice. In the words of then Acting Secretary of State Grew on March 4, 1945:

The Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania shall be officially regarded by the United States as independent states, even though they were absorbed by the Soviet Union during the war.

The United States should adopt an official policy for the current European Security Conference in accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 394 submitted during the first session of the 93d Congress and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

Now, therefore, let it be resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) that it is the sense of Congress that the United States Delegation to the European Security Conference should not agree to the Union's annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and it should remain the policy of the United States not in any way to recognize the annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union.

We of the free world, who enjoy the blessings of freedom, have not forgotten those who languish—still—in the shadow of tyranny and oppression.

TRIBUTE TO E. B. STAHLMAN, JR.— A LIFETIME OF DEDICATION

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened to learn of the recent passing of my friend, Mr. E. B. Stahlman, Jr., of Nashville, Tenn., a distinguished journalist, newspaper executive, civic leader, and champion of many worthy causes and endeavors in Nashville and middle Tennessee.

Mr. Stahlman was a member of the famed Stahlman publishing family—his grandfather, Maj. Edward Bushrod Stahlman, was publisher of the Nashville Banner for 50 years. His father, the late Edward C. Stahlman, was the first State editor of the Banner. His brother, Comdr. James G. Stahlman, was owner and publisher of the Banner until his retirement in 1972.

Mr. E. B. Stahlman worked in many management capacities in the news, advertising, and management operations of the Banner.

His leadership in charities and public endeavors was outstanding. Over the years he worked with the Boy Scouts and was the prime mover in locating Boxwell Reservation on Old Hickory Lake for Boy Scout activities. He was a leader in the Red Cross, the chamber of commerce, Kiwanis International, the Salvation Army, and many other organizations in the public interest.

E. B. Stahlman, in addition, was just a great guy—he was loved by his many friends, he was unselfish, comfortable to be with, and highly respected and regarded by all who knew him.

I want to take this means of extending to Mrs. Stahlman and other members of the family this expression of my deepest and most sincere sympathy in their loss and bereavement. My wife Ann joins me in these sentiments.

The Nashville Banner and the Tennessean in recent editorials praised the life and accomplishments of Mr. Stahlman, and because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people, I place these editorials in the RECORD:

[From the Tennessean]

MR. STAHLMAN GAVE MUCH

Mr. E. B. Stahlman, Jr., former executive vice president and co-publisher of the Nashville Banner, is dead at the age of 76.

Mr. Stahlman was a member of a long-time Nashville newspaper family. His grandfather, Maj. Edward Bushrod Stahlman was published of the Banner for nearly 50 years. His father, the late Edward C. Stahlman, was the newspaper's first state editor. And his brother, Mr. James G. Stahlman, was owner and publisher of the paper until June 1, 1972.

Mr. Stahlman himself had served the Banner in various capacities in news, advertising and management. He had also been active in numerous civic and charitable organizations in the community, especially in Boy Scout work.

He will long be remembered for his contributions to journalism and to civic and cultural life of the community.

[From the Nashville Banner]

E. B. STAHLMAN, JR.: A LIFETIME FILLED
WITH DEDICATION

The death Wednesday of E. B. Stahlman Jr. was the final chapter in a life of devotion and dedication to his chosen field of journalism, to the community in which he was such a driving force and to the young people who were the beneficiaries of so much of his tireless effort.

His colleagues in journalism have attested to his professional stature with distinctions and responsibilities, attaining the position of executive vice president and co-publisher of The Banner.

Through the deep conviction that strong minds and strong bodies work together to build a better world, Mr. Stahlman's love of athletics and sports was manifest by his unflinching dedication to The Banner's Banquet of Champions, which he served as master of ceremonies in honoring sports achievement.

And no man contributed more to the progress of the Boy Scout movement as did E. B. Stahlman Jr. Next to journalism itself, Boy Scouts were the foremost object of his energies.

Countless young men in what is now the Middle Tennessee Council of Boy Scouts have benefited from that labor of love. Generations to come will share in that fulfillment of Mr. Stahlman's vision, particularly his role in the fruition of the Boxwell Reservation.

His distinguished service to boyhood was rooted in his belief that the essentials of character-building lay in influences basic to physical, mental and moral strength.

To all of these efforts he gave freely and unselfishly of his time and effort, of his support, of his leadership.

E. B. Stahlman Jr. was one who could be called a Southern gentleman, a man of culture, ready wit and lasting friendships.

His acts of kindness, the constructive enterprises of which he made himself such a vital part and the continuing evidence of his contributions will remain for generations.

It can be justly said that the world was left abundantly better than E. B. Stahlman Jr. found it.

FORCIBLE ANNEXATION OF LITHUANIA

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with many of my colleagues on this occasion to note the 34th anniversary on June 15 of the annexation by force of the free nation of Lithuania by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

I am certain that the Government of the Soviet Union is not quite as uncomfortable about this observance in the U.S. Congress as it is about the silent commemoration in the minds and hearts of the people of Lithuania. As we and the rest of the world well know, the residents of that small Baltic country have not been altogether mute or docile during these past 34 years. In fact, they have been among the most vociferous of all of those who have sought to remind the Russians that their nationalism lives.

With the desire for détente obviously an important consideration for the Soviet leadership, the world has seen some amelioration of practices within the U.S.S.R. which had drawn unfavorable international publicity. That there should be a lessening of tension between the United States and the Soviet Union clearly is in the best interests of the entire globe. I fervently hope that progress in this area can continue so that perhaps one day mankind can eliminate war as a means of attempting to effect national policy.

But to advocate détente by no means implies that one agrees to avert his gaze from the so-called "captive nations" and the inescapable reality of their continued dominance by the U.S.S.R. Nor does the support of détente mean that one must recognize the annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States by the Russians.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be among those Members of the House marking this sad anniversary of the forcible annexation of Lithuania. May she

one day be restored to the company of the free nations of the world.

EDUCATIONAL EQUITY—WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I introduce in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for this day the text of a speech delivered by our colleague, Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK, the gentlewoman from the State of Hawaii, to the American Association of University Women on May 10, 1974.

I commend this speech to all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, the Senate, and all thinking Americans. It succinctly puts the dilemma of women in America today.

It outlines the battle women are fighting to achieve real equality with men in our society. It is a cry for action by women to activity work to attain their goals. It sets forth the things that need doing.

How ironical it is that the Declaration of Independence pronounces equality for all, yet now, nearly 200 years later, a majority of our population, namely women, are treated as less than equal to us, the minority of men.

Congresswoman MINK cogently sets out the action plan to change all that.

The speech follows:

EDUCATIONAL EQUITY—WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

(Speech by Representative PATSY T. MINK)

I appreciate the opportunity to participate in your conference. I realize that the invitation to me was to be the opening speaker, but due to my schedule I was unable to get here earlier. You are already well into the conference so I'm afraid that much of what I had prepared to say here is going to be redundant. A good deal of the ground, I'm sure you've already been challenged to cover by prior speakers or have already covered in the numerous workshops and other discussion groups you have had. But I do appreciate your inviting me even though I could not make it here yesterday.

The only day that we on the Hill can count on to have for ourselves is Friday, usually, and I guess by next month that will even be off as we'll have to have floor sessions on Friday. To further complicate things, in an election year we have to go home a good deal. Except for this weekend, I don't believe I'll be in Washington any weekend until the 13th of July.

So you can understand and appreciate some of the real difficulties and pressures that we have to endure while serving our constituents and also meeting what we consider to be our national responsibility.

Someone just remarked to me what a great loss it's going to be to the women of America that three of our most senior women members of the House of Representatives have decided to retire and not return to the Hill next year. I'm sure you'll agree that this is going to be an enormous loss to all of us.

Perhaps some of you will be inspired and challenged by this conference and decide to run for office this fall. We certainly need you! I don't know how many women exactly are running for Congress and perhaps most of the deadlines for filing have already ex-

pired. The last count I saw at a recent National Womens Political Caucus Meeting indicated that only some 33 women, at least on the Democratic side, have filed to run for the U.S. House, aside from the incumbents. Even if they all succeed we will still be a very small minority in the national legislature.

I think that really typifies what we're all up against, that in so many ways we have so little to say even today in the policy arenas that really count! This is why in our individual capacity, in whatever professional roles and other positions of responsibility that we may occupy, we simply have to stand our ground and make our own headway.

I know that a lot of people are relying upon the Equal Rights Amendment to make some fantastic revolutionary changes in people's attitudes in our country. While it has not yet been ratified, I'm sure most of us hope that it soon will be, it has always been my contention that even if it is ratified, it's not going to solve the basic problems that women face in our country today. What we face are social attitudes and ingrained stereotypes that both men and women have been born and reared to assume are the self-evident traditional ways in which human beings perform. This is the obstacle for any sort of equity, whether it be in education per se or whether it be in a profession or whether it be in politics or in all of the arenas in which men and women compete. The way the newspaper writers and the magazine editors and those who are more or less the leaders of public opinion write about women's lib and the women's movement, you would think we were already there. Those of us who are in politics have to contend with this kind attitude in the press. In some ways it is a form of ridicule, or derision, and this again, is one of the obstacles we face.

As I began to work in this field consciously (of course, unconsciously, I guess I was always in it) I began to realize my personal responsibility in this fight for equality.

The first lesson I decided I had to learn was that there was absolutely nothing to be gained by joining in any kind of qualified acceptance of the women's movement. I have hundreds, if not thousands of letters from women who write to me about their individual problems in education or their profession. I would say 90% will start out by saying, "I am not a member of the women's lib". I find that extremely offensive and I hope that you do also. If we adopt a superior attitude and reject people who are active in a total sense because we do not approve of some of their actions, we're not really in it at all! If we can't comprehend the fact that we are all in this together, and that everybody is chipping away at this business of discrimination in whatever way they can, then we're never going to make it! It seems to me that one of the first things that we have to do is to get rid of this apology "I am not a member of thus and thus". We are all members of a movement interested in equality and interested in obtaining equity for human beings and that, I think, is the only important thing. I can't help but feel that we are really yet somewhat down the road to really accomplishing changes in societal attitudes. Even within ourselves and women in general have not yet come to recognize or accept these changes.

Despite what the media is saying and despite how they are attempting to put us down by saying we have accomplished too much, too quickly, we should be realistic in appraising where we are today and realize how far we have still to go.

For many years the theory that we have all had to contend with in our society was that our country, our national resources, our governmental investments had to produce

some positive gain and thus placed qualifications on how we should invest our resources, our time, our assets and our money. There was always the implication that because we needed to qualify this input in terms of our country that only those things that were worthwhile that made men able to perform and to be the breadwinners and to sustain our society, only these things were of importance.

We find, I think, in a good deal of our reading, this kind of concept being accepted by historians, political scientists, economists, educators and administrators alike. They really never appreciated or seemed to understand the nation of citizens being equal and men and women alike being able to make a contribution. Economists remark that formal education increases lifetime earnings and this factor has brought about the human investment revolution in economic thought. We are constantly reminded about this way in which human value was to be assessed and in terms of return of investment and what this means to society. Much of our past literature and past analysis dwells on the fact that women were simply consumers and that any investment society made in us was simply a supplement, an unprofitable form of investment. They explained their so-called scientific conclusions on the basis that women leave the labor force to be married, to have children, and quite likely if they do return to the economy to be producers and to contribute earnings, they can only do so after a second resource investment needed to update their fields to make them relevant.

This concept of investment as one of the conditions in evaluating the importance and necessity of education has complicated an open attitude toward women in education. As educators, we must take issue with this concept and discredit it as a theory with any credibility. The rate of return for women's education has enormous direct economic benefit which can be measured. Women have not only proven their capacity to retain jobs and to sustain themselves in careers but they continue throughout their lifetime to return to society an enormous amount of value that they have received because of their educational experience, not only in the family situation but in terms of their personal endeavors. As educators, this is one theory or notion that we must work at, assiduously, to destroy, otherwise, it will continue to hold us down and deprive us of real equality.

There was a survey which was reported in the Review of Economics and Statistics recently which says that the rate of return of Americans with four years of college reveal that women earn higher rates of return than do men by at least 1.5%. Another survey by the American Council on Education indicates that 81% of women with doctorates work full time and that 79% of that number had not interrupted their career in the ten years after they received their degree. A more recent Council on education study indicates that only 20% of women faculty members have ever interrupted their careers for more than a year as compared to 25% of the men on the faculty. These are the real facts regarding women in the professions which have not been reported, have not been generally known or spoken about in our conferences and discussions. If men are going to continue to make judgments based upon the idea of return which they say is required in order for society to sustain itself, then we have the statistics to bear out our demand for an equal investment in our education and in our educational opportunities. The Carnegie Commission Report, which I'm sure all of you have read, also supports this conclusion quite dramatically and, of course,

we all agree with their account that women are the largest untapped source of superior intelligence in America. That I think is enough to launch us, if we need to be launched in any direction.

President Johnson and a good many of our national leaders have talked about the underutilization of women, and about the importance of women being given greater opportunities. We have heard an awful lot of lip service about our plight by a good number of people. We have to look to performance. We have to measure what these leaders have really done. I think that all of us will have to conclude that in spite of all the well-meaning, well-intended phrases and statements, that we simply have not been given the kinds of responsibilities and challenges and policy promotions I believe we deserve. Women occupy nearly half of the work force of America. That's all we are, the work force. We simply have not been given the opportunities for leadership and responsibility. That, I think is really the nuts and bolts of any conference of university women. How are we going to be able to challenge the leadership of this country, and the leadership of our educational institutions, first of all, to recognize our talents, our abilities, our training and to give us our share of responsibilities in administration and other positions of responsibility. That's really where we are still at. Despite the results of the poll I saw the other day that Americans have, next to the military, the highest regard for colleges and universities, I'm afraid that they, the colleges and universities, have not performed in accordance to this public stature because they have failed to recognize their responsibilities with regard to equality.

There are hundreds of cases filed to prove this point. They have not given women equal opportunities to compete for graduate fellowships, appointments to responsible faculty positions, high tenured positions as full professors or associate professors or given leadership in project applications for federal funds or in other ways recognized their stature on campus. Until we do so, there is no way that we're going to really be able to motivate the undergraduate women to believe that they have a chance in our society. They only have to look at their campuses to realize how tough it is and how frustrating it must be for so many women who have gone so far in graduate education and yet not to have the opportunities and challenges which they're entitled to enjoy on these campuses.

Some critics say that the women's movement has concentrated too heavily at this higher upper middle class arena of contests on colleges and have contested its real commitment to equality. I contend that that's where we've really got to strike out first. We're hitting at the intellectual leadership of our country. If we can't make them realize what they've done to subjugate and destroy self-respect and self-motivation in half the people in this country then there's not much hope for the rest of society. This is why the colleges and universities are key to an effort on the part of women to make society in its institutional mind come to accept some of these notions of equality.

The work of course, is very difficult. We have in all levels of our educational system all kinds of insidious ways in which we perpetrate the notion of the inferior female. We don't have to open very many textbooks in the early years of our education, even today, and not realize that these stereotypes still exist. In hearings held on the Women's Equity Education Act we saw that most elementary readers portrayed the women's role only as a mother, housekeeper, nurse, teacher and nothing else. All the other ways in which human life has characterized for the child

was through the eyes of a young man or a young boy or a male individual. This epitomizes what is wrong with the whole system.

Even the Office of Education, as sensitized as you might think that office would be because of all the agitation in the women's movement, put out a film a few years ago on career education where the only picture of women in the entire half hour film were sitting at a typewriter. It's outrageous but these things continue to occur and while we can pass out blame and throw stones at the people who edited such trash, it's not going to do any good. What we have to do is look at the system that allows these things to be created in the first place. Why is it that 80% of our teachers who happen to be women aren't sensitized to this invidious discrimination? Why can't we count on them to be able to counteract it in their teaching?

Why do they give out all this stuff without being troubled in their own minds? Do we really blame the textbook writers? Don't we have to cast some responsibility on the teaching profession? So I think it's not a case of trying to blame any particular office or institution or group of people in our society. We must awaken more people to the whole matter of discrimination and understand why society perpetuates it?

My own State, as liberal as we pretend to be in so many ways, is really backward in this whole field. We have only a few principals in our elementary and secondary schools who are women and yet the vast majority of the professionals in the educational system are women. We're only now beginning to make waves and a task force has been organized to try to solve this problem. I don't know how far we're going to get. I think the only dean we have at our university is the dean of the school of nursing which is typical of most campuses or maybe it's even worse in others where I've heard that the only dean is the dean of women. Here again, I think that the women's groups on these campuses have made a great effort to focus on this problem. Some 500 cases are pending before various agencies of the federal government and in the courts as well to try to do something about this deplorable situation.

The thing that distresses me most, I guess, is that the Carnegie Commission, for all the wonderful things that it brought to light ended up by saying that we have to wait until the year 2000 before anything can be expected to happen and that's intolerable! I hope we're all agreed that we will simply not accept that kind of a time table for change in America. We simply have to make it possible for the current generation of students in our schools to have a better chance at professional opportunities. And what's happening in our elementary and secondary schools is really terribly important because if they come out of this system the same as we all did it's going to take them just as long to recognize their worth and capabilities and to be motivated to take the kinds of courses of instruction that will lead them somewhere.

I think this is probably the most difficult part of it all. Even the counselors we have in our high schools need to go back to college to be sensitized because they're the ones that are constantly saying, "Oh, you ought to be a nurse, you ought to be a social worker" without really opening up all the possibilities to the child, or without looking at the child as a girl child or a boy child. This, of course, will take an enormous amount of discipline and sensitizing, so we have a problem there in itself.

So, as I review all these things in my mind, recognizing the tremendous effort that went into the Equal Rights Amendment with 200 organizations that got behind it and made the Congress finally realize that we were peo-

ple entitled to equal protection under our own Constitution, that that's not enough. We've got to do a great deal more. The real nub of the revolution is going to be in education and this is the basis for my introduction of the Women's Educational Equity Act. I believe that by having the federal government supporting this concept of equity and accepting education as being a key to ending discrimination, we can achieve the basic fundamental changes which are needed. We have had passed landmark legislation. Some like Title 9 of the Education Amendments of 1972 still have not been promulgated after 2 years. We're still waiting. So many things that we've been trying to do require that we wait for somebody else's permission.

Here's a chance for us to do something on our own and I'm very hopeful that the Women's Educational Equity Act will be passed. It has been added to the 1974 Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments bill in the Senate by Senator Mondale who co-sponsored my bill last year. It will be up on the floor next week for debate as an amendment to that omnibus piece of legislation. We are very optimistic that it will be left in the bill. Nobody dare do anything to remove it. We do have a threat, however, of someone who feels we haven't gone far enough. Senator Percy has his own notions about how the Women's Equity legislation can be improved and has offered his own bill to extend certain provisions and make further amendments to the Higher Education Act and Vocational Education Act. His bill also goes into the business of textbook revision. While I agree with all of the provisions in Senator Percy's legislation, which he is now seeking to add to my bill, it seems to me that his offering it will endanger the chances for enactment of the Mondale Amendment.

Therefore, we are working very hard to persuade Senator Percy to wait until later on in the year when the Vocational Education Amendment comes up and are urging him to offer his bill at that time. He will have an opportunity then all on his own to champion the cause of womanhood and add his amendment at that time. So, anything you can do to persuade the Senator that this is what he should be doing to help us, I hope you will do in the next 72 hours or so that we have before the debate ends in the Senate. I'm sure that if the Mondale Amendment is retained by the Senate that we will have no difficulty in the conference of the House and the Senate to retain it and then we will be well on our way. We took a calculated risk actually in going this route and not coming out all by ourselves with just our bill with our number on it. One of the principle objectives I had in sponsoring my legislation was not to just get a bill passed that nobody could vote against but never get any money for, but it was also to try to focus attention on this issue. So by going the route of having it added on as an amendment to another bill, of course, we are losing that aspect of greater visibility, greater debate and discussion.

But so many women's organizations were anxious to see the bill become law now and they pledge to work hard for funding. They wanted to get going with this business and were tired of simply having an issue to discuss. I agreed, so the strategy was developed to have Senator Mondale offer this amendment. Assuming that we will be successful in retaining it and it will become part of the law, we have to remember that since the 1972 Education Amendments passed two years have already gone by and we're still waiting for the executive branch to take action on Title 9. We don't want to make the mistake of sitting back and saying, "a ha, we've gotten our bill enacted into law, isn't that tremendous!"

Unless we continue to clamor nothing will happen and every budget will come out of the White House subsequently with no funding, no recognition of this new program that we have added to the national agenda. So, what is required is an even greater if not more intensive kind of lobbying to make sure that the funding which this bill calls for will actually be requested by the Administration and then approved by the Congress.

I'm sure that most of you have had a chance to read through the bill. You know that it authorizes the Secretary of HEW to make grants, to conduct special educational programs and activities at various levels of our educational enterprise, pre-school, elementary, secondary and at the university. There is an emphasis to make sure that we don't leave out the black women and the women of the lower-income work situations. One of the criticisms that was made at one of the hearings I conducted on my bill was registered by a representative of a black women's organization who said that they looked upon the bill as being limited to the white middle-class college educated women. We have tried to make sure that this is not the way in which the emphasis of the bill is drawn. We are looking towards funding of projects that will take a look at textbooks and make curriculum revisions throughout the system.

We are not only talking about elementary textbooks and readers and primers but we're also talking about basic re-writing of high school, college textbooks, of history texts, to make sure there is a balanced presentation of women's contributions to America and to the world, and not only an emphasis on the male who drove the covered wagon to greater progress. We're talking about training programs for adults in our society, not just institutionalized programs but community related activities and we're talking about training and service programs for counselors. We're talking about planning and developing women's resource centers. We're talking about the 600 women's studies programs already in existence in various colleges and universities across our country, but they need a tremendous amount of help.

Our University of Hawaii was one of the first to organize a women's study center and it got a great deal of support initially. Today we're down to only one person left in the center at half staff salary. This is probably what is happening in many of the women's programs in other universities. We need to keep this program as a permanent activity on our college campuses. I'm hoping that with the passage of this bill, it will stimulate other kinds of funding for teacher training programs and that we will see new materials developed in our teachers' colleges. This is, of course, a very important part of the whole business of sensitizing the people.

I hope that all of you will assist in your respective capacities, as heads of various organizations and institutions and administrators of college campuses and continue your work in this whole field of educational equity. Whenever a cause needs to be championed on your campus affecting one woman or a collection of women or a department or whatever, I hope that you will not shy away, or make undue requirements of worth and merit before you lend your name to the defense of equality. I think all of us have an enormous role to play, whether it is fighting for a sports scholarship at your university, even though you don't care a thing about sports, or whatever the cause, champion it. This is a very important part of your role. Whenever there is an opportunity for women and women's organizations to band together to elevate the notion of equality, whatever that field of endeavor might

be, in the sciences or math or in medicine or in the legal profession or in sports or in any kind of human endeavor, I think that this is our unique challenge and our unique responsibility.

The legislation that we're dealing with is simply to support this but without the involvement of human beings throughout our society to give this some life and breath and momentum and energy, nothing we do in the Congress is going to make any difference. I'm very much encouraged by the leadership of the AAUW. I know that all of you have been terribly excited and encouraged by your conference here. I know that in the Congress there's no one I have met yet who dared to speak out against equality for women, so in that sense our cause has made it but we have a long way to go to actually achieve it for ourselves. I congratulate all of you for your efforts. Thank you very much.

11500 BANANAS ON PIKE'S PEAK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have said that H.R. 11500, the bill to hound surface mining out of existence, is as crazy as trying to raise bananas on Pike's Peak. It is worse than that. It is as crazy as trying to raise half a billion dollars on Wall Street in a 30-year loan to finance a 5-year project.

That is pretty crazy. But this misbegotten bill would limit surface mining permits to a 5-year term. Then the operator has to go back to square 1 and make a new application, with no assurance that his permit will be renewed.

So here we are in an energy crisis, and this Congress is in the process of voting billions of dollars to get us out of it. One of the most promising technologies this money will develop is a better means to make synthetic gas from coal. But according to all the studies, this process will best be used on strip mined coal in the West.

A gasification plant and its coal mine will cost more than \$500 million, and will have a life of 20 to 30 years. It will also take that long to pay it off, for the money will have to be borrowed from investors. If any Member of this House knows a banker who will lend money for 30 years on a plant that they may be put out of business in 5 years, please give me his name. I want to talk to him about a 30-year loan on a new car.

But I do not think there is any banker that crazy. Only the Congress is, if we pass H.R. 11500 with such a cockeyed provision in it. But there is an alternative. It is to substitute H.R. 12898, a good bill that makes sense to American industry, and to the bankers and investors, and at the same time strictly enforces the reclamation of mined land.

SAD ANNIVERSARY FOR LITHUANIA

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, June 15 was a sad anniversary for the peace-loving people of Lithuania. This day marked the 34th anniversary of the forceful annexation of this freedom-starved nation by the Soviet Union.

Lithuanian-Americans and Lithuanians all over the world observed this occasion not with joy, but with sorrow; for it was on this day in 1940 when Lithuania was denied the right of national self-determination as well as their basic human rights, which was followed by mass deportation of thousands of Lithuanians to Siberian concentration camps.

Since then the Soviet Union has continued its suppressive activities through religious and political persecution, denial of their basic rights and subjecting the Lithuanian people to constant harsh and inhuman treatment. The Soviet oppressors, however, have found that the courageous spirit of the Lithuanian people cannot be suppressed and that their determination for their set goal of self-recognition and freedom is deep-rooted and long-lasting.

The Soviet Union is now seeking détente, as well as the most-favored-nation status in trade relations with the United States. This desire on the part of the Soviet Union presents the United States with a unique opportunity to ease the plight of Lithuania and those of the other captive nations which are still controlled by alien governments contrary to the desires of the peoples of these captive nations.

The aim of détente is the wish of every nation. To live in peace, free to develop and build one's own future so that a nation's people can benefit from the blessings of this Earth, is a hope deep in the heart of every individual human being. It should be firmly impressed on the Soviet Union that what they want for themselves, is something that they must be willing to grant to others.

I am proud to insert the full text of House Concurrent Resolution 394 into the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 394

Whereas the three Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been illegally occupied by the Soviet Union since World War II; and

Whereas the Soviet Union will attempt to obtain recognition by the European Security Conference of its annexation of these nations; and

Whereas the United States delegation to the European Security Conference should not agree to the recognition of the forcible conquest of these nations by the Soviet Union; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate Concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States delegation to the European Security Conference should not agree to the recognition by the European Security Conference of the Soviet Union's annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and

Lithuania and it should remain the policy of the United States not to recognize in any way the annexation of the Baltic nations by the Soviet Union.

This Congress should take constructive action in making certain that the U.S. delegation to the European Security Conference does not agree to the recognition by the European Security Conference of the Soviet Union's annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and it should be the policy of the United States not to recognize in any way the annexation of the Baltic Nations by the Soviet Union.

While steadfastly maintaining the U.S. policy of nonrecognition of the forceful incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, the United States should insist that certain policy changes are made by the Soviet Union. Among these changes are the lowering of excessive tariffs imposed on gifts to relatives and friends residing in the Baltic States. An increase in the current 5-day tourist visa to Lithuania to a more reasonable limit. The elimination of unreasonable travel restrictions on tourists to Lithuania. And, finally, provision for Lithuanians to immigrate to other countries as provided by the Charter of the United Nations signed by the Soviet Union.

In spite of the sadness of this day, we should continue to live in the knowledge that freedom cannot be forever denied to any people or nation that fervently desires it as part of their daily lives in a community of nations.

This knowledge gives us hope and confidence, that again, and hopefully in the near future, the Lithuanian people will be recognized as a nation, free to celebrate its own heritage, free to determine their own future. On this special occasion it is most fitting that we publicly pledge our cooperation until the full freedom of the Lithuanian people is achieved.

MRS. ANNAMARIE BARROS—1973-74
PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN
SOCIETY FOR MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to call your attention to the fact that one of my constituents, Mrs. Annamaria Barros from Los Gatos, Calif., has served with distinction as 1973-74 president of the American Society for Medical Technology—ASMT.

ASMT is a national, professional organization with over 20,000 members engaged in the practice of clinical laboratory science. The society has had a year marked with tremendous progress and achievement under the leadership of Mrs. Barros. She will next serve ASMT for 1 year as past president.

Climaxing her year in office, Mrs. Barros will preside over the annual meeting

in New Orleans, La., June 23-28. The theme for this year's annual meeting, "Pro Bono Publico"—for the good of the public—represents the ever-present goal of the society and Mrs. Barros' term in office.

Currently administrative assistant for public relations and marketing at Laboratory Services in San Jose, Calif., Mrs. Barros began her year as president with numerous achievements behind her. In 1969, she was awarded the Medical Technologist of the Year Award by the California Society of Medical Technologists—CSMT—and in 1973, ASMT voted her the Administrative Technologist of the Year.

She has been elected to various important society positions including president, president-elect, chairman of both the nominations committee and the personnel relations committee. She has also held membership to the board of directors, the President's Council, as well as several committees.

Additionally, Mrs. Barros has also been extremely active and involved for many years in her constituent societies; has been CSMT president, president-elect, and member of its board of directors, as well as several committees.

Mrs. Barros has and still does administer her expertise to many professional conferences, seminars, and workshops which she conducts nationwide. She was a discussion leader at the 1970 annual conference of the Health Professions Council in San Francisco; the ASMT representative and panelist at the National Health Forum in San Francisco, 1971; and cochairman and panelist at the regional workshop on the Organization and Operation of AMA-Approved Schools of Medical Technology, 1962; to name only a few. Many of her papers have been published, the latest being "Continuing Education—Necessary for the Future" which was published in the November/December 1973 issue of Cadence.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will join me in commending Mrs. Barros for the outstanding leadership she has demonstrated to both her profession and the entire field of allied health during her term as president of ASMT, and trust she will continue to play an important role in the future.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN
A. BLATNIK OF MINNESOTA

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as our colleague, and friend, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, has announced his intention to retire from the Congress, certainly it was fitting and appropriate that his colleagues paid tributes to him as they unveiled his portrait as chairman of the House Committee on Public Works in ceremonies at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

It was my privilege to attend the ceremonies in the Kennedy Center and to hear the remarks by Representative ROBERT JONES; Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY; Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works; and Senator WILLIAM HARSHA, concerning the outstanding record of public service which JOHN BLATNIK leaves the House as his monument and legacy of achievement in the public interest.

JOHN BLATNIK, in addition to his great competence and skill as a legislator, is a friend and classmate—we came to Congress at the same time, and I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to JOHN BLATNIK. He is a great legislator—a great Congressman—and he has served his district, State, and Nation faithfully and well and with great distinction.

JOHN A. BLATNIK was first elected to Congress in 1946, with a mandate to preserve and enhance the quality of life in northeastern Minnesota. That mandate has been fulfilled not only in his district, but in large part throughout the Nation.

Mr. BLATNIK has served on the House Committee on Public Works since 1946 and became its chairman in 1971.

He wrote the pioneering Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956, the Nation's first permanent pollution abatement program, which has become the most comprehensive and progressive environmental protection program in America.

To meet the Nation's growing transportation and communication needs, he coauthored the Interstate Highway program, and chaired the investigative subcommittee that oversaw construction of this largest public works undertaking in the history of the world.

Concerned about the maldistribution of population and economic activity, Mr. BLATNIK authored the Area Redevelopment Act, the accelerated public works program, and combined them into the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, which provides Federal seed money for communities lagging behind the Nation's overall growth rates.

He coauthored the legislation which created the St. Lawrence Seaway, bringing the trade routes of the world directly into the heartland of America; and the legislation creating Voyageurs National Park, the Nation's 36th national park, on Minnesota's Canadian border.

Congressman BLATNIK, a chemistry teacher by profession, became in 1941 the youngest State senator ever elected to the Minnesota Legislature. During World War II, he served 3½ years in the Army Air Corps Intelligence, including almost a year behind enemy lines in Yugoslavia, as a member of the OSS.

He returned from the war to become the first member of Minnesota's newly formed Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party to be elected to the National Legislature, where he has devoted his career to environmental protection and natural resources use and conservation; community facilities and development; and improved services for the elderly, increased opportunity for young people, vocational training and veterans' programs.

He has served this Nation well.

JOHN BLATNIK will be greatly missed

in the Congress but we wish him the very best of good luck and success in his richly deserved retirement from public service.

A CONSTITUENT PRAISES REPRESENTATIVE ARCHER

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasures of serving in the U.S. House of Representatives is the contact with constituents, both contacts directly with people and contacts through correspondence. A letter from a constituent can be a true inspiration to a Member of Congress. I would like to share with my fellow Members of the House a letter received by a constituent of a colleague of ours, BILL ARCHER of Texas. It is from Richard Colquitt, a recent graduate of Memorial High School in Houston, Tex.

This communication is significant in two ways. First, it praises the great work being accomplished by Representative ARCHER and those of use who have worked with this distinguished Texan can readily join in this praise for his diligence and dedication in performing his job as a Member of Congress. Second, it reflects some thoughtful and perceptive views on government, an insight into the leading issues facing our Nation, and a real concern for the future and direction of this country. If this letter is typical of our younger generation, we need not worry about our future.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ARCHER: I have just received your letter congratulating me on my graduation. I would like to take this time to thank you for that and to relay some of my views concerning some vital questions.

I attend Memorial High School and heard you speak to my government class. Also I made a trip with Close-Up, having heard you speak at a breakfast. At both these occasions I was very impressed by your honesty. Your answers were straight forward and logical. Let me say that I agree totally with your position on the possible impeachment. I don't see how people in and out of our government can come to a judgment on Mr. Nixon's guilt or innocence without the facts. I know we have some of the facts but we don't have all of them. Let me say I have great confidence in the Judiciary Committee.

As a student of government I am greatly interested in the action of Congress. The one great problem which I see growing in America is the increasing size and control of the federal government and the increasing move to what I consider socialism. Our federal government today seems to have its hand into everything. I believe the states should be the key governing body in this republic. Certainly we need a strong central government. But I really don't think our founding fathers ever intended for the federal government to seize this much power. To be honest with you Mr. Archer, I am afraid that this country is going down the drain, not because of Watergate but because of the increasing size of the federal government. I believe that the bigger the government gets the smaller the citizen gets. It appears to me that the federal government is getting unbelievable control.

The EEOC, from my understanding, is dictating to people who they can hire (because of supposed racial and sexual discrimi-

nation) and who they can't. I say that the federal government (or any government body for that matter) has no right to say who one can hire and who one cannot. Also new guidelines by the HEW concerning the funding of athletic departments is frightening. Saying that a college must spend the same amount of money on men's and women's athletic programs is ridiculous. It seems to me that these "federal guidelines" are out of hand. Whatever happened to states' rights? Whatever happened to the Constitution?

I realize you probably hear my complaints from many constituents. I just pray that the American people wake up before it is too late.

The main reason I am writing you is to voice my opinion concerning public financing of campaigns. I feel I know your views on this issue and completely agree with them. Public financing would do two terrible things in my opinion. One, it would increase our deficit spending and our national debt. Two, it would lead to further our path toward socialism. Campaign reform is needed. But heaven forbid this.

I would like to know if you think that this move will be passed by Congress. While I was in Washington, Senator Baker told me he was going to fight with all he had to stop it but that he wasn't sure he could. I would like to know how you feel about this.

My future plans are to attend the University of Texas at Austin and to major in political science. I would like to go on to law school. Hopefully someday I will get an opportunity to hold a public office like yours. I realize a lot can happen over the next seven years but these are my plans. Having an honest man like you in public office is an incentive to me. I would like to thank you for coming to Memorial to speak. Mr. Archer, you have my support and best wishes for November.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD COLQUITT.

SAVING THE CHESAPEAKE BAY—PART IV

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting in the RECORD the fourth and last installment in a series of articles on the future of the Chesapeake Bay written by Woody West, of the Washington Star-News.

In this article, Mr. West notes the somewhat different attitudes which have marked environmental legislation affecting the bay enacted in the two States which dominate control of the bay's waters, Maryland and Virginia. He notes that in the past 5 years, Maryland has passed an "impressive body of law" designed to preserve our environmental heritage, and in particular, the Chesapeake Bay. Virginia's record has been a little bit slower, he notes.

These differences in approach at once illustrate the need for establishing interstate cooperation in the development of the bay, and the difficulties involved in such an effort. But I have little doubt that the need for an interstate Chesapeake Bay compact is overwhelming, and in spite of differences regarding the details of such a compact, there is such general agreement that it is needed that along with myself, all of the members of the Virginia congressional delegation

joined with the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. DU PONT) and nearly all of the Members from Maryland to cosponsor House Joint Resolution 979 allowing the formation of such a compact. Unfortunately, the Judiciary Committee, to which the bill has been referred, has not yet seen fit to schedule hearings on the measure. But ignoring this legislation, and the forces which threaten the bay's future, can only be termed unwise. Mr. West quotes one scientist as saying:

We can be complacent only at our peril.

We cannot afford to be complacent much longer, a fact which I hope this series of articles will impress upon the members of the Judiciary Committee, and induce in them a willingness to act on this bill in the near future.

The text of the article follows:

IT'S NOT TOO LATE TO SAVE BAY FROM
DISASTER

(By Woody West)

Virginia and Maryland both look on the sweep of Chesapeake Bay with an intense proprietary gaze. Yet there is at least one philosophical difference in the perspective of the two states that will be significant in the future of the massive waterway.

"For the longest time, the Virginia government's general philosophy has been to remove itself from a great deal of involvement in local affairs, very much the Jeffersonian concept," observed Robert S. DeMauri, chief of Virginia's office of environmental services.

One result of this, in the Old Dominion, was that Virginia was the last Middle Atlantic state, for example, to pass a law to protect vital wetlands and marshes, the spawning ground and nursery of so many species of the Bay country's animal and plant life.

When it was passed, in 1972, it was not without strong opposition from local officials, and the statute is generally held to be a less rigorous law than Maryland's or Delaware's.

Said DeMauri, "The traditional criterion was simply the dollar value. We used to look at wetlands as waste and the quicker you could fill them in the better. But we're turning now to thinking of their productive value and it is involving quite a process of change."

DeMauri notes that there still is a prevalent attitude in Tidewater Virginia and the more rural counties generally that profoundly resents governmental efforts to manage the environment. "There's still a lot of the feeling that 'I own my land, and I'll do what I please with it,'" he says.

That fierce possessiveness is not absent in Maryland but it has not posed as bumpy an obstacle to a flurry of environmental legislation in the last five years—"an impressive body of laws," in the view of Dr. L. Eugene Cronin, director of the University of Maryland's Natural Resources Institute and one of the most respected Bay scientists.

In 1970, the Maryland General Assembly enacted its wetlands law after an eruption of concern over the thousands of acres that were being filled in, bulk-headed, and destroyed for agricultural use as well as for recreation and development.

That was followed by laws to control sedimentation and erosion and a powerplant siting law that is considered one of the most progressive in the nation. This law, which will be a major influence on where nuclear-powered generating plants will be built around the Maryland portion of the Bay, also levies a surcharge on the utility companies that is earmarked for research in environmental effects.

Geography and history account in part for this disparity in state action. Dr. William J. Hargis Jr., director of the Virginia Institute

of Marine Science in Gloucester, Va., notes that only about 30 of the state's 100 counties are intimately affected by the Bay and its tributaries.

"We're still more land than water-oriented," he says. "The thrust has continued toward the west in Virginia in that historical expansion that started in 1607."

There is ambiguity among scientists, conservationists and administrators around the Bay over the level of public consciousness.

"Mostly now," a government biologist said, "it's the 'bird and bunny' people, those active amateurs who join the groups and go to meetings and carry the brunt of the so-called citizen effort. They're good folks, but they're only a drop in the bucket of what's going to be essential for sound policy to come out of the legislatures."

A part of the difficulty in developing a sophisticated and effective public consciousness and action is one heard repeatedly: Mass urban living, high-rises obscuring horizon and concrete-blunting perception contribute to indifference or equanimity.

A sense of history and heritage is essential to develop the will to preserve and conserve.

There is a place, close to Washington, which is surpassingly conducive to this sense of time and place, past and present, man and Nature in a semblance of balance, Middleham Chapel sits on a gentle rise just off Route 4 in Calvert County about midway between Prince Frederick and Solomons.

"Founded in 1684 as a chapel of ease in Christ Church Parish and named for Middleham, Yorkshire, England," reads the gray historical marker at roadside.

"The site has been used for worship since the founding but the chapel was rebuilt in 1748. The bell, given by John Holdsworth, is dated 1699."

Dump trucks pound by the small chapel. Traffic is not heavy, by Washington standards, but Route 4 is the spinal column of the Southern Maryland county, and a stream of cars and pickups add their pistoned rumble to the flow of trucks.

Some of the headstones, small and unpretentious, that surround the steep-roofed chapel are as new as this decade. Others are nearly as old as the first tide of settlement in America. Wind, rain, the battering of years have obliterated inscription from many of the old markers but a finger still can trace 17th century memorials and many more from the 18th century. They are scattered among pines and some of the newer headstones are adorned with bouquets.

Family plots bear names synonymous with the history of Calvert County: Parran and Tall, Grover, Sollers, Somervell, Gray and Hunt and Tongue, a physical bond across the generations.

Over the door of the chapel, inset in gray brick among the red, is the date of the "new" chapel—1748—the proud signature of long-dead artisans.

Inside, a marble plaque on the south wall reads: "Near this place lieth the body of Mr. Alexander Parran, son and heir of John Parran of Baynton in the County of Oxon in England, Esq., who departed this life ye 30th day of Mary 1729, aged 52 years."

Black-bound hymnals are in the pews, used last Sunday, to be used again by descendants of Mr. Alexander Parran, Esq. A meeting of the Young Episcopal Churchmen is announced in the Chapel bulletin on a recent day, as well as a note that the Rector's Aid Society will be sponsoring a card party, 7:30 to 10:30 p.m., bridge and canasta.

A few miles south of the small chapel, with its poignant mixture of yesterday and today, workmen are swarming around the towering structure that this fall will be generating, by nuclear power, streams of electricity from Calvert Cliffs.

It can be argued that our ability to comprehend the link from Capt. John Smith's "fruitful and delightful" land to the fission at Calvert Cliffs may be essential for the

future of Chesapeake Bay, that will avoid the extreme possibility that is become little more than a waste sink for society's detritus.

Dr. Donald W. Pritchard, for a quarter of a century the director of the Chesapeake Bay Institute at Johns Hopkins University and now the institute's senior scientist, says: "We've lived in a time when we've had our cake and been able to eat it, too. We won't have that in the future."

There remains time, scientists feel, for social, political and environmental decisions to be made that will help to insure that the diverse and valuable resources of Chesapeake Bay can be protected from the avalanche of pressures that daily are growing around it. The Bay's resilience has provided that margin but, says one scientist, "We can be complacent only at our peril."

George Santayana, in "Character and Opinion in the United States," eloquently warned: "You may disregard your environment, you cannot escape it; and your disregard of it will bring you moral impoverishment and some day unpleasant surprises."

LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 15361, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1974, reaches the Floor of the House on Thursday, I plan to offer an amendment designed to give substance to the promise of equal housing opportunity made by the Congress.

The amendment has two main provisions: It prohibits the use of zoning, subdivision controls, or building codes to prevent the development of low- and moderate-income housing outside the central cities and it directs the Department of Housing and Urban Development and other appropriate Federal agencies to give top priority in awarding Federal grants and loans to communities that develop comprehensive plans for the inclusion of such housing.

For the information of Members, I am inserting the full text of the amendment. I hope that all who wish to pay more than lipservice to the principle of equal opportunity will support this effort:

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 15361, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MR. BADILLO

Page 112, after line 16, insert the following new part (and redesignate the succeeding part and sections accordingly).

PART C—ENCOURAGEMENT OF LOW- AND
MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING
DISCRIMINATION AGAINST LOW- OR MODERATE-
INCOME HOUSING PROHIBITED

SEC. 521. (a) No State or general or special purpose unit of local government (or other agency having official jurisdiction over one or more regions or subareas within a State or States) shall, in the exercise of power with respect to planning, zoning, subdivision controls, building codes or permits, or other matters affecting land use, prevent the reasonable provision of low and moderate income housing in undeveloped or predominantly undeveloped parts of any community within a metropolitan area as defined in subsection (b), or discriminate in any other way (on the basis of amount, type, location, or otherwise) against low or moderate income housing in any such community.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term

"metropolitan area" means any city or municipality having a population of one hundred thousand or more (as determined on the basis of the most recent decennial census), together with all general or special purpose units of local government located within a fifty-mile radius of such city or municipality (whether or not located within the same State).

(c)(1) If the Attorney General of the United States, after consultation with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, believes that the provisions of subsection (a) have been or are being violated, he may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court to enforce compliance with such provisions.

(2) Any person who would be assisted (financially or otherwise) in obtaining suitable housing, or would derive any other benefit, direct or indirect, by or from the provision of low or moderate income housing (or additional low or moderate income housing) in any community within a metropolitan area as defined in subsection (b), and who believes that the provisions of subsection (a) have been or are being violated with respect to such community in a way which effectively deprives him of such assistance or benefit, may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy, or in any appropriate State or local court of general jurisdiction, to enforce compliance with such provisions or obtain other equitable or preventive relief under this section, and may request such relief in any court whenever relevant in connection with a defense to any suit or action brought against such person in that court.

PRIORITY IN FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITIES WHICH INCLUDE LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING IN THEIR DEVELOPMENT PLANS

SEC. 522. (a) In the administration of any Federal program providing assistance (in the form of loans, grants, or otherwise) to assist in the construction or development of housing, or in carrying out open-space or urban development projects, or for the planning or construction of hospitals, airports, libraries, water supply or distribution facilities, sewage facilities or waste treatment works, highways, transportation facilities, law enforcement facilities, or water development or land conservation projects, or elementary and secondary schools, colleges and universities, pre-school and day care facilities and in the administration of the Federal programs of mortgage insurance and loan guarantees under the National Housing Act and under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, a priority shall be given (as provided in subsection (b)) to applications made with respect to property located within the jurisdiction or boundaries of any general or special purpose unit of local government in a metropolitan area as defined in subsection (d) (or other agency having official jurisdiction over one or more regions or subareas, including at least one metropolitan area as so defined, within a State or States) which has drawn up, submitted, and had approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, or which is subject to the jurisdiction of an areawide agency that exercises powers with respect to planning, zoning, subdivision controls, building codes or permits, or other matters, affecting land use in the area which such unit or agency represents and has drawn up, submitted, and had approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, a plan or plans—

(1) specifically providing for the inclusion of low and moderate income housing in the areas within the jurisdiction of such unit or agency that are undeveloped or predominantly undeveloped but that are in the path of development, in a manner consistent with any local comprehensive or master plan for such areas; and

(2) providing, with respect to the areas within the jurisdiction of such unit or agency in which little or no vacant land is available for low and moderate income housing because of existing density and land use, for compensatory arrangements with other localities within the same metropolitan area still having available vacant land for the construction of low and moderate income housing in those localities, so that no metropolitan area (as defined in subsection (d)) will be left without a proportionate and well-distributed number of units of low and moderate income housing.

Any plan or compensatory arrangement described in the preceding sentence shall be designed to avoid the concentration of low and moderate income housing within any fixed geographical boundaries in any metropolitan area; and any unit or agency which enters into a compensatory arrangement with another locality or localities for the provision of low and moderate income housing because its current density and land use precludes the construction of additional low and moderate income housing within its boundaries shall, when currently used sites become vacant, make every effort to include such housing within its boundaries.

(b) Each unit or agency which draws up a plan or enters into an arrangement under subsection (a) shall submit such plan or arrangement to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for his approval. Upon such approval, all officers and agencies of the United States shall give priority, including all possible special consideration and preference, to any applications submitted by such unit or agency for assistance under any Federal law or program in connection with the construction or development of housing, the carrying out of open-space or urban development projects, the planning or construction of hospitals, airports, libraries, water supply or distribution facilities, sewerage facilities or waste treatment works, highways, transportation facilities, law enforcement facilities, or water development or land conservation projects, or the planning or carrying out of any other urban or areawide development programs or projects, with emphasis upon the development of a sufficiently stable neighborhood possessing an adequate level of amenities for all residents of the area or areas involved.

(c)(1) No plan described in subsection (a) shall be approved by the Secretary unless it is accompanied by satisfactory assurances that all low and moderate income housing constructed in accordance therewith, other than housing which (under applicable State or local law) is specifically exempt from tax or subject to tax only in reduced amounts or at reduced rates, will pay its full share of any local real estate taxes which are generally applicable to housing of the type involved.

(2) Where any of the housing involved is low-rent public housing which is exempt from real and personal property taxes levied or imposed by the State, city, county, or other political subdivision in which the project is located, the plan may be approved only if the public housing agency having jurisdiction over the project is required to make payments in lieu of taxes with respect to the project and the amount of such payments is increased by not less than 10 per centum each year until such time (not later than ten years after the first such increased payment) as the amount of such payments equals the full amount of such taxes which would be paid with respect to the project except for the exemption. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may cause or permit any contract for annual contributions which may be outstanding with respect to the project to be amended in order to conform with the provisions of this paragraph, and, if conformity with such provisions would require an invoice in the annual con-

tributions payable with respect to the project, may provide for such increase in the amendment.

(d) For purposes of this section, the term "metropolitan area" means any city or municipality having a population of one hundred thousand or more (as determined on the basis of the most recent decennial census), together with all general or special purpose units of local government located within a fifty-mile radius of such city or municipality (whether or not located within the same State).

(e) The Secretary shall upon request provide appropriate technical assistance to any unit or agency developing a plan or entering into an arrangement as described in subsection (a).

(f)(1) For purposes of this part, income levels and the definition of low and moderate income housing shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of low and moderate income budgets published for the respective areas involved by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, with such adjustments as the Secretary may consider necessary in order to allow for variations and special circumstances within such areas.

(2) The determination of what many constitute a proportionate number of units of low and moderate income housing for any area shall be made by the Secretary on the basis of figures developed by the Bureau of the Census showing the number of low and moderate income families within such area, and shall take into consideration the housing presently available within such area for such families.

VALERY AND GALINA PANOV

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, after long years of struggle, Valery Panov and his wife Galina are at last being allowed to leave the Soviet Union.

Panov, formerly one of the finest artists in the Kirov Ballet company, is a Jew. For many years now, he wanted to emigrate to Israel, where he felt he could attain true artistic and individual freedom. As a result of this natural desire, both Panov and his wife were dismissed from their positions with the Kirov. For an artist of Panov's stature this was tantamount to a death sentence.

Valery and Galina steadfastly maintained their right to emigrate through long years of official harassment. They continued to practice their exercises in their cramped Leningrad apartment, in the hope that someday they would be free to dance again.

They became a cause celebre among the world's artistic community. Many people who otherwise might never have known of the problems of Soviet Jewry became involved in the Panov's fight for freedom, and this additional pressure on the Soviet Government made it possible for thousands of other less prominent Jews to emigrate to Israel and the United States.

I am impressed by the timing of the Panovs' release from the Soviet prison state. In only 2 short weeks, President Nixon will be making his second tour of the Soviet Union. Undoubtedly, a major impetus to the Soviet Government's de-

cision was the desire to divert attention from the problems of Soviet Jewry by letting out one of the more renowned activists.

Whatever the motivation for Panov's release may be, it clearly refutes one of the President's most cherished foreign policy theories. In his commencement address at Annapolis earlier this month, the President advocated a "handsoff" policy toward Soviet Jews. He felt that this is an internal problem in the Soviet Union and not properly the concern of the U.S. people and their elected representatives.

Well, the President is quite wrong in this regard. It was not a handsoff policy that got the Panovs out of the Soviet Union after long years of trying. It was not a handsoff policy that won the freedom of thousands of other Jews who are today living as free men and women in the United States and Israel.

A handsoff policy would be a total disaster. It is only by continuing pressure that we see any progress at all. It is not only a question of the world's literati and beautiful people massing their support for two suffering artists. It is a question of the little people, those who are not glamorous or artistic, continuing to press the Soviet Union for concessions until there are no more Jews being harassed because they want to emigrate.

I am gratified to see that Valery and Galina Panov have finally been given permission to leave. But the Russians are wrong if they think that this will make things easier for them while President Nixon is touring Moscow. Instead, this should only be the beginning of a new wave of intense pressure against the Soviet Government.

We have had a number of notable victories, when prominent Jewish activists have been permitted to leave, simply to get undesirable elements out of the country. But each of these victories has been accompanied by a new wave of harassment.

Reports are now coming out of Moscow and other Russian cities, of the telephones of well-known Jewish activists being cut off to prevent them from communicating with their friends in the United States while President Nixon tours Russia. We may soon begin hearing of mass army inductions and arrests, to get these "threats" to Russian security and the safety of our President out of the way.

What is worse, the Russians may now feel they can act with impunity in increasing the tempo of their harassment of Jewish activists. President Nixon, in the commencement address at Annapolis, said that the problem of Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union was an internal Russian problem, and it was not for the United States to tell another nation how to handle its internal affairs. With such an attitude on the part of the highest elected official of the United States, and perhaps the one man in our entire Government who has the greatest personal stake in détente, it would be no surprise to me if the Russians felt free to engage in a mass round-up of Jewish activists and then cut down even further on the number of exit visas they so generously grant.

The fact that the Soviet Government finally granted Valery and Galina Panov permission to emigrate, after 2 years of pressure from concerned people in the United States and elsewhere, the fact that the Soviet Union greatly increased the number of exit visas granted after they realized that the fruits of détente were in jeopardy, the fact that they lifted the infamous ransom on Jews desiring to emigrate after an outcry in the United States—these all demonstrate that it is consummate folly to think that the problems of Soviet Jews are internal matters best left to the discretion and well-known humanity of the Soviet Government.

We are not trying to tell the Soviets how to run their country. We do not want to meddle in their internal affairs. What we are concerned with is America's image as the defender of human rights and as a guardian of the most basic principles of international law. To do that, it is incumbent upon us as a nation to support movements for freedom wherever they occur, even in nations with whom we are seeking better relations.

The President should realize that détente will not be jeopardized if we continue to press the Soviets to let the Jews emigrate. Concessions by the Soviet Union could only improve their chances for getting exactly what they want in the way of trade from this country. Continued intransigence, by the Soviets and by our President, can only put an end to all thoughts of détente.

Valery and Galina Panov are more than a man and wife who have suffered because they dared stand up for their rights. They are symbols of what can be done when people care enough to fight for something they believed in. If everyone felt as the President does, that the problems of Soviet Jews are an internal Russian matter and the United States should not meddle, then the Panovs and thousands of other men, women, and children would today still be trapped in Russia, only dreaming of the freedom that might otherwise have been theirs.

The Panovs have sacrificed much, they have suffered greatly. I can only salute them from the bottom of my heart, and hope that now they are living in a land of cultural and personal freedom, the world will soon be treated to their artistry again.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON SHORTAGES

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the American public has borne a great burden over the past year, suffering from shortages of many, many goods.

I have received countless letters from my constituents with similar complaints. Supplies of foodstuffs, plastic goods, small automobiles, raw materials for industry, and of course gasoline, are still seriously short.

And the saddest part of this has been the failure of the Government to find viable means of relieving the present shortage situation, and avoiding future ones.

This is why I wholeheartedly commend the efforts of the joint leadership, on Wednesday, when they jointly introduced a bill creating a National Commission on Shortages.

The fact that the majority leader, THOMAS P. O'NEILL, and Whip JOHN McFALL, along with Minority Leader JOHN RHODES and Whip LESLIE ARENDTS all co-sponsored this vital legislation indicates the excellence of their leadership.

This bill will create a 13-member commission, and will allow for the first time a real coordination between business, government, and the consuming public, to study the question of shortages, and provide the much needed impetus for solving them. Further, through the efforts of this Commission, the possibility of additional shortages developing is lessened substantially.

I would like to urge all of my colleagues to support this essential bill, and impress upon them the need for expeditious action.

To provide relief for our citizens, the establishment of this Commission is imperative. And, it must be done soon, before we are overcome by even more and worse shortages.

JUDGE PERRY'S GIFT HAS BECOME A COMMUNITY PROJECT

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of my colleagues to the unique gift of a mastodon made by Judge Joseph Sam Perry and his wife to Wheaton College, in Wheaton, Ill.

I am proud to say I have known Judge Perry for many years and this distinguished citizen, who serves as U.S. district court judge for the northern district of Illinois, has a long record of brilliant accomplishments both in public service and as a member of his community.

In October of 1963, on Judge Perry's property in Glen Ellyn, Ill., the unusually well-preserved bones were found of a mastodon, an elephant-like creature which became extinct about 8,000 years ago.

Judge and Mrs. Perry invited geology students and faculty from Wheaton College to excavate the bones and at the college they were carefully washed, dried, and preserved. Judge and Mrs. Perry then gave custody of this outstanding specimen to Wheaton College so it could be a project for all citizens of the area and it has now become a community effort.

The Perry Mastodon display is housed in the new building which was constructed for the biology and physics department in the 1960's. As a platform

turns, one side of the animal is revealed, with the flesh realistically reproduced. Another half turn shows the bones of the left side in place. On the revolving platform are plants growing around the specimen and behind are black spruce trees blending into the diorama which carries the view through to the horizon. The scene has been reproduced to resemble this part of Illinois as it appeared perhaps 11,000 years ago.

In addition to thousands of visitors, more than 16,000 schoolchildren have viewed the Perry Mastodon since it first went on display at Wheaton College, and it has served as a valuable teaching aid to teachers in public and private schools located in a 50-mile radius.

Judge Perry's life and work are an inspiration to his fellow citizens and I wish him and Mrs. Perry ever-increasing success and abundant good health and happiness as they continue their dedicated examples of community service.

LIBERAL DEMOCRAT BLASTS BUS- ING AS PHONY SOLUTION

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine who has known and felt the sting of racial prejudice against his family, has just sent me a copy of his blistering letter to the superintendent of the Jefferson County School Board in Kentucky.

He "tells it like it is" on compulsory, court-ordered busing of schoolchildren to achieve "racial balance."

His letter deserves the attention of my colleagues and all others truly interested in the advancement and the freedom of all the people of our land:

PLEASURE RIDGE PARK, KY.,
May 23, 1974.

Superintendent RICHARD VANHOOSE,
Jefferson County School Board,
Louisville, Ky.

SIR: I find it necessary to address you directly on the matter of busing.

Before I amplify, please allow me to clarify. I am a liberal and a Democrat. I am in favor of equal rights for all peoples. I am active in civic affairs in that direction, work with an integrated group, and have served over 30 years federal service most of which has been in an integrated status. In addition, since my wife is of oriental descent, my children are a minority group and subject to prejudices few people would understand.

I have followed the actions of your Board, the Courts, and the voice of the local papers. The time has come for me to protest, as an American, and to demand the rights and freedoms specified in the Constitution of the United States.

No place, in any document or law of this land, is it implied that, to obtain equality among the peoples of the United States, the children of any citizen could be taken without permission of the parent or guardian and transported to an unsafe area, to obtain an inadequate education, in unfamiliar surroundings. I say this because I have just completed studies on Political Theory and American Government. I know I need not

remind you that there is no implication of intent to reduce freedoms for one party in order to obtain freedoms for another in basic documents such as the American State Papers, the Constitution, the Amendments, the Civil Rights Act, or in any Supreme Court decision.

Our Constitution demands freedoms for our peoples. It affords us the right to obtain life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness so long as we do not infringe on the rights of our neighbors. Let me tell you something, Mr. VanHoose. When I came to this area we chose our location and they sold us our house. My neighbors were full of the normal prejudices but this is America and we were free to select. We overcame this with clean living, hard work, and setting an example. Today my girls are popular, loved, advanced students at Pleasure Ridge Park High School and L. Max Sanders Elementary. Some of their best teachers are black. Our friends are black and/or white (and yellow if you must). We have been free and intend to stay that way. You, your board of education, the city superintendent and his board of education, radical minorities, or any other element (including Judge Gordon) are not going to take this freedom away from me. To do so would destroy the constitutional rights of every American, black, white, or otherwise.

I wish, at this time, to point out some facts that you, as a school board, must face.

1. The people of Jefferson County will not permit a merger. By law we are required to take over a defunct city school system if it is unable to operate. We are not required to merge.

2. The City School Board, by its own admission, is incapable of operation. It is obvious to all of us in the county as to why. It is not because of the blacks, but rather because of the fiscal and administrative irresponsibility of the white leaders, both educational and political. These leaders will never be permitted, by county residents, to share in the administration of our school system.

3. Because of the long record of fiscal and political irresponsibility of city officials, most county residents are former city residents. People moved away from the city to improve their lot. If they are forced to return, they will move farther.

4. Busing, even if it were legal and I defy you or any judge to show me where it is justified, will not solve the problem because this is not the problem. You, and the true racists that are forcing this appeasement down our throat, know as well as I do that the problem is with the banks, the loan companies, and the trades. Let us all be men and face the problem at its root. What kind of creature would let his children carry the burden? Are you that kind of creature Mr. VanHoose? Mr. Gordon?

Why, as our representatives on the Board of Education, have you not offered to distribute teachers equally (by educational level) among schools? Why has the kind Judge not required the loan agencies to give special rates to groups to balance racial populations? Why have unions not been required to let in blacks? Why have our schools not offered programs for blacks in white areas? I suspect because by busing the do gooders can feel better and keep their prejudices, and the radicals can get even. It won't work.

In Nazi Germany the people sat back and watched their freedom erode. In the end they were pronounced guilty along with their leaders. I have fought two wars to keep the freedom of myself, my family, and my country. I wish to serve you notice Mr. VanHoose, the Jefferson County Board of Education, and Judge Gordon, that I have just begun to fight.

Sincerely,

CHARLES J. BLAUD.

COMPLIMENT FOR NEWSMAN

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. CARTER, Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to find responsible members of the press who point out the shortsightedness of the media. If Henry Kissinger had been a cold, unemotional person it would have been impossible for him to have secured the agreements among countries which have been at war for 27 years. After Secretary Kissinger slaved tirelessly for months to bring about these agreements, his efforts were crowned by success. Following this greatest coup of American diplomacy, he returned to find some members of the media determined to discredit him. Let me compliment Mr. Crosby Noyes for his erudite assessment of the situation.

I include his editorial for perusal by the Members.

KISSINGER AND MEDIA MYOPIA

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

Watergate was not invented by the "media," as a good many people seem to believe. But the media have become Watergate-myopic to an extent that dangerously distorts their perspective of what is going on in this country and the world and leads to some ugly aberrations when it comes to their own role in the scheme of things.

Take Henry Kissinger, for instance. My colleagues in the press have been preening themselves for having subjected him to the most outrageous display of incivility ever inflicted on a Secretary of State. The fact that he betrayed his anger at abuse that would have discomfited the Pope is hailed as some kind of journalistic triumph.

Because Henry Kissinger is believed to be a central figure of the Watergate scandal? Hell, no. Precisely because he is about the only important figure in the Nixon administration still held in high esteem in the country and the world as a whole was reason enough.

The fact that Kissinger is able to operate effectively in the interests of the United States makes him automatically a prime target for the solicitude of those who identify themselves as "adversaries" of anything and everything that the government of this country is trying to do.

And take, for that matter, President Nixon's present tour of the Middle East. It is, we have all been led to believe, an exercise in "Watergate diplomacy"—a fairly pathetic attempt by the President to leave his impeachment troubles behind him and bask, however momentarily, in the atmosphere of respect and prestige that normally attaches itself to the leaders of large countries.

But quite certainly, this is not the primary purpose of the trip. And if its significance is largely symbolic, it is symbolic of a fact that is and will be of overwhelming importance to the foreign policy of the United States, whoever may be president next year.

That fact simply, is that the Middle East has become within the last 12 months an area of primary concern, not only to the United States, but to the entire industrialized Western world. The survival of the extremely complicated and vulnerable system that, for want of a better word, we call capitalism is going to depend for some time on what happens in the Middle East and what our relations with the governments there may be.

We are just beginning to wake up to the new reality. Over a period of years, if we

thought about the Middle East at all, it was in the context of the conflict between Israel and her Arab neighbors, of Soviet-American relations in the area and, more recently, of the availability and cost of Arab oil.

But now very suddenly all of these diverse preoccupations have been engulfed by a new realization: Barring some kind of cataclysmic reordering of international reality, the nations of the Middle East, in a few years, will control a large part of the world's available monetary assets.

And if the capitalistic world expects to stay in business, it will have to do a very considerable share of that business with governments and people who have been regarded, if at all, with scant consideration.

The fact that the major oil-exporting nations—most of which are in the Middle East—will collect \$70 billion in revenues this year and \$140 billion next year transcends by a very large degree every other political and economic problem in the area. The President's trip to the Middle East represents a reordering of priorities throughout the industrialized Western world that is not just suggested but absolutely required by this highly predictable fact.

That peace in the area is a primary requirement is clear on the face of it. That very much closer economic and political ties between the United States and the Arab nations also will be essential to the survival of the capitalistic system is much less clearly perceived by a press which is focused—virtually exclusively—on the objective of destroying its own government.

Fortunately for all of us, that government—beset as it may be—understands the problem. So do the others that are directly concerned, including Israel, the Arab states and even, to some extent, the Soviet Union.

The concern of the United States for the Middle East today is easily the equivalent of the concern of the United States for Western Europe in the period of the creation of the Marshall Plan and NATO—and for much the same reasons.

To consider this presidential trip an exercise in Watergate diplomacy and to delight in abusing the most effective secretary of State we have ever had amounts to myopia verging on outright blindness.

REMARKS DURING DEBATE ON THE SCHOOL LUNCH ACT CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the School Lunch Act, but only with the understanding that this is the last year we will be operating this program by purchasing food products through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

This program was established when America had great surpluses of food, much of which was rotting in Government grain elevators and storage bins. During that period, the Government was in the business of purchasing food products from farmers and dairymen to help keep the incomes on the farms at reasonable levels. It was a simple matter, then to distribute these food products to the States for redistribution to schools and other institutions to provide low cost meals for children and for the poor.

Now, without any food surpluses, we

find the Federal Government in the food purchase and distribution business. The Government is now entering the market place in direct competition with private industry, buying these products at market prices and then distributing them to the schools and other institutions. I find this totally objectionable.

Let me make quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that I do not object to the food programs themselves. I have supported and continue to support programs that provide low-cost meals to schoolchildren, to the elderly and to other poor people in various institutions that are now receiving such support. As long as a majority of our society continues to view these programs as worthwhile, we should continue to appropriate funds for them.

What I object to is the Federal Government getting into the food purchase and distribution business. This is totally unnecessary and inefficient.

There are those that say that since the Government can purchase in bulk, the cost of these programs can be held down. This is totally untrue. In 1972, I asked the General Accounting Office to investigate food purchases programs operated by the Defense Supply Agency for the military commissaries here and abroad. DSA argued that they could purchase products much more cheaply by going direct to the grower and purchasing in large lots rather than by opening bidding to terminal markets supplying direct to the individual commissary.

The results of that study clearly showed that the Defense Department could save about \$18 million a year on the purchase of fresh fruits and vegetables alone by getting out of the commodity purchasing and distribution business and instead letting such operations be handled by private industry.

The same applies to the school lunch program. The food industry operates on one of the smallest profit margins of any business. Because of fierce competition, prices are very close to cost. The businessmen make their profit by keeping operating costs down to a bare minimum and selling large volumes of goods.

When the Government enters the picture, the taxpayers pay not only for the food purchased, but for the Federal bureaucrats to purchase and distribute it and the State bureaucrats to redistribute it. As always, when Uncle Sam gets his hands into a business enterprise the costs escalate.

This legislation will continue the present, faulty program for another year. We cannot change over to a new system this late in the game. Schools and other institutions have made plans for the upcoming fiscal year based on the old system. However, next year plans must be made early to get the Government out of the food purchase and distribution business.

I favor the Federal Government simply sending a check to the localities participating in the various programs sufficient for them to go out into the marketplace to purchase their own food products. This has worked under the food stamp program. What we would be establishing in effect would be a food stamp program

of sorts for schools and other institutions covered by this act.

Mr. Speaker, if we applied generally the philosophy that the Government can buy things cheaper for the American public since it eliminates the profit then the Government would end up purchasing all manner of products for the elderly, the poor, the deprived, and the helpless. It was never the intention of Congress or the American taxpayer to support such a system whether the item purchased be food or deodorant spray. The best economies are realized when the Government stays out of businesses that can best be operated by those in the private sector. I hope this is the last time this body will be voting to continue operations of the Federal food purchase and distribution business.

GOVERNOR LAUDS LINCOLN SCHOOLER

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, Robert Ayala, a 10-year-old fifth grader at Lincoln Elementary School in Nutley, N.J., recently was named grand prize winner from among the 39,984 entrants in the 30th annual school traffic safety poster contest conducted nationally by the American Automobile Association.

Robert's entry was sponsored by the New Jersey Auto Club, the State's AAA-affiliated organization and the theme of this year's poster contest was bicycle safety.

While Robert's achievement is of itself significant and worthy of high praise, it is truly remarkable in that he is the third member of the Ayala family to have won the top award in this competition held each year in all 50 States. This is the first time in the 30 years the contest has been held that three members of a single family have attained the grand prize.

Robert joins his older brothers, Tito, now 13, who won the top prize in 1970, and 15-year-old Mario, who received the same award in 1969. The boys are the sons of Mr. and Mrs. Miguel Ayala of Nutley and have won a total of 24 local, State, and national awards in AAA school safety poster competitions.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert a newspaper story on the poster contest:

FOR SAFETY POSTER EFFORT: GOVERNOR LAUDS LINCOLN SCHOOLER

It was Robert Ayala's day last Thursday as the ten-year old Nutley youngster journeyed to Governor Brendan T. Byrne's office in Trenton to receive his grand prize awards, a plaque and \$650 in U.S. Savings Bonds, in the 30th annual American Automobile Association school traffic safety poster contest.

Following his meeting with the Governor, during which he sketched a rabbit for the Chief Executive to demonstrate his artistic talent, Robert was presented to the State Senate by Nutley Mayor and State Senator Carmen A. Orechio, whose resolution applauding Robert's winning entry was unanimously endorsed by the Senate.

A picture taking session with Assembly-

man Carl A. Orechio, who represents Robert's Nutley district in the Legislature, followed.

Robert's poster on the theme of bicycle safety was judged the very best among the 39,989 entries received in the nationwide contest. And, as just about everyone in Nutley is aware, the ten-year old Lincoln School fifth grader is the third member of his family to win the coveted top prize, an unprecedented achievement.

Robert, whose entry in the national competition was sponsored by the New Jersey Auto Club (AAA), joins his older brothers, Tito, now 13 who won the top prize in 1970, and 15-year old Mario, who garnered the same award in 1969. The boys are the sons of Mr. and Mrs. Miguel Ayala of 17 Prospect Street in Nutley and have won a total of 24 local, state and national awards in AAA school safety poster competitions.

The young prize winner was accompanied to the Trenton award ceremony by his parents, his school art teacher, Mrs. Gladys Moore, and Matthew J. Derham, President of the New Jersey Auto Club (AAA).

The winning poster shows a blue cut out of an automobile and a cyclist with the legend, "Drive Right With Traffic," a reference to the fact that bicycles are required to keep to the right side of the road.

A REPUBLICAN LEADER SPEAKS OUT ON CAMPAIGN REFORM

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the debate on the need for and the extent of campaign reform legislation has been going on for some time. The revelations about the 1972 Presidential campaign of Richard M. Nixon have provided us with ample examples of what is wrong with the current laws regulating political campaigns. Most of the proposed reforms address the question of money in campaigns, and it is clear from the overwhelming vote in California earlier this month on their campaign reform measure that the electorate wants to get the money out of politics. It has been clear to me that this is not enough, but it is still a must. More than 150 House Members, including myself, are cosponsoring the Clean Elections Act which was introduced by our distinguished colleagues, Representative MORRIS UDALL of Arizona and Representative JOHN ANDERSON of Illinois. One element of this legislation is a provision for public financing of Federal elections. It is perhaps predictable, but still disappointing that the bulk of the Republican Party is opposed to this aspect of campaign reform.

It is for this reason that I was especially pleased to read the views of the Honorable JOHN ANDERSON, chairman of the House Republican Conference, in yesterday's Washington Post on the subject of campaign reform. The article demonstrated that the Republican Party still has intelligent leaders who are capable of working for the public, rather than the private interest. It is unfortunate that the gentleman from Illinois is in a minority within his own minority party.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, and insert the article from the Post into the RECORD for others to read.

The article follows:

PUBLIC CAMPAIGN FUNDS WILL NOT CRUSH "INTERESTS"

(By JOHN B. ANDERSON)

Anderson, a Republican congressman from Illinois, is chairman of the House Republican Conference and co-author of a bill providing for partial public financing of political campaigns. This article is excerpted from a pamphlet recently published by the Poynter Project on American Institutions at Indiana University.

The shocking revelations about the financing of the 1972 presidential campaign have brought public confidence in our political system to a low point. The accounts of six-figure slush funds, suitcases loaded with \$100 bills, laundered contributions sluiced through Mexican banks, and extensive political spying and espionage drastically increased public cynicism about the integrity of the electoral process. The perception grew that our elections were becoming a quadrennial political sweepstakes in which the electorate takes a back seat to big money, the media, and the special interests. The fact that the 1972 elections were estimated to have cost nearly half a billion dollars compounded the disillusionment.

It is not surprising, then, that there emerged a strong national consensus favoring fundamental change in the manner in which we conduct and finance our political campaigns. A substantial majority of the public came to endorse the use of tax funds to finance candidates for public office. An increasing number of prominent national leaders, a growing chorus of politicians from both parties, and a vast legion of editorial writers and other national opinion-makers expressed support for public financing of elections.

Unfortunately, there are already warning signs that public election finance is being treated as an all-embracing panacea rather than a solution to an important but limited set of problems. Analysis has been increasingly replaced with sloganeering, and the obvious deleterious effects of private money on the political process have been elevated to the status of an unmitigated evil that must be "purged" from the body politic. As a result, expectations are being aroused which the best possible new system could never hope fully to satisfy.

Perhaps to some degree, this quest for catharsis stems from the trauma and unease pervading the nation as a result of the Watergate drama. But whatever the source, treatment of a single reform as a means to national self-purification and salvation is bound to produce mistakes in formulation and ultimate disappointment with the results. Therefore, we must insist that the supplying of public funds for election campaigns be viewed as a limited solution to a limited structural problem, not as a quick-fix tonic for all the ills of a distraught nation.

INCENTIVES FOR ACTION

Let us begin with a basic axiom: The influence of special interest groups in the political process should not be exclusively equated with their ability to make large campaign contributions. To be sure, Common Cause has shown that wealthy contributors and special interest committees provided more than \$30 million directly to congressional candidates during the 1972 campaign, millions more to party committees, and perhaps an equal amount to the presidential campaigns. But special interest groups have far more tools in their influence kits than mere campaign cash.

Most important, they have the ability for effective political mobilization. Mancur Ol-

son in his book, "The Logic of Collective Action," incisively analyzes the fundamental dilemma of a large, heterogeneous industrial democracy: Producer groups of all types have an inherent advantage over consumers, the broad public and general taxpayers in affecting the political process. In the first instance, this stems not from money but from a profound difference in incentives for political action.

The 2.5 million members of the building trades unions for example, have a strong interest in the Davis-Bacon Act that assures them the highest union wage rate on each of some \$40 billion in annual government contracts. It is commonly agreed that this law keeps construction wage costs considerably above the true market rate. But while economists have estimated that this distortion of the labor market costs the economy directly, and consumers indirectly, some \$2 to \$3 billion each year, it is the representatives of the building trades who are at the front door of the Education and Labor Committee when any threat to that particular policy arises. The "general public" isn't there.

Similarly, the hundreds of millions in additional income for dairy farmers represented by an increase in the support price from 75 per cent to 85 per cent of parity generates far greater incentives for political mobilization than does the few extra cents per quart of milk among the 60 million American households who drink milk. The life or death of the American shipbuilding industry, to take a final example, is vitally dependent upon the \$300 million annual subsidy for ship construction. Yet, since that amount averages out to only about \$3.50 per income tax return, it is readily understandable that the industry rather than the general public is mobilized when that program is subject to review or extension.

Most public policies have quite different effects upon different parts of the electorate. The incentives for political action are skewed in favor of producer groups who are hit hard rather than general consumers on whom each decision has only marginal impact.

SERVICING MEMBERS

Once activated, a series of further advantages accrue to producer groups. Since most are organized around a specialized economic interest or activity, they can frequently meet needs, offer services and provide tangible benefits to their members that provide an incentive for continued support of group activities. Prof. Olson showed that the Farm Bureau has retained the allegiance and active participation of nearly 3 million farm families across the nation because it offers cheap insurance policies, technical assistance and farm fuel and other raw material supply services only to members in good standing. He found this same pattern among some noneconomic groups, such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Literally no veterans' legislation even moves out of committee without a VFW stamp of approval, primarily because the organization can mobilize millions of veterans in Congressional districts all across the country. And the organization can generate this kind of response and maintain its large membership because it provides a service that is very important to many veterans: that of ombudsman and intermediary between the individual veteran and the \$12 billion-a-year Veterans Administration which provides a broad range of cash and service benefits to eligible veterans.

Nearly all of the hundreds of lobbies, trade associations and other interest groups in Washington devote a very considerable share of their time and resources to just these kinds of services. They do so because it pays off handsomely in terms of solving the otherwise vexing problems of organizational maintenance. By contrast, the fact that very

few "citizens," "consumer" or general "taxpayer" organizations survive for more than a year or two is largely a function of their lack of tools to cope with this fundamental organizational imperative.

GETTING THE WORD OUT

Another advantage available to producer groups is their possession of effective communication networks. Most of the major lobbies and associations in Washington can mobilize their membership on literally an hour's notice when an urgent issue is at stake. Some, like the NAM, even have their entire national memberships cross-coded and computerized. If a head count on a crucial amendment shows that 10 more votes are needed, they can choose the most amenable congressmen and nearly instantaneously contact their own members in the relevant districts, urging that he be flooded with telephone calls, telegrams, and sometimes even 11th-hour visits from important constituents.

This communications ability is especially important because there seems to be an inherent tendency in the decision-making process, at least at the legislative level, to keep things in flux and uncertainty until the last moment. Let me cite a recent example from my own experience: A sweeping pension reform bill affecting some \$150 billion in private pension plan assets and nearly 30 million participating workers was scheduled for floor action on a Wednesday. Yet, because of a jurisdictional squabble between the Ways and Means Committee and the Education and Labor Committee, most members were not sure even as late as Monday night what the major amendments would be during the floor debate. Consequently, only those groups with the ability to communicate and mobilize on very short notice were in a position to make their interests known when the uncertainty was finally resolved.

Still another advantage of producer groups is the financial capability to maintain professional lobbyists and staffs, which stems, of course, from their power to raise the dues and other revenues from their members needed to compensate professional employees. This is important because the federal government, or even Congress, is not a unitary monolithic institution but a complex and specialized social organism in which power is dispersed widely depending upon the issue and concerns involved.

The ability to penetrate the tangle and to reach the often obscure centers of access and influence on a particular issue or policy is precisely the specialized trade of the professional lobbyist. Most of these lobbyists, of course, are no smarter than the average citizen or no more shrewd than many amateur politicians or volunteer activists. But they do possess the advantage of long experience; close observation and familiarity, and full time on-the-job training. In the final analysis, that provides another advantage to the producer groups they represent in the struggle for political power.

Finally, producer groups possess the ability to marshal specialized knowledge and expertise on the wide-ranging and often vexing problems which confront governmental decision-makers. To be sure, members of Congress have staff support, and numerous executive agencies publish reams of helpful data, statistics and analytical reports every week. But as often as not, professional staffers on Capitol Hill are as overtaxed as members, and the raw data published by, say, the Labor or Commerce departments is more confusing than illuminating. It takes detailed familiarity with trends, relationships and likely consequences of proposed actions to resolve most policy issues—something that often can be provided only by the producer groups affected.

Thus the influence directly attributable to campaign contributions must be interpreted

as only one manifestation of an underlying or generic advantage possessed by groups. To be sure, giving public money to candidates will neutralize perhaps the most important single source of political leverage characteristic of producer groups, and, in some degree, will thereby indirectly reduce the potency of these other factors as well. The ability to withhold or confer campaign contributions surely enhances the impact of producer-group expertise, lobbying efforts or even grass-roots membership mobilization.

But this reform will not obliterate these other advantages of producer groups in the governmental decisionmaking process. For that reason, public finance alone can not be expected to fully equalize the balance of power between special interests and the consumer, taxpayer, or general interest. To pretend that it can somehow purge the political process of special-interest influence and put some abstract "public interest" or "majority will" in total command is to misunderstand the realities of political power in a complex, industrial democracy.

SOMETIMES POWER FAILS

To be sure, proponents of the thesis that "money is power" can give an exhaustive list of incidents and governmental decisions which tend to bear out their contention: Textile quotas, the milk support increase, the oil depletion allowance, the ITT case, the Lockheed loan, the stillborn consumer protection agency bill, weak pesticide control legislation and the huge merchant marine subsidies are just a few.

But there are also many cases which do not conform to their thesis. The aerospace industry, for example, is one of the more amply endowed special interest groups in the country, but that did not prevent the SST project from being killed by Congress after more than \$800 million had been spent on research and development. Similarly, perhaps the most notorious special interest group in Washington, the highway lobby, was dealt a sound defeat when the highway trust fund was opened for mass transit.

Although the total level of defense spending has steadily risen, this is probably more due to inflation and the increased costs of the volunteer army than the political power of the so-called "military-industrial complex." Indeed, despite the extensive expenditures of the defense industry on lobbying and campaign contributions, the item of real concern to it—the military hardware budget—has declined in real dollars from \$35 billion to \$23 billion over the last 10 years, a drop of more than 34 per cent.

If campaign money does not always preclude unfavorable action for contributing groups, neither does it always produce desired beneficial policies. No one discounts the campaign funding role of the petroleum industry, but that has not moved natural gas deregulation legislation off dead center by so much as an inch. The great national banks like Chase Manhattan or Bank of America have strongly urged adoption of the Hunt Commission proposal to substantially reduce government regulation of financial institutions. Yet the proposal has scarcely gotten a congressional hearing, despite the enormous financial clout of those institutions which would benefit.

PROCEDURES MATTER

Such examples suggest that the power of campaign cash is derivative rather than intrinsic, and that the characteristics of the decision-making process may have a lot to do with the effectiveness of political money.

For instance, suppose that the rules and customs of the House confer great prestige and authority on subcommittees, each composed of perhaps six or eight members, and that their decisions are rarely reversed by either the parent committee or the full House. Further suppose that committee rules are so ill-defined and loose that the chairman

and perhaps one or two favored colleagues have almost a monopoly over the deliberations of their subcommittees, and that there are no requirements for committee vote disclosure or open sessions.

Under these conditions, it is obvious that producer groups having a vital interest in legislation handled by a particular subcommittee have a built-in potential for enormous influence—not the least by campaign contributions to a small number of members. By concentrating their attentions, favors, and contributions on these strategically placed members, especially the chairman, they can often very efficiently and effectively achieve their legislative ends. When decision-making power is buried in some remote bureau or legislative subcommittee, it is the producer groups (not representatives of broader interests) that have the superior capacity to be first in line at the committee room door.

The polar opposite of this situation can be best illustrated by the defeat of the SST. Probably no more intense campaign has been waged on any single domestic issue in recent years than the combined efforts of the aerospace industry, the administration and the labor unions in the spring of 1971 to secure continued funding for the project. Clearly, if there were ever a classic scenario in which overwhelming special interest might be assembled for victory at the expense of the public interest, this was it. Yet, as we reflect back on its demise, there appear to be a number of characteristics of the decision-making process which proved inhospitable to interest-group domination.

Most importantly, the decision was taken, after many months of intensive debate in the national press and other public forums, in a close and dramatic vote on the floor of the House, not in a closed committee room. The oil depletion allowance, by contrast, has not been subject to an open public vote on the floor of the full House of Representatives for decades. These two examples suggest that the scope and level of the decision-making process may have a great deal to do with whether or not special interests prevail.

THE "ACTION CHANNEL"

This same spectrum applies to the executive branch. If decisions are buried deep in the bureaucracy with little central control and review from above, the obstacles to producer group influence are substantially reduced. In return for a large contribution, for instance, a producer group may be successful in securing the appointment of a bureau head who is favorably disposed toward its interests. As decisions are moved up to the presidential level, as the President's current problems resulting from the milk support decision attest, the possibilities for public scrutiny and accountability are much greater.

The purchasing power of special interest contributions, then, varies considerably, depending upon what Richard Neustadt has called the "action channel," or the location of effective decision-making power. Since this "action channel" is often located deep and sometimes obscurely in the governmental structure, public campaign finance would tend substantially to reduce the ability of specialized producer groups to take advantage of that obscurity.

Yet, again, reduction or elimination of interest group contributions from the campaign funding system will not entirely nullify the advantages of producer groups. All the other factors of influence will continue to remain operative. So long as effective decisionmaking power is lodged deep in the governmental structure, the ability to mobilize grass-roots membership, the presence of professional lobbyists and the provision of specialized information and expertise will tend to magnify the influence of producer groups, even should they be deprived of their most potent source of leverage through enactment of a bill providing funds for candidates.

It is clear that the time is long overdue for reform of the woefully inadequate campaign funding system whose worst manifestations have done so much to discredit government and politics in the past two years. The *sine qua non* of this effort must surely be the elimination of both the corrupting appearance and fact of large contributions, and the replacement of these funds with some measure of public financing. Yet only by approaching this project with a clear understanding of its limits as well as its possibilities, of the pitfalls to be encountered as well as the gains to be reaped, can we insure that the venture will be fruitful.

LEGISLATIVE STATUS REPORT

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, periodically, I enter into the RECORD a status report on legislation I have sponsored. Following is such a report covering all legislation I sponsored during the 93d Congress:

LEGISLATIVE STATUS REPORT, JUNE 1974

AGRICULTURE

H.R. 5683. (Denholm): Funds REA Emergency Loan Program (Enacted as PL 93-32).

H.R. 3077 (Dellums): Limits procurement of lettuce by the Department of Defense.

H.R. 13080 (Mathias): Embargo on export of fertilizers.

H.R. 14661 (Dellums): Free seeds for gardeners (Agriculture Committee hearings started).

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

H.R. 8770 (Nedzi): Establish Folklife Center in Library of Congress (hearings started by House Administration Committee.)

ASIAN-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

H.R. 3086 (Dellums): Japanese-American Friendship Act.

BUDGET

H.R. 8897 (Rangel): Make full appropriations for OEQ.

CHILD WELFARE

H.R. 3081 (Dellums): Comprehensive Child Care Services.

H.R. 2573 (Dellums): Requires child-care facilities in low rent housing projects.

H.R. 6379 (Schroeder): Establish National Center on Child Development and Abuse Prevention within HEW (enacted as P.L. 93-247.)

H.R. 8270 (Daniels): Youth Camp Safety Act (Education and Labor Committee hearings started.)

CIVIL LIBERTIES

H.R. 2572 (Dellums): Defines the authority of armed forces to gather intelligence.

H.R. 2577 (Dellums): Government must notify individuals of records kept by government agencies.

H.R. 2578 (Dellums): Limits the sale of mailing lists by federal agencies.

H.R. 2579 (Dellums): Amends the Hatch Act.

H.R. 2581 (Dellums): Lowers juror age from 21 to 18 in federal courts.

H.R. 2582 (Dellums): Gun control.

H.R. 2584 (Dellums): Newsmen privilege (Similar bill, H.R. 5928 to be reported in lieu).

H.R. 3100 (Dellums): Amnesty (initial hearings by Judiciary Committee).

H.R. 3520 (Waldie) Protects confidential sources of news media—Similar bill H.R. 5928 to be reported in lieu.

H.R. 4209 (Diggs) Safeguards Americans abroad from discrimination.

H.R. 5592 (Drinan) Abolishes capital punishment.

H.R. 7796 (Dellums) Better Voting Act (post card registration passed Senate, pending in House).

H.R. 9480 (Kastenmeier): Voting rights for former convicts.

H.R. 10182 (Stark): Protection of financial information.

H.R. 11275 (Goldwater): Code of Fair Information Practices Act.

H.R. 12349 (Litton): Limits IRS authority for inspection of tax returns.

H.R. 13077 (Heinz): National Rape Control and Prevention Act.

H.R. 13912 (Conyers): Grand Jury system reform.

H.J. Res. 217 (Dellums): Lowers age requirement for membership in Congress.

H.J. Res. 242 (Brown): Gives Members of Congress the right to sue for impoundment of funds.

H.J. Res. 291 (Delugo): Allow citizens of Guam and Virgin Islands to vote for President and Vice-President.

H. Res. 556 (Dellums): Constitutional amendment giving Congress power to change election laws.

COMMERCE

H.R. 8288 (Stark): Allow coops to receive SBA assistance.

H.R. 12532 (Sarasin): Embargo on petrochemical exports until end of price controls.

H.R. 15056 (Sisk): Prevention of discrimination in rates against privately owned refrigerator rail cars.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

H.R. 3385 (Dellums): All Congressional and agency meetings open to public.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

H.R. 2412 (Rosenthal): Establishes Office of Consumer Affairs. (Substitute. Bill passed House.)

H.R. 2580 (Dellums): Requires licensing of food manufacturers and processors.

H.R. 3093 (Dellums): Consumers class action rights.

H.R. 3096 (Dellums): Bans war toys.

H.R. 4879 (Udall): Full disclosure on land sales (Included in land use bill. Defeated in House.)

H.R. 8436 (O'Hara): Prohibit weaker State meat inspection standards (Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains completed hearings).

H.R. 11460 (Brown of Cal.): Banks and Savings & Loans pay interest on escrow accounts.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE

H.R. 6316 (Danielson): Create Federal Disaster Insurance Corporation.

H.R. 7547 (Dellems): Eucalyptus tree fire danger assistance. (Reported by Agriculture Committee; Rules defeated on House floor.)

H.R. 7926 (Stark): Disaster Relief Act Assistance for Seventh District

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

H.R. 2574 (Dellums): Statehood for D.C.

H.R. 5598 (Fauntroy): Rent control for the District of Columbia. (Signed into law as PL 93-157.)

H.R. 9470 (Dellums): Autonomous elected Board of Education for the District of Columbia. (Hearings started by subcommittee on Education.)

H.R. 9682 (Diggs): Home Rule for the District of Columbia. (Signed into law as P.L. 93-198.)

H.R. 11108 (Diggs): Extend D.C. Medical and Dental Manpower Act of 1970 (reported by subcommittee.)

H.R. 11238 (Gude): Subsidized adoption program for D.C. (Signed into law as P.L. 93-241.)

H.R. 12832 (Diggs): D.C. Law Revision Commission (Passed House)

H.R. 14662 (Dellums): Pay raise for D.C. teachers (Subcommittee hearings held)

H.R. 14692 (Fauntroy): Urban homesteading program for D.C.

DRUGS

H.R. 3103. (Dellums): Prohibits the mailing of unsolicited sample drug products.

H.R. 3382 (Dellums): Regulates interstate sale and trafficking of hypodermic needles.

H.R. 7061 (Dellums): Prohibits aid to foreign countries who produce drugs.

H.R. 10732 (Owens): Amends F.D.A. vitamin labeling regulations. (Commerce Committee hearings underway.)

H.R. 12582 (Wolff): Authorizes printing of pamphlet describing drug laws in other nations for travelers

EDUCATION

H.R. 3082 (Dellums): Grants to Degandah-Quetzalcotal University.

H.R. 3085 (Dellums): Encourages States to increase proportion of expenditures to public education.

H.R. 3378 (Dellums): Provides instructional services for homebound children.

H.J. Res. 810 (Dellums): National Education Policy. (Adopted as part of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1974.)

H.J. Res. 851 (Badillo): Authorize President to proclaim week of May 13, 1974 as Bilingual Education Week.

EMPLOYMENT

H.R. 1490 (Eckhardt): Amends Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

H.R. 2585 (Dellums): Unemployment insurance for agricultural workers.

H.R. 2586 (Dellums): Extends unemployment insurance for agricultural workers.

H.R. 3083 (Dellums): Day laborer's rights.

H.R. 3110 (Dellums): Assigns unused lab space to unemployed scientists.

H.R. 3112 (Dellums): Pension Rights. (Weaker bill in conference between House and Senate)

H.R. 3986 (Hawkins): Public Service employment programs.

H.R. 5401 (Corman): Unemployment insurance for agricultural workers.

H.R. 5706 (Hawkins): Aid for OIC programs.

H.R. 6161 (McFall): Establishes price wage board and guidelines.

H.R. 7224 (Harrington): Federal Security of Employment Benefits.

H.R. 7225 (Harrington): Improve extended unemployment and compensation program.

H.R. 7964 (Mink): Equalize compensation of overseas teachers.

H.R. 8372 (Heinz): Reallocation of vocational rehabilitation funds.

H.R. 8420 (Harrington): Public Service Employment Act.

H.R. 9699 (Abzug): Flexible Hours Employment Act.

H.R. 10970 (Dellums): Eliminate employment discrimination because of type of military discharge.

H.R. 12257 (Roybal): Establish a National Office for Migrant and Seasonal Workers.

H.R. 13075 (Harrington): Revised Public Service Employment Act.

H.J. Res 243 (Harrington): Increases House of Representatives intern programs.

ENERGY

H.R. 5234 (Kastenmeier): Prevents coal companies from owning all energy sources.

H.R. 8069 (Aspin): Continued gas sales to independent retailers. (Hearings held by Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.)

H.R. 8802 (Burton): Percentage of oil imports must be carried on U.S. ships. (Similar bill H.R. 8193 passed House.)

H.R. 9095 (Owens): Recycling of waste products.

H.R. 9364 (Fraser): Amend Interstate Commerce Act to prevent oil companies from owning pipelines.

H.R. 10299 (Ashley): Improving motor vehicle fuel economy.

H.R. 10542 (Dingell): Assuring adequate fuel supplies.

H.R. 11058 (McCormack): Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act. (In conference between House and Senate.)

H.R. 12430 (Vanik): Eliminate tax preference on oil operations outside the U.S. (Scheduled for floor debate.)

H.R. 12595 (Drinan): Deny energy companies tax deductions for institutional advertising.

H.R. 12909 (Fraser): Exempt certain cheaper crude oil from price controls.

H.R. 13462 (Moakley): Special assistance to workers unemployed or underemployed because of energy shortages.

H.R. 13581 (Harrington): Prevent interlocking corporate ties among oil companies.

H.R. 13642 (Hanrahan): Ad expenses may not be counted as costs by utilities in rate making.

H.R. 13783 (Reid): Investigate accounting practices of oil companies.

H. Res. 1024 (Rangel): Create Select Committee on Effects of Energy Crisis on the Poor.

ENVIRONMENT

H.R. 2677 (Hechler): Strip Mining Act. (Weaker bill scheduled for floor debate.)

H.R. 3076 (Dellums): Safe Pesticide Act.

H.R. 3092 (Dellums): Smogless Vehicles Development Act.

H.R. 3095 (Dellums): Emissions Control Act.

H.R. 3097 (Dellums): Amends National Emission Standards Act to require most stringent standards.

H.R. 3101 (Dellums): Regulates dumping in oceans and other waters.

H.R. 3102 (Dellums): Provides for environmental action suits. (Hearings held by Merchant Marine Committee.)

H.R. 3104 (Dellums): Increases penalties under 1899 Refuse Act.

H.R. 3105 (Dellums): Amends Refuse Act of 1899 relating to issuance of certain permits.

H.R. 3106 (Dellums): Provides for assistance in enforcing clean air and water standards.

H.R. 3107 (Dellums): Synthetic Detergent Study.

H.R. 3388 (Dellums): Establishes Desert Pupfish National Monument.

H.R. 5325 (Dellums): Establishes a National Environmental Trust Fund.

H.R. 8530 (Udall): Alaskan Petroleum Transportation Act. (Weaker P.L. 93-153 signed into law.)

H.R. 8889 (Koch): Spaying and neutering clinics.

H.R. 9583 (Patman): Fire Prevention and Control Act. (In conference between House and Senate.)

H.R. 9866 (Bafalis): Deauthorization of Cross Florida Barge Canal.

H.R. 13951 (Seiberling): Increase Land and Water Conservation Act funds.

H.J. Res. 763 (Matsunaga): Set aside of EPA water pollution regulations.

FOOD STAMPS

H.R. 2571 (Dellums): Allows food stamps to be used for purchase of imported meats.

H.R. 12990 (Holtzman): Prevent cutbacks to persons affected by 1973 Social Security Act amendments. (Related bill scheduled for floor debate.)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

H.R. 179 (Dellums): Halt bombing and withdraw from Vietnam.

H.R. 3911 (Mills): Prohibits most-favored nation treatment for denial of right to emigrate. (Included in trade bill now pending in Senate.)

H.R. 4987 (Roybal): Increases immigration.

H.R. 5741 (Roybal): Increases immigration from western hemisphere.

H.R. 8005 (Fraser): Re-institution of Rhodesian chrome ore boycott sanctions.

CXX—1231—Part 15

(Reported by subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.)

H.R. 8177 (Harrington): Cut off war funds in Cambodia and Laos.

H.R. 8573 (Rangel): Herbicide Export Control Act.

H.R. 8574 (Rangel): Prohibit exports of herbicide to Portugal and S. Africa.

H.R. 8965 (Steiger): Citizenship and adoption for S. Vietnamese children.

H.R. 9214 (Kastenmeier): Accountability and liability for government officials involved in national security policy.

H.R. 10588 (Matsunaga): Creates Department of Peace.

H.R. 12156 (Dellums): Cut off aid to Saigon until Paris Agreements are met.

H.R. 12961 (Littton): Prevent U.S. fuel used to train pilots of nations embargoing petroleum to this country.

H.R. 13927 (Brown of California): Extend temporary visas for Chileans.

H.R. 15026 (Studds): Extend territorial boundaries for fishing rights.

H. Res. 441 (Harrington): Test Ban Treaty Negotiations.

H. Res. 493 (Gude): Prohibition of weather modification in war.

H. Res. 522 (Diggs): Fair employment in South Africa.

H. Res. 523 (Fraser): Diplomatic relations between U.S. and Sweden. (Approved by subcommittee on Europe.)

H. Res. 616 (O'Neill): Phantom Jet sales to Israel.

H. Res. 1113 (Dellums): Condemning terrorism in Middle East.

H.J. Res. 268 (Diggs): Fair employment in South African enterprises.

H.J. Res. 516 (Bingham): To end the war in Indochina. (Subcommittee of Asian and Pacific Affairs conducting hearings.)

H. Con. Res. 417 (Drinan): Declaration of world peace (Foreign Affairs Committee hearings started).

H. Con. Res. 432 (Long of Maryland): Proposed conference on arms sales to the Middle East.

H. Con. Res. 496 (Rangel): Calling for negotiations on the Turkish opium ban.

H.J. Res. 268 (Diggs): Fair employment in South African enterprises.

H.J. Res. 516 (Bingham): To end the war in Indochina. (Subcommittee of Asian and Pacific Affairs conducting hearings.)

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

H.R. 2576 (Dellums): Amends Age Discrimination Act to include state employees.

H.R. 3296 (Pickle): Impoundment limits (similar bill, H.R. 8480, passed by House).

H.R. 3379 (Dellums): Expands the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations to include school board officials.

H.R. 5398 (Conyers): Prevent dismantling of OEO.

H.R. 5587 (Conyers): Prevent dismantling of OEO.

H.R. 5626 (Reid): Eliminates restrictions on social service regulations.

H.R. 5722 (Melcher): Consent needed for OMB Director. (Vetoed by President. Revised version signed into law as P.L. 93-250.)

H.R. 6223 (Dellums): Bureaucratic Accountability Act. (Judiciary Committee hearings started).

H.R. 6261 (Mink): Amends Freedom of Information Act.

H.R. 7266 (Mitchell): Put protective police under GSA.

H.R. 7696 (Dellums): Federal Employee benefits retirement amendments. (Reported by subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Mail.)

H.R. 7697 (Dellums): Postal Reorganization Act Amendments.

H.R. 7698 (Dellums): Postal Service Labor relations amendment.

H.R. 12004 (Moorhead): Amendments on

classification of government documents. (In conference between House and Senate.)

H.R. 12157 (Dellums): Federal Election Finance Act. (Hearings underway by House Administration Committee.)

H.R. 13181 (Charles Wilson of California): Eliminate restrictions on rights of postal workers.

H.R. 13767 (Dellums): Continuing Congressional Oversight Act.

H.R. 13798 (Dellums): Central Intelligence Agency Disclosure Act.

H.R. 13799 (Dellums): Congressional Access to Information Act.

H. Res. 148 (Dellums): Abolishes Committee on Internal Security.

H.J. Res. 432 (Reid): Social Service program regulations.

H.J. Res. 999 (Anderson of California): Prohibits changes in the consumer price index unless approved by Congress.

HEALTH

H.R. 6041 (Hastings): Health Programs Extension (signed into law as P.L. 93-45).

H.R. 6622 (Waldie): Extension of Migrant Health Act.

H.R. 8539 (Murphy): Continuation of Public Health Service Hospitals.

H.R. 9363 (Burke of Calif.): Expand the definition of "Development Disability" to include autism.

H.R. 13084 (Meeds): Health Education Program grants.

H.R. 15098 (Koch): Authorizes immediate recall of adulterated or misbranded foods and drugs.

HOLIDAYS

H.R. 2265 (Conyers): Designates Martin Luther King's birthday as legal holiday.

H.R. 12850 (Symington): Designate a Susan B. Anthony Public Holiday.

H. Con. Res. 465 (Bingham): Put a bust of Dr. Martin Luther King in Capitol Building.

HOUSING

H.R. 3080 (Dellums): Authorizes loans to pay mortgages of persons temporarily unemployed.

H.R. 10902 (Stephens): Rural Housing Act. (Partly included in housing bill scheduled for House debate.)

H.R. 13985 (Mitchell of Md.): Housing Act amendments. (Rejected by Banking Committee during consideration of Housing bill.)

H.R. 14900 (Metcalfe): Loan program for low and middle income homeowners maintenance and improvements.

H.R. 15024 (Roush): Increased depreciation allowed for expenditures on low income rental housing.

IMPEACHMENT

H.R. 13094 (Rallsback): Gives Congress the right to relevant information.

H.R. 14817 (Reid): Prevents plea bargaining by President.

H. Res. 465 (Stark): Study by House Committee of Watergate.

H. Res. 650 (Abzug): Impeachment.

H. Res. 1107 (Owens): Authorizes full broadcasting of impeachment proceedings.

H.J. Res. 784 (Culver): Appoint special prosecutor for floor vote. (Similar H.R. 11401 reported in lieu.)

LEGAL SERVICES

H.R. 3099 (Dellums): Provides compensation for victims of violent crimes.

H.R. 4263 (Meeds): Establishes the National Legal Services Corporation (weaker bill enacted as P.L. 93-95).

H.R. 8349 (Roybal): Provide bi-lingual court proceedings.

MILITARY AFFAIRS

H.R. 3111 (Dellums): Increases service-men's group life insurance coverage.

H.R. 3224 (Benitez): Terminates weapons range activities near Culebra. (Defense Department registered official objection.)

H.R. 3386 (Dellums): Provides veterans with up to nine months of educational assistance and refresher courses. (Similar bill passed as PL 93-293).

H.R. 4751 (Danielson): Social Security benefit increases disregard for purposes of determining eligibility for veterans benefits. (Veterans committee hearings held).

H.R. 7695 (Dellums): Establishes Assistant Secretary of Defense for Equal Opportunity.

H.R. 7794 (Dellums): Bans bounties paid civilian police forces.

H.R. 8490 (Koch): Changes in military discharge information released to public.

H.R. 8491 (Koch): Independent Review Boards for discharges.

H.R. 8492 (Koch): Increased veterans educational benefits.

H.R. 8494 (Koch): Additional educational benefits for Vietnam vets.

H.R. 8496 (Koch): Establishes Vietnam era veterans task force.

H.R. 8687 (Leggett): Special pay incentives for physicians, dentists, veterinarians and optometrists. (Armed Services Committee hearings.)

H.R. 8719 (Dellums): Overseas troop reduction limitation. (Defeated as amendment to procurement bill.)

H.R. 8960 (Robison): Establish within Peace Corps Vietnam Assistance Volunteers program.

H.R. 10011 (Owens): Controls transportation of nerve gas (Armed Services Committee hearings.)

H.R. 10882 (Abzug): Psychiatric help for Vietnam veterans.

H.R. 11267 (Du Pont): No sex discrimination in Military Academy appointments. (Armed Services Committee hearings.)

H.R. 12144 (Stokes): Limitations on information on discharge certificates.

H.R. 12949 (Carey): Increase veterans education benefits.

H.R. 13104 (Dellums): Eliminate employment discrimination because of discharge status.

H.R. 13506 (Koch): Give veterans benefits to conscientious objectors who have performed alternative service.

H. Res. 220 (Kyros): Troop reduction in western Europe. (Hearings being conducted by Subcommittee on Europe.)

H. Res. 528 (Owens): Detoxification of nerve gas by DOD.

H. Res. 712 (Owens): Review of national policy regarding chemical warfare.

H. Con. Res. 253 (Dellums): Overseas troop reduction limitation.

H.J. Res. 267 (Dellums): Clarifies presidential powers relating to the use of nuclear weapons in declared or undeclared wars. (Weaker H.J. Res. 542 vetoed by President and overridden by House; now law as PL 93-148.)

MOTOR VEHICLES

H.R. 3091 (Dellums): Bans the use of internal combustion engines in motor vehicles after Jan. 1, 1975.

H.R. 3094 (Dellums): Speed Controls in cars.

H.R. 3108 (Dellums): Color coded traffic signs and signals.

NATIVE AMERICANS

H.R. 3090 (Dellums): Enforces Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo.

H. Con. Res. 115 (Meeds): American and Alaskan Native Act.

PENAL REFORM

H.R. 2583 (Dellums): Omnibus Penal Reform Act.

H.R. 5202 (Badillo): Provides rules for treatment of prisoners in federal prisons.

H.R. 6852 (Dellums): Prohibits psychosurgery in federal facilities.

POPULATION POLICY

H.R. 3381 (Dellums): Expands family planning services and population research.

H.R. 6021 (Dellums): Extension of Family Planning Act. (Commerce Committee hearings held.)

H.R. 8114 (Brown): Establish National Institute of Population Sciences.

PUBLIC LANDS

H.R. 3087 (Dellums): 160 acre limit enactment.

H.R. 7458 (Dellums): Channel Islands National Park.

H.R. 3088 (Dellums): Open Beach Act.

H.R. 3089 (Dellums): Mineral King: enlarges Sequoia National Park.

H.R. 4012 (Leggett): Snow Mountain Wilderness Bill. (Interior Committee hearings held.)

H.R. 4568 (Waldie): San Joaquin Wilderness and Sierra and Inyo National Forests.

H.R. 5288 (Mathias): Establishes California Desert National Conservation Area.

H.R. 9764 (Pettis): Protection of California desert areas. (Interior Committee hearings held.)

H.R. 12895 (Melcher): Designate new wilderness areas (Merchant Marine Committee hearings.)

H.R. 14011 (Stark): Authorizes study for a Ridgeland National Park in East Bay area.

H.J. Res. 204 (Dingell): Establishes Tule Elk Wildlife Refuge. (Merchant Marine Committee hearings.)

SENIOR CITIZENS

H.R. 3084 (Dellums): Establishes older worker community service program.

H.R. 3098 (Dellums): Free or reduced rail transportation to handicapped or 65 and over.

H.R. 3377 (Dellums): Strengthens Older Americans Act (Enacted as P.L. 93-17).

H.R. 3388 (Dellums): Widow, widower benefits bill.

H.R. 7052 (Dellums): Tax credit for senior citizen homeowners and renters.

H.R. 8595 (Lehman): Experimental program of elderly home care.

H.R. 11122 (Pepper): Nutrition programs for the elderly.

H.R. 12365 (Riegle): Establishes a food allowance for older Americans.

SOCIAL SECURITY

H.R. 3116 (Dellums): Include qualified drugs under Hospital Insurance Program.

H.R. 3117 (Dellums): Individuals may qualify regardless of quarters when earned.

H.R. 3118 (Dellums): Liberalizes eligibility for blind persons.

H.R. 5258 (Stokes): Disability insurance benefits.

H.R. 8546 (Abzug): Minimum annual incomes.

H.R. 10236 (Rosenthal): Increase Social Security benefits enacted by public law (Enacted into law as P.L. 93-233).

H.R. 10584 (DeLugo): Social Security increases for Guam and the Virgin Islands.

H.R. 11169 (Corman): Give states wide range for social service funds.

H.R. 11276 (Goldwater): Limit use of Social Security number and information.

H.R. 11471 (Grasso): Limit Medicare inpatient hospital deductible costs.

H.R. 12947 (Burke of Mass.): Increases federal contribution to trust fund.

H.R. 13126 (Abzug): Emergency grants to persons whose SSI checks are lost or stolen.

H.R. 13400 (Harrington): Forbids cuts in veterans pensions because of social security increases.

H.R. 14809 (McKinney): Authorizes supplemental benefits for additional medicare physical examinations.

H.R. 15123 (Brown of Michigan): Provides staggering of social security check issuance throughout the month.

SPORTS

H.R. 2575 (Dellums): Athletic Safety Act.

H.R. 7083 (Badillo): Roberto Clemente Memorial Foundation.

H.R. 7795 (Dellums): Athletic Care Act. (Education and Labor Committee adopted amendment to Elementary and Secondary Education Act calling for one year study of athletic injury problem).

H.R. 13156 (Selberling): Professional athletes bill of rights.

H. Res. 487 (Anderson of Calif.): Honoring Hank Aaron.

TAXES

H.R. 1041 (Corman): Tax equity.

H.R. 3113 (Dellums): Expenses for care of certain dependents.

H.R. 3114 (Dellums): Excise tax on fuels containing sulphur.

H.R. 3115 (Dellums): Increase personal exemptions after 1974.

H.R. 3120 (Dellums): Extends to unmarried persons tax benefits of splitting income.

H.R. 3387 (Dellums): Residents of Philippines can be claimed as tax-deductible dependents.

H.R. 6030 (Fraser): Puts \$1 campaign tax check-off on front page of tax form.

H.R. 7053 (Dellums): World Peace Tax Fund.

H.R. 12992 (Jordan): Reduction in withholding taxes.

H.R. 14424 (Hogan): Withhold taxes for congressional employees.

H.R. 14496 (Rarick): Additional deduction for adoption expenses.

H.R. 15076 (Holtzman): Additional deduction for dependent care expenses.

TRANSPORTATION

H.R. 3078 (Dellums): Urban mass transit fund.

H.R. 3079 (Dellums): Oakland-Chinatown project.

H.R. 8570 (Moss): Defining inclusive tour air charters.

H.R. 10155 (Burke of Cal.): High speed West coast ground transportation.

H.R. 14447 (Gunter): Suspend diesel fuel excise tax and roll back prices.

URBAN AFFAIRS

H.R. 3109 (Dellums): Construction of bicycle lanes.

H.R. 3985 (Hawkins): Year round recreational program for youth.

H.R. 4820 (McFall): Extends Public Works Act authorization for one year (similar bill H.R. 2246 enacted as PL 93-46).

WOMEN

H.R. 3374 (Dellums): Prohibits discrimination by sex or marital status for extension of credit (Enacted by Senate; House action pending).

H.R. 3375 (Dellums): Prohibits discrimination by sex or marital status for any dealings with any federally insured banks.

H.R. 3376 (Dellums): Prohibits discrimination by sex or marital status regarding federally related mortgage transactions.

H.R. 3383 (Dellums): Prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex.

H.R. 3384 (Dellums): The Ms. prefix bill.

H.R. 9776 (Abzug): Postage stamp honoring Jeannette Rankin.

H.R. 13251 (Holtzman): Eliminate wage differential discrimination based on sex.

IT COULD BE KICK AN INDIAN IN THE POCKETBOOK DAY WHEN H.R. 11500 COMES TO THE FLOOR

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, proposed surface coal mining legislation in the form of H.R. 11500 needlessly goes out

of its way to hurt people. Even the poor Indians are not immune from its meat ax approach to the problem of instituting proper reclamation of mined land.

The bill would make it impossible for Indians to mine their coal lands where surface rights are, for any reason in the hands of someone else, until and unless that someone else gets paid off and grants permission to do so.

Of course, this misbegotten piece of legislative foolishness is at least discriminatory in a universal way. It also imposes the same unconscionable burden on coal landowners who are not Indians.

The usual rules of law see to it that the holder of surface rights to land beneath which mining is to occur shall be adequately compensated for whatever loss they incur by reason of the mining. By comparison, H.R. 11500 would give such holders the right to stop all mining pending payment of a ransom which Indians and non-Indians alike have to fork over.

Congress does not have to buy all that, or all the other environmental extremism hidden like fishhooks in H.R. 11500. It has an alternative, H.R. 12898, which will accomplish the reclaiming of mined land, while, at the same time: First allowing needed coal to be mined, and, second, disallowing surface interest owners the privilege of blackmail.

A CASE AGAINST RAPE

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, WEEI-CBS Radio in Boston has recently completed an editorial series on the crime of rape. Awareness of any problem is one of the most important steps in solving it. And I believe we are making enormous strides in promoting public awareness of the rape problem—with this particular series of editorials as one example. With the hope of spurring my colleagues along and at the same time urging immediate action on H.R. 11520, I insert in the RECORD at this time the four editorials by Francis Giles, editorial and public affairs director at WEEI, on "Another Case of Rape."

The editorials follow:

A CASE AGAINST RAPE

Three hundred and seventy-six Boston women reported that they were sexually assaulted last year and only twenty-one men were convicted for those rapes. The rate of rape is rising throughout the United States and it will continue to rise until this crime is dealt with intelligently.

FBI statistics show that the actual number of rapes is somewhere between five and ten times the number reported each year.

Legal reform has been haltingly slow in the area of rape which accounts for the low conviction rate.

Because of the stigma attached, women have been hesitant to report these attacks. Police departments have dealt with rapes as

low priority crimes and therefore arrests have been few.

The public hasn't been well informed about sexual assault and is just realizing the enormity of the problem. Also, because of fear and the social intolerance of police, prosecutors and the community in general, women have not known how to protect themselves or how to prevent what has happened to them from happening to others.

During the remainder of the week WEEI will be discussing the subject of rape and what progressive legislation is pending. Tomorrow WEEI will look at Massachusetts House Bill 5802.

ANOTHER CASE OF RAPE—PART II

Yesterday WEEI began a series of editorials to discuss the crime of rape and the needed changes in our legal codes.

Today we will look at Massachusetts House Bill 5802 proposed by State Representative Jon Rotenberg of Brookline. Rotenberg's bill prohibits both rape and homosexual rape and proposes imprisonment up to life for violators. The measure has been approved by the state's judiciary committee and is now awaiting full legislative approval.

WEEI supports passage of House Bill 5802. It is a first step to overhauling the Commonwealth's archaic rape laws. In accordance with the advice women are currently being given by law enforcement officers not to resist attackers, the measure will also provide grounds for prosecution of those who sexually assault others with the threat of physical harm.

Rape is probably the most heinous personal assault that one individual may commit against another and it is past time to protect women and men from these attacks. This bill essentially defines sexual assault and will make it unlawful to commit sodomy or rape with anyone—man or woman—against his will.

We ask you to support House Bill 5802 and to tell your representatives that you do. WEEI hopes that the public will no longer look at the rape victim as the guilty party and that juries will consider the seriousness of this crime.

Tomorrow WEEI will look at federal legislation proposed to form a national center for prevention and control of rape.

ANOTHER CASE OF RAPE—PART III

For the past two days WEEI has been talking about rape in hopes of stimulating further public reaction to this barbaric crime.

Yesterday we urged passage of Massachusetts House Bill 5802 which would replace the Commonwealth's archaic rape statute and offer prison sentences up to life for offenders.

Today WEEI will discuss the National Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape proposed by Kansas Congressman Larry Winn, Jr. and 66 other House members.

The bill, H.R. 11520 will establish an organization with facilities for studying the effectiveness of existing Federal and local laws dealing with rape as well as the treatment rape victims receive.

After studying the incidence of sexual assault and the effectiveness of programs designed to prevent its occurrence, the National Center would make grants to community mental health agencies, private non-profit organizations and public projects to research rape prevention. The Center would also provide funding to establish programs for counseling rape victims.

The measure is currently being heard before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. We urge favorable consideration of H.R. 11520.

ANOTHER CASE OF RAPE—PART IV

For the past few days, WEEI's editorials have dealt with the subject of rape.

We have discussed statistics—that 376 Boston women reported last year that they were sexually assaulted and how that figure reflects only a small percentage of the actual number of women who were attacked. We have also talked about the low conviction rate, that only 21 men were sentenced for those assaults.

Why is it that only a small number of women report these attacks and an even smaller number of men are convicted? These answers lie somewhere within the multiple standards that our society employs to morally judge men and women and find that the two sexes should be treated differently.

The conservative moral attitudes displayed by some juries have forced prosecuting attorneys to make such differentiations as "hard" and "soft" rape. The difference indicates whether the woman was brutally assaulted or that she might have unwittingly put herself into some "compromising" situation and then she was attacked.

Women are often treated not as the victim, but as the culprit and for that reason many women have found the involved process of making police reports can be humiliating.

Rape isn't treated like any other personal assault crime.

Unless other circumstances such as homicide or kidnapping prevail, there isn't the immediate response on the part of law enforcement officers, prosecutors, or juries.

It is a sad commentary of our judicial and moral system that so many women are compelled to live within a rape schedule; afraid to walk unaccompanied on even the most brightly lighted streets, not able to attend plays or concerts alone and unable to run, even to the grocery store or walk their dogs after dark for fear that someone will attack them.

THE 34TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET ANNEXATION OF LITHUANIA

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, June 15, 1974, marked the 34th anniversary of the forcible annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Government into the Soviet Union. Along with Latvia and Estonia, Lithuania was carved into the Soviet sphere as a result of big power machinations stemming from the Nazi-Soviet pact of 1939. This wholesale land grab by the Soviets was stoutly and courageously resisted by Lithuanian freedom fighters who, defending their homeland, dared to take on the Soviet occupation army. Fifty thousand Lithuanian lives were lost in the ensuing struggle. This valiant guerrilla resistance has provided the basis for the ongoing tradition of anti-Soviet sentiment that is clearly manifest in Lithuanian society today.

An incident which demonstrates this anti-Soviet sentiment occurred recently when a Lithuanian seaman aboard a Soviet vessel sought asylum on a U.S. Coast Guard ship. Unfortunately, the Soviet authorities were permitted to board the U.S. ship and to seize the Lithua-

nian seaman who was subsequently imprisoned. I have recently introduced a resolution which expresses concern over the fate of this unfortunate seaman. The resolution reads as follows:

H. CON. RES. 504

Whereas Simas Kudirka, a Lithuanian seaman, attempted to seek asylum in the United States while his ship was moored beside a United States Coast Guard vessel in United States territorial waters; and

Whereas Simas Kudirka was forcibly seized from the United States Coast Guard vessel and returned by Soviet authorities to a Soviet vessel, and subsequently imprisoned in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas American citizens are increasingly concerned about this flagrant violation of human rights; and

Whereas his continued imprisonment and the inability to learn of his welfare raise among American citizens an impediment to the improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States direct the Secretary of State to bring to the immediate attention of the Soviet Government the deep and growing concern among citizens of the United States over the plight of Simas Kudirka and to urge his release from imprisonment and his return to his family.

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States forward a copy of this concurrent resolution to the United States Representative to the United Nations for transmission to the Commission on Human Rights or the Division of Human Rights of the United Nations.

It was also not long ago that a Lithuanian youth burned himself as a martyr in protest against the denial of national self-determination, the denial of religious and political freedom, and the denial of human rights by the Soviet Union. This dramatic action, more than a quarter century after the Soviet takeover, clearly demonstrates the depth of the resentment that patriotic Lithuanians everywhere feel toward the continuing subjugation of their country.

During the Stalin era, this resentment was so strong that the Soviets despaired of ever cajoling the Lithuanian people into accepting Soviet domination and thus were forced to begin a campaign of mass deportation. More than one-sixth of the Lithuanian people were sent into exile in Russia and Siberia. Their only crime was that they steadfastly refused to accept the Soviet line. It was believed by the Soviets that a mass deportation resulting in a significant depopulation would eventually bring about a subjugation of the Lithuanian people through a forced homogenization of their cultural identity. The Soviets vastly underestimated the tenacity of the Lithuanians in retaining their cultural heritage, however. Even after more than 30 years of attempting to erode the 1,000-year-old culture of these brave people, the Soviets have made little, if any, headway.

The United States has never recog-

nized the forcible annexation of Lithuania and other Baltic States to the Soviet Union. If it was wrong 34 years ago to accept this outright neocolonization then it should not be accepted today. We must steadfastly maintain this policy of non-recognition not only as a sign to the people of Lithuania that we are behind them, but also to serve notice on the Soviet Union that the United States, while seeking to decrease tensions in certain areas, by no means intends to imply that it is abandoning its advocacy of the principle of political self-determination.

In 1967 Secretary of State Dean Rusk eloquently reaffirmed U.S. policy toward Lithuania when he stated:

U.S. support for the Lithuanian people's just aspirations for freedom and independence is reflected clearly in our refusal to recognize the forcible incorporation of [Lithuania] into the Soviet Union and in the warm sympathy manifested by the American people in the Lithuanian cause.

In continuing to look resolutely toward a free and independent existence, the Lithuanian people both here and abroad have established a firm foundation for the hope of free men everywhere that the goal of Lithuanian national self-determination will ultimately be realized.

We must never forget these brave people. All Americans should take a moment to consider that, in the community of man, a loss of freedom for some is really a loss for all. Mr. Speaker, this 34th anniversary of the subjugation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union provides an opportunity for us to consider this important lesson. The heroic resistance of the Lithuanian people continues to provide an example to oppressed people throughout the world.

THE CONSUMER—ABOUT TO BE TAKEN AGAIN?

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

MR. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today, representatives of the meat industry will be meeting at the White House with Secretary of Agriculture Butz and Presidential Economic Counselor Kenneth Rush on ways and means to shore up beef prices. It appears that a number of cattlemen and feedlot operators are losing money. It is their own fault. In the past they held cattle off the market and raised beef prices so high that the consumer was "turned off," quit buying beef, and turned to other products. Now the cattlemen are stuck with overweight and old animals and decreased beef demand.

Despite the fact that many of their problems were brought on by their own greed, I would be happy to support efforts of Members of Congress from the cattle areas to investigate why there has not been a proportionate decline in the price of beef in the supermarket—why the middleman has not passed on lower

beef prices and thereby helped restore demand for beef.

But I am opposed to efforts to limit imports of meat products. Even when beef and other meat prices were at record highs, the tariff on low-cost tinned and canned meats was not suspended. Even when beef prices soared through the ceiling, the administration opposed efforts to repeal the meat import quota law.

But now that beef prices have slumped and the consumer has an opportunity for some relief, the cattlemen want the low-priced, hamburger-type foreign meat restricted from entering the country! For the cattlemen, it is the best of both worlds—for the consumer, it is a one-way street: he always must pay.

Now a proposal has even been advanced to provide \$3 billion in Government-guaranteed loans to cattle farmers, ranchers, and feeders. Not only will American consumers be stuck with high beef prices, but as taxpayers, they will have to foot tens of millions of dollars in interest subsidies for the cattlemen. If such legislation were enacted, it might even provide loans for cattlemen to support themselves while they boycott the marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, the American beef producer has spoken for and worked for the "free marketplace"—and Secretary Butz has led the way. But now that prices are slumping, the beef producers are crying "unfair" and have come running to the Federal Government for relief. Last year the cattlemen deliberately adopted a policy which hurt the consumer and helped sabotage the economic stabilization program. Now they have reaped the rewards for their narrow, selfish policy. They should be allowed to stew in the "free marketplace" where there is the freedom to lose—as well as to win.

VOTING RECORD

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

MR. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, a number of constituents have contacted me regarding my legislative performance and voting record for the 93d Congress. To make this information as completely available as possible, I am submitting it for the daily RECORD. However, a simple series of numbers and dates does not inform our constituents of very much and I am therefore enclosing additional voting participation information.

In the 92d Congress my record for voting participation was 91 percent. The congressional average, with 541 recorded votes, was 83 percent. As of June 11, 1974, with 739 recorded votes, my voting percentage for the 93d Congress is 90 percent.

The voting record follows:

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD—HON. BILL FRENZEL—93D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Key: NVF—Not voting (paired for); NVA—Not voting (paired against); PNVF—Present not voting (paired for); PNVA—Present not voting (paired against)

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
1	01/03/73	H1	Quorum—Call of the States	Present			426
2	01/03/73	H2	H. Res. 0—Election of Speaker	Ford	236	188	2
3	01/03/73	H16	H. Res. 6—Ordering the previous question	Nay	208	206	
4	01/15/73	H237	Quorum—Call of the House	Present	251		
5	01/23/73	H389	do	Present			331
6	01/29/73	H513	do	Present			271
7	01/31/73	H591	do	Present			361
8	01/31/73	H598	H. Res. 176—Ordering the previous question	Nay	205	167	
9	01/31/73	H599	H. Res. 176—On agreeing to the resolution	Nay	238	135	
10	01/31/73	H603	H. Res. 132—On agreeing to the resolution	Yea	282	91	
11	02/05/73	H684	H.J. Res. 123—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	283	40	
12	02/06/73	H730	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			336
13	02/07/73	H805	do	Present			375
14	02/07/73	H808	H. Res. 188—Ordering the previous question	Nay	237	150	
15	02/07/73	H831	H.R. 2107—On agreeing to the amendment	Aye	176	217	
16	02/07/73	H835	H.R. 2107—On agreeing to the amendment	Aye	132	260	
17	02/07/73	H838	H.R. 2107—On passage	Nay	251	142	
18	02/20/73	H964	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			343
19	02/20/73	H968	H.R. 3694—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	286	72	1
20	02/21/73	H1020	H.J. Res. 345—On passage	Yea	311	73	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 20)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	10	8	2	20
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	10	8	2	20
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	0	0	0	0
Voting percentage (presence)	100	100	100	100

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
21	02/22/73	H1073	H.R. 1975—On agreeing to the amendment	Not voting	196	160	
22	02/22/73	H1074	H.R. 1975—On passage	NVF	269	95	
23	02/27/73	H1149	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			369
24	02/27/73	H1155	H.R. 3577—On passage	Yea	358	23	
25	02/28/73	H1205	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			387
26	02/28/73	H1210	H. Res. 256—On agreeing to the resolution	Nay	317	75	2
27	02/28/73	H1216	H. Res. 18—Ordering the previous question	Nay	204	191	1
28	02/28/73	H1225	H. Res. 257—On agreeing to the resolution	Nay	153	234	
29	03/01/73	H1275	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			343
30	03/01/73	H1284	H.R. 3298—On passage	Nay	297	54	
31	03/05/73	H1341	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			335
32	03/05/73	H1346	H.R. 4278—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	352	7	
33	03/05/73	H1350	H.J. Res. 393—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	332	29	
34	03/06/73	H1387	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			371
35	03/07/73	H1427	do	Present			379
36	03/07/73	H1434	H. Res. 272—Ordering the previous question	Nay	197	196	1
37	03/07/73	H1447	H. Res. 259—On agreeing to the amendment	No	201	198	
38	03/07/73	H1448	H. Res. 259—On agreeing to the resolution	Yea	371	27	
39	03/08/73	H1516	Quorum—Call of the House	Absent			311
40	03/08/73	H1532	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			309

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 40)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	20	16	4	40
Present responses (yea, nay, present-paired for or against)	19	15	3	37
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	1	1	1	3
Voting percentage (presence)	95	93.7	75	92.5

See footnote at end of table.

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
41	03/08/73	H1536	H.R. 17—On agreeing to the amendment	No	165	213	
42	03/08/73	H1556	H.R. 17—On passage	Yea	318	57	
43	03/13/73	H1642	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			386
44	03/13/73	H1678	H.R. 71—On agreeing to the amendment	No	168	229	
45	03/13/73	H1689	H.R. 71—On passage	Yea	329	69	
46	03/14/73	H1720	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			376
47	03/14/73	H1721	do	do			371
48	03/14/73	H1730	S. 583—On passage	Yea	399	1	
49	03/15/73	H1773	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			366
50	03/15/73	H1804	H.R. 2246—On passage	Nay	278	108	
51	03/20/73	H1954	Quorum—Call of the House	Absent			376
52	03/20/73	H1959	H. Res. 285—On agreeing to the resolution	Not voting	372	9	
53	03/21/73	H2000	Quorum—Call of the House	Absent			372
54	03/21/73	H2006	H.R. 5446—On passage	Yea	392	2	
55	03/22/73	H2064	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			378
56	03/22/73	H2077	H. Res. 308—On agreeing to the resolution	Nay	289	101	1
57	03/22/73	H2090	H.R. 5445—On passage	Yea	387	1	
58	03/27/73	H2156	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			379
59	03/28/73	H2194	do	do			386
60	03/29/73	H2258	do	do			368

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 60)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	28	26	6	60
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	26	23	5	54
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	2	3	1	6
Voting percentage (presence)	92.8	88.4	88.3	90.0

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
61	03/29/73	H2262	H.R. 5293—Recommit with instructions	Nay	132	238	
62	03/29/73	H2263	H.R. 5293—On passage	Yea	299	72	
63	04/02/73	H2309	H.R. 3153—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	340	1	
64	04/02/73	H2316	H. Res. 330—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	303	52	
65	04/03/73	H2371	Quorum call of the House	Present			398
66	04/03/73	H2372	do	Present			375
67	04/03/73	H2376	do	Present			382
68	04/03/73	H2377	do	Present			381
69	04/04/73	H2401	do	Present			404
70	04/04/73	H2404	H.R. 3577—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	396	18	
71	04/04/73	H2408	H. Res. 337—Ordering the previous question	Nay	244	170	
72	04/04/73	H2412	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			381
73	04/04/73	H2412	do	Present			370
74	04/04/73	H2422	H.R. 5683—On agreeing to the amendment	Aye	162	244	
75	04/04/73	H2424	H.R. 5683—On passage	Yea	317	92	
76	04/05/73	H2451	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			349
77	04/05/73	H2457	H. Res. 340—On agreeing to the resolution	Nay	281	70	3
78	04/09/73	H2486	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			321
79	04/09/73	H2490	H.R. 4586—On passage	Yea	328		
80	04/09/73	H2494	H.R. 342—On passage	Yea	331	1	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 80)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	38	35	7	80
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	36	32	6	74
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	2	3	1	6
Voting percentage (presence)	94.7	91.4	85.7	92.5

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD—HON. BILL FRENZEL—93D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
81	04/10/73	H2540	Quorum—Cal. of the House	Present			396
82	04/10/73	H2551	H.R. 3298—On Presidential veto	Nay	225	189	
83	04/10/73	H2563	H. Res. 348—On agreeing to the resolution	Yea	197	210	
84	04/11/73	H2598	H. Res. 348—On agreeing to the resolution	Yea	371	14	1
85	04/11/73	H2618	H.R. 3180—On passage	Yea	354	49	
86	04/12/73	H2681	H.J. Res. 496—On passage	Yea	367		
87	04/16/73	H2727	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			361
88	04/16/73	H2735	H. Res. 357—Ordering the previous question	Nay	147	258	
89	04/16/73	H2761	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			385
90	04/16/73	H2766	H.R. 6168—On agreeing to the amendment	No	139	263	
91	04/16/73	H2767	do	Aye	271	132	
92	04/16/73	H2768	do	No	151	253	
93	04/16/73	H2770	do	No	173	225	6
94	04/16/73	H2771	do	No	147	250	5
95	04/16/73	H2773	do	No	101	303	
96	04/16/73	H2776	H.R. 6168—On motion to recommit	Nay	164	243	
97	04/16/73	H2777	H.R. 6168—On passage	Yea	293	114	
98	04/17/73	H2816	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			369
99	04/17/73	H2832	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			361
100	04/17/73	H2847	H.R. 6691—On agreeing to the amendment	No	189	195	
CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 100)							
				Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes				46	40	14	100
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)				44	37	13	94
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)				2	3	1	6
Voting percentage (presence)				95.6	92.5	92.8	94
Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
101	04/18/73	H2580	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			389
102	04/18/73	H2885	H.R. 6691—On motion to recommit	Nay	185	215	2
103	04/18/73	H2893	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			372
104	04/18/73	H2900	H. Res. 360—Ordering the previous question	Nay	193	209	
105	04/18/73	H2901	H. Res. 360—Ordering the previous question	Yea	157	245	
106	04/18/73	H2941	Quorum—Call in committee	Absent			372
107	04/18/73	H2950	H. Res. 360—On motion to table	Yea	183	173	
108	04/18/73	H2964	S. 50—Agreeing to Senate amendment	Yea	348		
109	04/19/73	H2982	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			380
110	04/19/73	H2991	S. 502—On agreeing to the amendment	Aye	190	215	
111	04/19/73	H3033	S. 502—On agreeing to the amendment	Aye	232	93	
112	04/30/73	H3141	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			325
113	04/30/73	H3144	do	Present			374
114	04/30/73	H3149	S. 398—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	267	115	
115	05/01/73	H3212	H. Res. 351—On agreeing to resolution	Yea	318	56	5
116	05/01/73	H3227	H.R. 3922—On agreeing to the amendment	Aye	130	263	
117	05/01/73	H3228	H.R. 3932—On passage	Nay	229	171	
118	05/02/73	H3259	H. Res. 370—On agreeing to the resolution	Not voting	365	2	1
119	05/02/73	H3271	H.R. 6388—On passage	Not voting	385	16	
120	05/03/73	H3295	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			357
CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 120)							
				Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes				55	47	17	120
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)				52	43	16	111
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)				4	4	1	9
Voting percentage (presence)				92.8	91.4	94.1	92.5
Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
121	05/03/73	H3328	H.R. 982—On agreeing to the amendment	No	96	266	
122	05/03/73	H3332	H.R. 982—On passage	Yea	297	63	
123	05/07/73	H3361	Quorum—Call of the House	Absent			321
124	05/07/73	H3369	H.R. 4967—Suspend rules and pass	Not voting	336	8	
125	05/07/73	H3375	H.R. 6574—Suspend rules and pass	Not voting	342	1	
126	05/07/73	H3390	H.R. 2828—Suspend rules and pass	Not voting	340	1	
127	05/07/73	H3400	H.R. 29—Suspend rules and pass	Not voting	344		
128	05/08/73	H3418	H.R. 5452—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	368	9	
129	05/08/73	H3425	H.R. 5451—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	370	1	
130	05/09/73	H3463	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			374
131	05/09/73	H3470	H.R. 7445—On passage	Yea	388		
132	05/09/73	H3484	H.R. 6370—On agreeing to the amendment	Aye	98	264	29
133	05/09/73	H3486	H.R. 6370—On passage	Yea	376	4	18
134	05/10/73	H3547	S. 394—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	363	25	
135	05/10/73	H3555	H. Res. 389—Ordering the previous question	Yea	184	222	
136	05/10/73	H3592	H.R. 7447—On agreeing to the amendment	Aye	219	188	
137	05/10/73	H3597	do	No	180	219	
138	05/10/73	H3598	do	Aye	224	172	
139	05/10/73	H3600	do	No	211	178	
140	05/10/73	H3603	do	Nay	194	187	
CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 140)							
				Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes				68	49	2	140
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)				60	44	22	126
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)				8	5	1	14
Voting percentage (presence)				88.2	89.7	95.6	90
Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
141	05/10/73	H3604	H.R. 7447—On passage	Yea	284	96	
142	05/15/73	H3635	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			355
143	05/15/73	H3644	H.R. 6768—On agreeing to the amendment	No	164	216	
144	05/15/73	H3646	do	No	200	134	
145	05/15/73	H3647	do	No	192	198	
146	05/15/73	H3649	H.R. 6768—On passage	Yea	266	123	
147	05/16/73	H2697	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			382
148	05/16/73	H3702	H.R. 5777—On passage	Yea	382	7	
149	05/21/73	H3795	H.J. Res. 512—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	375	1	1
150	05/21/73	H3800	H.R. 6330—Suspend rules and pass	Nay	270	98	1
151	05/22/73	H3823	Quorum—Call of the House	Absent			386
152	05/22/73	H3832	H.R. 6717—Suspend rules and pass	Nay	307	90	
153	05/22/73	H3841	H.R. 7200—Motion to recommit	Nay	10	393	
154	05/22/73	H3842	H.R. 7200—On passage	Yea	387	5	
155	05/23/73	H3910	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			383
156	05/23/73	H3920	S. 518—On Presidential veto	Nay	236	176	
157	05/23/73	H3946	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			405
158	05/23/73	H3950	H.R. 7528—On agreeing to the amendment	Aye	104	294	
159	05/23/73	H3951	H.R. 7528—On passage	Yea	322	73	
160	05/29/73	H4014	H. Res. 408—On agreeing to the resolution	Yea	299	9	1
CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 160)							
				Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes				79	54	27	160
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)				71	48	26	145
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)				8	6	1	15
Voting percentage (presence)				89.8	88.8	96.2	90.6

See footnote at end of table.

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD—HON. BILL FRENZEL—93D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
161	05/29/73	H4034	H.R. 6912—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	162	162	3
162	05/29/73	H4040	do	No	100	218	3
163	05/29/73	H4042	H.R. 6912—On passage	Yea	281	36	3
164	05/30/73	H4068	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			352
165	05/30/73	H4073	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			347
166	05/30/73	H4078	H.R. 5857—On passage	Yea	288	75	
167	05/30/73	H4085	H.R. 5858—On passage	Yea	260	100	
168	05/31/73	H4142	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			355
169	05/31/73	H4161	H.R. 7806—On passage	Yea	372	1	
170	05/31/73	H4174	H.R. 7724—On agreeing to the amendment.	Yea	354	9	
171	05/31/73	H4178	H.R. 7724—On passage	Yea	361	5	
172	05/31/73	H4189	H.R. 6458—On passage	Nay	261	96	
173	06/04/73	H4238	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			289
174	06/04/73	H4240	H. Res. 398—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	299		
175	06/05/73	H4272	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			383
176	06/05/73	H4293	H.R. 8070—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	384	13	
177	06/05/73	H4308	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			374
178	06/06/73	H4352	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			399
179	06/06/73	H4368	H.R. 7935—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	186	232	
180	06/06/73	H4373	do	Aye	199	218	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 180)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	88	61	31	180
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	80	55	30	165
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	8	6	1	16
Voting percentage (presence)	90.9	90.1	96.7	91.6

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
181	06/06/73	H4374	H.R. 7935—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	193	225	
182	06/06/73	H4375	do	No	189	224	
183	06/06/73	H4376	do	No	195	224	
184	06/06/73	H4376	do	Aye	102	313	
185	06/06/73	H4383	do	Aye	167	249	
186	06/06/73	H4384	do	Aye	182	233	
187	06/06/73	H4388	do	Aye	251	163	1
188	06/06/73	H4391	do	Aye	199	215	
189	06/06/73	H4397	do	Aye	213	203	
190	06/06/73	H4398	H.R. 7935—On passage	Yea	287	130	
191	06/06/73	H4416	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			157
192	06/06/73	H4416	Motion—Motion to adjourn	Not voting	9	143	1
193	06/07/73	H4421	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			380
194	06/07/73	H4457	H. Res. 382—On agreeing to the resolution.	Nay	130	281	
195	06/07/73	H4467	H.R. 7645—On passage	Yea	331	57	
196	06/07/73	H4481	H.R. 7446—On passage	Yea	344	14	
197	06/08/73	H4515	H.R. 2246—Agreeing to conference report.	Yea	276	2	
198	06/08/73	H4516	H. Res. 426—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	274		
199	06/08/73	H4523	H.R. 7670—On passage	Yea	266	10	
200	06/11/73	H4546	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			321

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 200)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	96	64	40	200
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	87	58	39	184
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	9	6	1	16
Voting percentage (presence)	90.6	90.6	97.5	92.0

See footnote at end of table.

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
201	06/11/73	H4546	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			329
202	06/11/73	H4547	H. Res. 000—Calendar Wednesday dispense.	Yea	221	119	
203	06/11/73	H4553	H.R. 4083—On passage	Yea	330		
204	06/11/73	H4557	H.R. 6713—On passage	Yea	330	12	
205	06/11/73	H4564	H.R. 8250—On passage	Yea	268	84	
206	06/11/73	H4573	H.R. 4771—On passage	Yea	210	144	1
207	06/12/73	H4595	H.R. 5293—Agreeing to conference report.	Yea	329	64	
208	06/12/73	H4599	H. Res. 423—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	307	91	
209	06/12/73	H4608	H.R. 77—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	279	126	1
210	06/12/73	H4612	do	No	111	293	
211	06/12/73	H4612	do	Aye	177	223	
212	06/12/73	H4614	H.R. 77—On passage	Yea	257	149	
213	06/13/73	H4652	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			402
214	06/13/73	H4657	H. Res. 437—Ordering the previous question.	Nay	21	395	
215	06/13/73	H4658	do	Yea	254	160	
216	06/13/73	H4658	H. Res. 437—On agreeing to the amendment.	Yea	248	163	
217	06/13/73	H4659	H. Res. 437—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	271	141	
218	06/13/73	H4674	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			389
219	06/13/73	H4677	H.R. 8410—On passage	Yea	261	152	
220	06/14/73	H4711	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			381

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 220)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	109	68	43	220
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	100	62	42	204
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	9	6	1	16
Voting percentage (presence)	91.7	91.1	97.6	92.7

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
221	06/14/73	H4715	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			370
222	06/14/73	H4737	H.R. 3926—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	141	248	
223	06/14/73	H4739	H.R. 3926—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	146	235	
224	06/14/73	H4741	H.R. 3926—On passage	Yea	309	63	
225	06/14/73	H4744	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			306
226	06/15/73	H4767	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			328
227	06/15/73	H4787	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			342
228	06/15/73	H4790	H.R. 8619—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	234	125	
229	06/15/73	H4795	H.R. 8619—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	195	157	1
230	06/15/73	H4813	H.R. 8619—On passage	Yea	304	3	
231	06/18/73	H4856	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			344
232	06/18/73	H4860	Quorum—Call in committee	Absent			344
233	06/18/73	H4870	H.R. 8658—On passage	Yea	321	64	
234	06/18/73	H4887	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			378
235	06/18/73	H4894	H.R. 8152—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	227	162	1
236	06/18/73	H4897	H.R. 8152—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	231	161	
237	06/18/73	H4904	H.R. 8152—On passage	Yea	391		
238	06/19/73	H4949	H.R. 689—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	399		
239	06/19/73	H4955	H.R. 6129—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	387	14	
240	06/19/73	H4963	H.R. 7127—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	385	16	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 240)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	116	75	49	240
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	107	68	48	223
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	9	7	1	17
Voting percentage (presence)	92.2	90.6	97.9	92.9

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD—HON. BILL FRENZEL—93D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
241	06/19/73	H4965	H. Res. 434—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	389	4	
242	06/19/73	H4973	H.R. 5464—On agreeing to the amendment.	Yea	281	125	
243	06/19/73	H4974	H.R. 5464—On passage	Yea	399	4	
244	06/19/73	H4980	H.R. 5094—On passage	Nay	319	84	
245	06/20/73	H4999	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			399
246	06/20/73	H5021	H.R. 8760—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	107	309	
247	06/20/73	H5027	do	No	204	213	
248	06/20/73	H5031	do	Aye	137	277	
249	06/20/73	H5032	do	No	17	392	
250	06/20/73	H5034	H.R. 8760—On passage	Yea	414	2	
251	06/20/74	H5040	H. Res. 435—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	358	34	
252	06/21/73	H5067	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			388
253	06/21/73	H5091	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			395
254	06/21/73	H5102	H.R. 7824—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	245	166	
255	06/21/73	H5108	do	No	159	237	
256	06/21/73	H5119	do	No	200	181	
257	06/21/73	H5120	do	No	207	171	
258	06/21/73	H5126	do	No	221	150	
259	06/21/73	H5127	do	No	233	139	1
260	06/21/73	H5128	H.R. 7824—On preferential motion	No	91	283	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 260)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	122.0	78	60.0	260.0
Present responses (Yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	113.0	71	59.0	243.0
Absences (Absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	9.0	7	1.0	17.0
Voting percentage (presence)	92.6	91	98.3	93.4

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
261	06/21/73	H5130	H.R. 7824—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	316	53	
262	06/21/73	H5131	do	No	301	68	
263	06/21/73	H5137	H.R. 7824—On passage	Yea	276	95	5
264	06/22/73	H5159	Quorum—Call of the House	Absent			308
265	06/22/73	H5181	H.R. 8510—On agreeing to the amendment.	Not voting.	109	238	
266	06/22/73	H5185	do	Not voting.	288	73	4
267	06/22/73	H5186	H.R. 8510—On passage	Not voting.	364	6	
268	06/22/73	H5211	Quorum—Call in committee	Absent			342
269	06/22/73	H5216	H.R. 8825—On agreeing to the amendment.	Not voting.	168	184	
270	06/22/73	H5224	do	Not voting.	106	241	
271	06/22/73	H5237	H.R. 8825—On passage	Not voting.	316	21	
272	06/25/73	H5258	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			376
273	06/25/73	H5268	H.R. 7447—On presidential veto	Aye	235	172	1
274	06/25/73	H5274	H.R. 7447—On preferential motion	Nay	204	204	1
275	06/25/73	H5276	H. Res. 454—On agreeing to the resolution.	Nay	276	129	
276	06/25/73	H5293	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			385
277	06/25/73	H5293	H.R. 8662—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	136	266	
278	06/25/73	H5298	H.E. 8662—On passage	Yea	398	4	
279	06/25/73	H5304	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			320
280	06/25/73	H5315	do	Present			236

See footnote at end of table.

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 280)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	128	84	68	280
Present responses (yea, nay, present-paired for or against)	117	75	63	255
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	11	9	5	25
Voting percentage (presence)	91.4	89.2	92.6	91

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
281	06/26/73	H5358	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			398
282	06/26/73	H5367	H.J. Res. 636—On motion to limit debate.	No	275	136	
283	06/26/73	H5371	H.J. Res. 636—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	218	194	
284	06/26/73	H5372	do	Aye	232	181	
285	06/26/73	H5373	do	Aye	240	172	
286	06/26/73	H5373	H.J. Res. 636—On passage	Yea	325	86	
287	06/26/73	H5375	H. Res. 455—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	395	3	1
288	06/26/73	H5405	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			375
289	06/26/73	H5417	do	Present			363
290	06/26/73	H5433	H.R. 8877—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	110	288	
291	06/26/73	H5434	do	Aye	186	213	
292	06/26/73	H5438	do	No	161	244	
293	06/26/73	H5440	do	Aye	190	218	
294	06/26/73	H5443	H.R. 8877—On motion to recommit.	Yea	186	219	
295	06/26/73	H5443	H.R. 8877—On passage	Yea	347	58	
296	06/27/73	H5475	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			360
297	06/27/73	H5481	H.R. 8215—On agreeing to the amendment.	Yea	403		1
298	06/27/73	H5482	H.R. 4260—On passage	Yea	402		
299	06/27/73	H5486	H. Res. 470—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	401	12	
300	06/27/73	H5487	H.R. 7447—On Presidential veto	Yea	241	173	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NO. 300)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	136	88	76	300
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	125	79	71	275
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	11	9	5	25
Voting percentage (presence)	91.9	89.7	93.4	91.6

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
301	06/27/73	H5513	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			365
302	06/27/73	H5517	do	Present			389
303	06/27/73	H5519	do	Present			386
304	06/27/73	H5532	H.R. 8917—On passage	Yea	405	4	
305	06/28/73	H5577	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			400
306	06/28/73	H5589	H.R. 8537—Motion to instruct conferees.	Yea	238	175	
307	06/28/73	H5605	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			390
308	06/28/73	H5607	H.R. 8947—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	108	303	1
309	06/28/73	H5611	do	Aye	206	205	
310	06/28/73	H5624	H.R. 8947—On passage	Yea	384	26	
311	06/28/73	H5636	H.R. 8548—On passage	Aye	322	62	
312	06/29/73	H5659	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			379
313	06/29/73	H5680	H.R. 9055—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	57	346	
314	06/29/73	H5686	H.R. 9055—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	163	236	
315	06/29/73	H5687	H.R. 9055—On passage	Yea	278	124	
316	06/29/73	H5696	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			371
317	06/29/73	H5699	H.R. 8916—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	220	164	
318	06/29/73	H5703	H.R. 8916—On passage	Yea	370	11	
319	06/29/73	H5727	H.R. 8410—Recede in Senate amendment.	No	185	190	
320	06/30/73	H5761	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			311

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD—HON. BILL FRENZEL—93D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 320)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	141	96	83	320
Present responses	130	87	78	295
Absences	11	9	5	25
Voting percentage (presence)	92.1	90.6	93.9	92.1

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Mem- ber's re- sponse	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Pres- ent
321	06/30/73	H5776	H.R. 8410—Recede and concur with amendment.	Yea	294	54	
322	06/30/73	H5781	H.J. Res. 636—Agreeing to conference report.	Yea	266	75	1
323	06/30/73	H5791	H.R. 7445—Recede and concur with amendment.	Yea	327	9	1
324	07/10/73	H5822	Quorum—Call of the House	Absent			370
325	07/10/73	H5861	H.R. 8860—On agreeing to the amendment.	Not voting	313	89	1
326	07/10/73	H5867	do	Not voting	246	163	1
327	07/10/73	H5872	do	Not voting	139	264	
328	07/11/73	H5935	Quorum—Call of the House	Absent			390
329	07/11/73	H5945	H.R. 8860—On agreeing to the amendment.	Not voting	241	162	
330	07/11/73	H5956	do	Not voting	174	239	
331	07/11/73	H5960	do	Not voting	160	247	
332	07/11/73	H5966	do	Not voting	186	220	
333	07/12/73	H6003	Quorum—Call of the House	Absent			361
334	07/12/73	H6013	H. Res. 00—Motion that committee rise.	Not voting	325	67	
335	07/12/73	H6028	H.R. 8606—On agreeing to the amendment.	Not voting	167	245	
336	07/12/73	H6045	H.R. 2990—On passage	Not voting	328	65	
337	07/16/73	H6089	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			357
338	07/16/73	H6097	H.R. 8860—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	207	190	
339	07/16/73	H6112	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			389
340	07/16/73	H6118	H.R. 8860—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	221	177	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 340)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	145	101	94	340
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	133	89	80	302
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	12	12	14	38
Voting percentage (presence)	91.7	88.1	85.1	88.8

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Mem- ber's re- sponse	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Pres- ent
341	07/17/73	H6154	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			410
342	07/17/73	H6158	S. 504—Agreeing to conference report.	Nay	306	111	
343	07/17/73	H6172	H.R. 6078—Suspend rules and pass.	Nay	296	123	
344	07/17/73	H6176	H.R. 8949—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	412	3	1
345	07/17/73	H6194	H.R. 9045—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	421		
346	07/17/73	H6202	S. 2120—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	409	7	
347	07/17/73	H6208	S. 1752—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	174	237	
348	07/18/73	H6231	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			402
349	07/18/73	H6256	H.J. Res. 542—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	166	250	
350	07/18/73	H6258	do	No	153	262	
351	07/18/73	H6271	do	No	200	211	
352	07/18/73	H6263	H.J. Res. 542—On passage	Yea	244	170	
353	07/18/73	H6315	Quorum—Call of the House	Absent			389
354	07/19/73	H6321	H.R. 8850—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	238	173	
355	07/19/73	H6333	do	Aye	213	203	
356	07/19/73	H6342	do	Aye	210	207	
357	07/19/73	H6343	do	No	85	326	
358	07/19/73	H6352	do	Aye	208	207	
359	07/19/73	H6354	do	Aye	250	165	
360	07/19/73	H6355	H. Res. 00—Strike enacting clause	No	73	338	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 360)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	152	104	104	360
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	140	91	90	321
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	12	13	14	39
Voting percentage (presence)	92.1	87.5	86.5	89.1

See footnote at end of table.

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Mem- ber's re- sponse	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Pres- ent
361	07/19/73	H6361	H.R. 8860—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	248	165	
362	07/19/73	H6362	H.R. 8860—On motion to recommit.	Aye	182	225	
363	07/19/73	H6363	H.R. 8860—On passage	Aye	226	182	
364	07/20/73	H6423	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			362
365	07/20/73	H6447	H.R. 8538—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	189	190	
366	07/20/73	H6452	H.R. 8538—On passage	Aye	363	14	
367	07/23/73	H6468	H. Res. 493—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	351	4	
368	07/23/73	H6491	H.R. 5356—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	193	192	
369	07/23/73	H6497	do	No	159	236	
370	07/23/73	H6499	do	Aye	189	202	
371	07/23/73	H6500	H.R. 5356—On passage	Yea	324	73	
372	07/23/73	H6516	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			360
373	07/23/73	H6520	H. Res. 495—On agreeing to the resolution.	Nay	180	202	
374	07/24/73	H6540	S. 1888—Previous question to instruct	Nay	244	155	1
375	07/24/73	H6541	S. 1888—Motion to instruct conferees.	Yea	371	35	
376	07/24/73	H6564	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			383
377	07/24/73	H6573	H.R. 8480—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	180	229	
378	07/24/73	H6577	do	Aye	205	206	
379	07/25/73	H6595	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			401
380	07/25/73	H6597	S. 1423—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	256	155	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 380)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	158	108	114	380
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	146	95	100	341
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	12	13	14	39
Voting percentage (presence)	92.4	87.9	87.7	89.7

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Mem- ber's re- sponse	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Pres- ent
381	07/25/73	H6602	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			396
382	07/25/73	H6603	H.R. 8480—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	96	318	
383	07/25/73	H6612	do	No	156	252	
384	07/25/73	H6612	do	Aye	205	206	
385	07/25/73	H6625	H.R. 8480—Recommit with instructions.	Aye	208	212	
386	07/25/73	H6626	H.R. 8480—On passage	Nay	254	164	
387	07/26/73	H6657	Quorum—Call of the House	Absent			364
388	07/26/73	H6668	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			378
389	07/26/73	H6688	do	Present			381
390	07/26/73	H6692	do	Present			282
391	07/26/73	H6692	H.R. 9360—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	131	271	
392	07/26/73	H6695	do	Aye	203	204	
393	07/26/73	H6699	do	No	173	232	
394	07/26/73	H6706	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			381
395	07/26/73	H6721	H.R. 9360—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	278	102	
396	07/26/73	H6737	do	No	240	137	
397	07/26/73	H6746	H.R. 9360—Recommit with instructions.	Not voting.	232	139	
398	07/26/73	H6747	H.R. 9360—On passage	NVF	188	183	1
399	07/30/73	H6836	H.R. 8947—Agreeing to conference report.	Yea	373	9	
400	07/30/73	H6849	H. Res. 512—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	156	237	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 400)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	162	114	124	400
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	14	100	109	358
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	13	14	15	42
Voting percentage (presence)	91.9	87.7	87.9	89.5

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Mem- ber's re- sponse	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Pres- ent
401	07/30/73	H6850	S. Con. Res. 42—On agreeing to the Resolution.	Yea	370	22	
402	07/30/73	H6858	H.R. 9474—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	385		
403	07/30/73	H6866	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			362
404	07/31/73	H6922	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			376
405	07/31/73	H6931	H.R. 9286—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	88	323	

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD—HON. BILL FRENZEL—93D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
1406	07/31/73	H6950	do	Aye	96	313	
1407	07/31/73	H6956	do	No	130	282	
1408	07/31/73	H6968	do	No	67	339	
1409	07/31/73	H6984	do	No	242	163	
1410	07/31/73	H6990	do	Aye	242	163	
411	07/31/73	H7003	H.R. 9286—On passage	Yea	367	37	
412	08/01/73	H7116	H.R. 8825—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	401	9	
413	08/01/73	H7121	H.R. 8825—Insist on disagreement	Yea	222	189	
414	08/01/73	H7135	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			394
1415	08/01/73	H7142	H.R. 9590—On agreeing to the amendment	No	199	209	
1416	08/01/73	H7144	H.R. 9590—On agreeing to the amendment	No	190	217	
417	08/02/73	H7213	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			398
418	08/02/73	H7219	H. Res. 515—On agreeing to the resolution	Yea	401	11	
1419	08/02/73	H7268	H.R. 9130—On agreeing to the amendment	Aye	160	261	
1420	08/02/73	H7281	do	Aye	198	221	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 420):

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	168	118	134	420
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	155	104	119	378
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	13	14	15	42
Voting percentage (presence)	92.2	88.1	88.8	90

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
1421	08/02/73	H7298	H.R. 9130—On agreeing to the amendment	Aye	179	233	2
1422	08/02/73	H7300	do	No	334	65	
1423	08/02/73	H7302	do	Aye	177	228	
424	08/02/73	H7306	H.R. 9130—On passage	Yea	356	60	
425	08/03/73	H7376	S. 1636—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	335	71	
1426	08/03/73	H7391	H. Res. 518—On agreeing to the resolution	Aye	183	230	
427	08/03/73	H7422	S. 502—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	382	34	
428	08/03/73	H7433	H.R. 7935—Agreeing to conference report	Nay	253	152	
429	08/03/73	H7437	S. 1888—Ordering the previous question	Yea	349	54	
1430	08/03/73	H7439	S. 1888—Concur in amendment with amend.	No	252	151	
431	08/03/73	H7444	H.R. 8658—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	342	47	
1432	08/03/73	H7451	H.R. 8760—Agreeing to conference report	Aye	359	5	
433	09/05/73	H7517	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			354
434	09/05/73	H7523	H.J. Res. 512—On motion to recommit	Yea	202	172	
435	09/05/73	H7533	H.R. 8920—On passage	Yea	368	11	1
436	09/05/73	H7549	H.R. 8449—On passage	Yea	359	21	
437	09/06/73	H7590	H.R. 6912—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	322	59	1
438	09/06/73	H7608	H.R. 8351—On passage	Yea	357	37	
439	09/06/73	H7619	H. Res. 484—On agreeing to the resolution	Yea	304	84	
1440	09/06/73	H7642	H.R. 8547—On agreeing to the amendment	No	154	211	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 440)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	180	119	141	440
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	167	105	126	398
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	13	14	15	42
Voting percentage (presence)	92.7	88.2	89.3	90.4

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
441	09/06/73	H7646	H.R. 8547—on passage	Yea	220	133	1
442	09/10/73	H7691	H. Res. 536—on agreeing to the resolution	Yea	334	11	1
443	09/10/73	H7699	H.R. 7482—on passage	Yea	287	63	1
444	09/11/73	H7718	Quorum—Call of the house	Present			376
445	09/11/73	H7723	H.R. 7645—Reject sec. 13 of conference report	Yea	213	185	
446	09/11/73	H7738	H.R. 2096—on passage	Yea	248	152	1
1447	09/11/73	H7744	H. Res. 511—on agreeing to the resolution	No	163	233	

See footnotes at end of table.

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
448	09/12/73	H7764	Quorum—Call of the house	Present			382
449	09/12/73	H7785	S. 504—On presidential veto	Nay	273	144	1
450	09/12/73	H7804	H.R. 7974—On passage	Yea	369	40	
451	09/12/73	H7812	H.R. 8789—On passage	Yea	396	4	
452	09/13/73	H7844	H.R. 8619—Motion to instruct conferees	Yea	231	160	2
453	09/13/73	H7851	H.R. 6576—On passage	Nay	321	74	
454	09/13/73	H7863	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			382
1455	09/13/73	H7865	H.R. 9639—On agreeing to the amendment	No	127	272	
456	09/13/73	H7865	H.R. 9639—On passage	Yea	389	4	
457	09/13/73	H7901	H.R. 9553—On passage	Not voting	336	37	1
458	09/17/73	H7964	H.R. 7265—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	339	14	
459	09/18/73	H8007	H.R. 8070—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	400		
460	09/18/73	H8012	H.R. 7730—Suspend rules and pass	Yes	236	164	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 460)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	195	122	143	460
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	181	108	128	417
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	14	14	15	43
Voting percentage (presence)	92.8	88.5	89.5	90.6

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
461	09/18/73	H8023	H.R. 37—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	390	12	
462	09/18/73	H8039	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			386
463	09/18/73	H8042	H. Res. 420—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	345	64	
464	09/19/73	H8074	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			400
465	09/19/73	H8100	H.R. 7935—On Presidential veto	Nay	259	164	1
466	09/19/73	H8111	H.R. 9715—On agreeing to the amendment	No	240	178	
467	09/19/73	H8112	H.R. 9715—On passage	Yea	305	108	
468	09/19/73	H8116	H. Res. 546—On agreeing to the resolution	Yea	311	81	
469	09/20/73	H8163	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			381
470	09/20/73	H8180	H.R. 8917—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	385	14	
471	09/20/73	H8182	H.R. 8917—Recede and concur with amendment	Yea	326	73	
472	09/20/73	H8195	H.R. 9281—Recommit with instructions	Yea	116	282	
473	09/20/73	H8196	H.R. 9281—On passage	Nay	299	93	
474	09/20/73	H8203	H.R. 9256—On passage	Not voting	217	155	
475	09/25/73	H8247	H.R. 8619—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	348	24	
476	09/25/73	H8265	H.J. Res. 727—On agreeing to the amendment	Nay	184	198	
477	09/25/73	H8265	do	Yea	286	94	
478	09/25/73	H8269	do	Yea	371	7	2
479	09/25/73	H8270	H.J. Res. 727—On passage	Yea	368	7	
480	09/26/73	H8323	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			355

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 480)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	210	126	144	480
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	195	112	129	436
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	15	14	15	44
Voting percentage (presence)	92.8	88.8	89.5	90.8

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
1481	09/26/73	H8332	H.R. 981—On agreeing to the amendment	No	174	203	
1482	09/26/73	H8338	do	No	70	310	
483	09/26/73	H8346	H.R. 981—On passage	Yea	336	30	
484	10/01/73	H8397	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			336
485	10/01/73	H8403	H.R. 8029—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	331	33	
486	10/01/73	H8406	S. 2419—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	330	28	
487	10/01/73	H8413	H.R. 10397—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	241	130	
488	10/02/73	H8473	S. 795—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	294	106	
489	10/02/73	H8488	S. 1914—On passage	Yea	313	90	
490	10/03/73	H8555	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			396
1491	10/03/73	H8564	H. Res. 372—On agreeing to the resolution	No	282	131	

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD—HON. BILL FRENZEL—93D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
492	10/03/73	H8586	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			396
493	10/03/73	H8587	H.R. 6452—On agreeing to the amendment	Aye	206	203	
494	10/03/73	H8594	H.R. 6452—On striking enacting clause	Aye	143	268	
495	10/03/73	H8596	H.R. 6452—On agreeing to the amendment	Yea	205	210	
496	10/03/73	H8597	H.R. 6452—On passage	Nay	219	195	
497	10/03/73	H8613	H.R. 10088—On passage	Yea	376	2	
498	10/04/73	H8655	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			362
499	10/04/73	H8677	H.J. Res. 748—On agreeing to the amendment	No	129	237	
500	10/04/73	H8677	H.J. Res. 748—On passage	Aye	274	90	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 500)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	219	130	151	500
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present- paired for or against)	204	116	136	456
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	15	14	15	44
Voting percentage (presence)	93.1	89.2	90	91.2

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
501	10/09/73	H8700	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			370
502	10/09/73	H8708	H. Res. 581—On agreeing to the resolution	Yea	346	50	
503	10/09/73	H8734	Quorum—Call in committee	Absent			367
504	10/10/73	H8757	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			400
505	10/10/73	H8827	H.R. 9682—On agreeing to the amendment	No	228	186	
506	10/10/73	H8829	do	No	138	273	
507	10/10/73	H8835	do	No	209	202	
508	10/10/73	H8838	do	No	132	275	
509	10/10/73	H8840	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			392
510	10/10/73	H8841	H.R. 9682—On agreeing to the amendment	No	130	278	
511	10/10/73	H8852	do	No	144	273	
512	10/10/73	H8853	H.R. 9682—On passage	Yea	343	74	1
513	10/11/73	H8885	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			387
514	10/11/73	H8890	do	Present			395
515	10/11/73	H8892	H.J. Res. 727—On motion to recommit	No	182	225	
516	10/11/73	H8893	H.J. Res. 727—Agreeing to conference report	Aye	309	99	
517	10/11/73	H8895	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			383
518	10/11/73	H8916	H.R. 10614—On passage	Yea	359	28	
519	10/12/73	H8948	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			351
520	10/12/73	H8963	H.J. Res. 542—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	238	123	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 520)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	223	138	159	520
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present- paired for or against)	208	123	144	475
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	15	15	15	45
Voting percentage (presence)	93.2	89.1	90.5	91.3

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
521	10/12/73	H8993	H.R. 10203—On passage	Aye	337	14	
522	10/12/73	H8995	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			321
523	10/15/73	H9044	do	Present			353
524	10/15/73	H9048	do	Present			352
525	10/15/73	H9049	S. 907—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	306	54	
526	10/15/73	H9055	H.R. 8346—Suspend rules and pass	Aye	108	258	
527	10/16/73	H9070	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			388
528	10/16/73	H9078	H.R. 9590—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	403	10	
529	10/16/73	H9079	H.R. 9590—Recede and concur in Senate amendment	Yea	253	153	
530	10/16/73	H9080	do	Yea	302	107	
531	10/16/73	H9084	H.R. 6691—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	400	11	
532	10/16/73	H9105	H.R. 10717—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	404	3	
533	10/16/73	H9138	H.R. 9681—On agreeing to the amendment	No	136	245	2
534	10/16/73	H9143	H.R. 9681—Motion to limit debate	No	161	214	
535	10/17/73	H9194	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			389
536	10/17/73	H9201	H. Res. 601—On agreeing to the resolution	Nay	193	216	
537	10/17/73	H9211	H.R. 9681—On agreeing to the amendment	No	152	256	3
538	10/17/73	H9223	H.R. 9681—On passage	Yea	337	72	3
539	10/17/73	H9231	S. 2016—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	346	51	
540	10/18/73	H9252	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			367

See footnote at end of table.

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NO. 540)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	232	144	164	540
Present responses (yea, nay, present-paired for or against)	217	129	149	495
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	15	15	15	45
Voting percentage (presence)	93.5	89.5	90.8	91.6

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
541	10/18/73	H9266	H.R. 10397—On passage	Aye	273	97	
542	10/18/73	H9272	H.R. 9639—Concur in Senate amendment	Nay	145	218	
543	10/23/73	H9306	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			371
544	10/23/73	H9316	H.R. 10586—On passage	Yea	345	41	
545	10/23/73	H9340	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			327
546	10/24/73	H9362	do	Present			377
547	10/24/73	H9365	H. Res. 600—On agreeing to the resolution	Yea	369	15	1
548	10/24/73	H9374	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			368
549	10/24/73	H9376	H.R. 3927—On agreeing to the amendment	No	140	252	
550	10/24/73	H9378	H.R. 3927—On passage	Yea	335	60	
551	10/25/73	H9407	H. Res. 655—On agreeing to the resolution	Yea	380	2	
552	10/25/73	H9418	H.R. 10956—On passage	Yea	364	18	
553	10/30/73	H9461	H. Res. 606—On agreeing to the resolution	Yea	376	4	
554	10/30/73	H9478	H.R. 9456—On passage	Yea	372	13	
555	10/31/73	H9501	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			382
556	10/31/73	H9513	H.R. 9286—Reject sec. 817 of conference report	Yea	103	290	
557	11/06/73	H9594	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			363
558	11/06/73	H9600	H.J. Res. 735—Suspended rules and pass	Yea	343	28	
559	11/06/73	H9608	H.R. 5874—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	349	25	
560	11/06/73	H9610	H.R. 8219—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	340	39	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 560)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	244.0	150	166.0	560.0
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present- paired for or against)	229.0	135	151.0	515.0
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	15.0	15	15.0	45.0
Voting percentage (presence)	93.8	90.0	90.9	91.9

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
561	11/06/73	H9613	H.R. 10937—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	378	1	
562	11/07/73	H9641	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			393
563	11/07/73	H9661	H.J. Res. 542—On Presidential veto	Yea	284	135	
564	11/07/73	H9668	H. Res. 687—Ordering the previous question	Yea	274	135	
565	11/07/73	H9676	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			387
566	11/07/73	H9678	H.R. 11104—On agreeing to the amendment	No	263	147	
567	11/07/73	H9681	H.R. 11104—On passage	Yea	253	153	
568	11/08/73	H9728	H. Res. 688—On agreeing to the resolution	Yea	393	2	
569	11/08/73	H9761	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			371
570	11/08/73	H9763	H.R. 9142—On agreeing to the amendment	No	148	245	
571	11/08/73	H9771	do	Yea	187	198	
572	11/08/73	H9772	H.R. 9142—On passage	Yea	306	82	
573	11/13/73	H9799	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			335
574	11/13/73	H9822	S. 1081—Recommit conference report with instructions	Yea	162	213	1
575	11/13/73	H9823	S. 1081—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	361	14	1
576	11/13/73	H9911	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			391
577	11/13/73	H9914	H.R. 8916—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	394	11	
578	11/13/73	H9916	H. Con. Res. 378—On agreeing to the resolution	Nay	215	190	
579	11/13/73	H9928	H.R. 8877—Recommit the conference report	Aye	272	139	
580	11/13/73	H9944	Quorum—Call of the House	Absent			373

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 580)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	255	156	169	580
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present- paired for or against)	240	140	154	534
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	15	16	15	46
Voting percentage (presence)	94.1	89.7	91.1	92.0

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD—HON. BILL FRENZEL—93D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
581	11/13/73	H9950	S. 1570—Agreeing to conference report.	Yea	348	46	3
582	11/14/73	H9978	H. Res. 128—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	388	18	
583	11/14/73	H9990	Quorum—Call in committee.	Present			375
584	11/14/73	H10012	do	Present			375
585	11/14/73	H10020	H.R. 11459—On passage.	Yea	366	29	
586	11/15/73	H10059	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			398
587	11/15/73	H10059	H. Res. 702—Previous question on amendment.	Nay	230	182	
588	11/15/73	H10066	H. Res. 702—Ordering the previous question.	Nay	233	186	
589	11/15/73	H10067	H. Res. 702—Recommit with instructions.	Aye	190	227	
590	11/15/73	H10068	H. Res. 702—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	367	51	
591	11/15/73	H10074	H.R. 11333—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	246	163	
592	11/15/73	H10075	H.R. 11333—On passage.	Aye	391	20	
593	11/26/73	H10113	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			317
594	11/26/73	H10133	H.R. 11238—On passage.	Yea	350		
595	11/27/73	H10175	H.R. 7446—Agreeing to conference report.	Yea	357	34	
596	11/27/73	H10175	H. Res. 718—On consideration of resolution.	Yea	349	40	
597	11/27/73	H10196	H.R. 11324—On passage.	Yea	311	88	
598	11/28/73	H10221	H. Res. 719—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	386	7	
599	11/28/73	H10252	H.R. 11010—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	248	149	
600	11/28/73	H10257	do	No	260	140	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 600)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes.	265	160	175	600
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against).	250	144	160	554
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against).	15	16	15	46
Voting percentage (presence).	94.3	90	91.4	92.3

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
601	11/28/73	H10267	H.R. 11010—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	107	292	
602	11/28/73	H10269	H.R. 11010—On passage.	Yea	269	31	
603	11/29/73	H10317	H. Res. 721—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	347	54	
604	11/29/73	H10342	Quorum call in committee.	Present			375
605	11/29/73	H10345	H.R. 11575—On agreeing to the amendments.	Aye	178	226	
606	11/30/73	H10391	Quorum call of the House.	Present			350
607	11/30/73	H10404	H.R. 11575—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	170	20	
608	11/30/73	H10417	do	Aye	118	250	
609	11/30/73	H10419	do	Aye	160	210	
610	11/30/73	H10424	H.R. 11575—On passage.	Yea	336	23	
611	11/30/73	H10433	Quorum call in committee.	Present			317
612	11/30/73	H10433	H.R. 11576—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	160	164	
613	11/30/73	H10442	H.R. 11576—On passage.	Yea	295	3	
614	12/03/73	H10467	Quorum call of the House.	Present			348
615	12/03/73	H10497	S. 1191—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	354	36	
616	12/03/73	H10508	H.R. 11710—Suspend rules and pass.	Nay	261	129	
617	12/03/73	H10511	H.R. 9437—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	272	120	
618	12/04/73	H10547	Quorum call of the House.	Present			391
619	12/04/73	H10548	H. Res. 725—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	265	137	
620	12/04/73	H10554	S. 1443—Agreeing to conference report.	Yea	210	19	1

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NO. 620)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes.	274	165	181	620
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against).	259	149	166	574
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against).	15	16	15	46
Voting percentage (presence).	94.5	90.3	91.7	92.5

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
621	12/04/73	H10573	H. Con. Res. 173—Suspend rules and agree.	Yea	405		
622	12/05/73	H10667	H.R. 8877—Agreeing to conference report.	Yea	371	33	
623	12/05/73	H10668	H.R. 8877—recede and concur in Senate amendment with amendment.	Not voting.	263	140	

See footnote at end of table.

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
624	12/05/73	H10681	H.R. 7130—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	106	300	
625	12/05/73	H10686	do	No	185	218	
626	12/05/73	H10692	do	No	192	217	
627	12/05/73	H10699	do	No	117	289	
628	12/05/73	H10704	do	No	108	295	
629	12/05/73	H10706	do	Aye	186	221	
630	12/05/73	H10708	do	Aye	185	221	
631	12/05/73	H10719	H.R. 7130—On passage.	Aye	386	23	
632	12/06/73	H10741	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			383
633	12/06/73	H10746	H. Res. 738—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	389	15	
634	12/06/73	H10829	H. Res. 735—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	387	35	
635	12/07/73	H10881	H.R. 11459—Agreeing to conference report.	Nay	329	40	
636	12/07/73	H10884	H. Res. 673—On agreeing to the resolution.	Nay	295	70	
637	12/07/73	H10891	H.R. 9107—On passage.	Yea	270	95	
638	12/10/73	H10915	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			355
639	12/10/73	H10925	H. Res. 657—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	230	147	
640	12/10/73	H10967	Quorum—Call in committee.	Present			338

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 640)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes.	283	168	189	640
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against).	267	152	174	593
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against).	16	16	15	47
Voting percentage (presence).	94.3	90.4	92	92.6

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
641	12/10/73	H10977	Quorum call in committee.	Present			337
642	12/11/73	H11027	Quorum call of the house.	Present			347
643	12/11/73	H11064	H.R. 10710—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	319	80	
644	12/11/73	H11071	do	No	106	298	
645	12/11/73	H11071	H.R. 10710—On passage.	Aye	272	140	
646	12/11/73	H11100	H.R. 11088—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	82	334	
647	12/11/73	H11107	H.R. 11008—Call in committee.	Aye	364	52	
648	12/11/73	H11107	Quorum call in committee.	Present			385
649	12/11/73	H11122	do	Present			381
650	12/11/73	H11125	H.R. 11771—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	102	304	
651	12/11/73	H11129	do	Aye	147	256	
652	12/11/73	H11132	do	No	134	266	
653	12/11/73	H11133	H.R. 11771—On passage.	Yea	219	180	
654	12/12/73	H11173	Quorum call of the house.	Present			365
655	12/12/73	H11179	do	Present			382
656	12/12/73	H11181	H. Res. 744—On agreeing to the resolution.	Aye	272	129	
657	12/12/73	H11189	Quorum call in committee.	Present			369
658	12/12/73	H11244	H.R. 11450—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	152	256	
659	12/12/73	H11251	do	Aye	286	112	1
660	12/13/73	H11277	Quorum call of the house.	Present			389

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NO. 660)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes.	284	176	200	660
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against).	268	160	185	613
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against).	16	16	16	47
Voting percentage (presence).	94.3	90.9	92.5	92.8

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
661	12/13/73	H11285	H.R. 11450—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	256	155	2
662	12/13/73	H11300	do	No	221	192	
663	12/13/73	H11302	H.R. 11450—On motion to limit debate.	No	58	351	
664	12/13/73	H11315	H.R. 11450—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	188	213	1
665	12/13/73	H11327	do	No	199	180	1
666	12/14/73	H11361	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			355
667	12/14/73	H11368	H.R. 11450—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	170	223	
668	12/14/73	H11381	do	No	180	210	1
669	12/14/73	H11383	do	Aye	185	202	
670	12/14/73	H11394	H.R. 11450—On motion to limit debate.	No	197	196	

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD—HON. BILL FRENZEL—93D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
1671	12/14/73	H11401	H.R. 11450—Strike enacting clause	No	56	335	
1672	12/14/73	H11403	H.R. 11450—On agreeing to the amendment	Aye	299	89	1
1673	12/14/73	H11407	do	No	189	194	
1674	12/14/73	H11409	do	No	197	184	
1675	12/14/73	H11411	H.R. 11450—Motion that committee rise	Aye	104	280	
1676	12/14/73	H11413	H.R. 11450—On agreeing to the amendment	Aye	311	73	
1677	12/14/73	H11414	do	No	301	60	21
1678	12/14/73	H11415	do	Present	332	19	29
1679	12/14/73	H11416	do	No	327	27	25
1680	12/14/73	H11420	do	No	174	202	4

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 680)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	284	177	219	680
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	268	161	204	633
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	16	16	15	40
Voting percentage (presence)	94.3	90.9	93.1	93.7

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
1681	12/14/73	H11421	H.R. 11450—On agreeing to the amendment	No	140	226	15
1682	12/14/73	H11422	do	Aye	349	8	17
1683	12/14/73	H11422	H.R. 11450—Motion that committee rise	No	86	290	2
1684	12/14/73	H11424	H.R. 11450—On agreeing to the amendment	No	152	205	22
1685	12/14/73	H11425	do	No	170	205	3
1686	12/14/73	H11437	do	Aye	201	172	1
1687	12/14/73	H11438	do	No	50	320	1
1688	12/14/73	H11450	H.R. 11450—On motion to recommit	No	173	205	
1689	12/14/73	H11451	H.R. 11450—On passage	Yea	265	112	3
1690	12/17/73	H11507	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			304
1691	12/17/73	H11525	do	Present			331
1692	12/17/73	H11528	S. 1435—On motion to recommit	Nay	80	259	
1693	12/17/73	H11528	S. 1435—Agreeing to conference report	Aye	272	74	
1694	12/17/73	H11534	S.J. Res. 180—Suspend rules and pass	Nay	263	91	
1695	12/17/73	H11540	S. 2482—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	339	21	
1696	12/18/73	H11594	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			381
1697	12/18/73	H11598	H.R. 9256—Agreeing to conference	Yea	307	82	
1698	12/18/73	H11600	H. Res. 746—On agreeing to the resolution	Nay	284	101	
1699	12/18/73	H11609	S. 2156—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	270	122	
1700	12/18/73	H11617	S. 2316—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	315	73	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 700)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	292	180	228	700
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	276	164	213	653
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	16	16	15	47
Voting percentage (presence)	94.5	91.1	93.4	93.2

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
1701	12/18/73	H11637	H.R. 11714—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	230	160	
1702	12/18/73	H11644	H.R. 11763—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	356	18	
1703	12/19/73	H11689	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			375
1704	12/19/73	H11703	H.R. 11576—On motion to recommit	Yea	216	180	
1705	12/19/73	H11735	Quorum—Call in committee	Present			360
1706	12/19/73	H11739	H.R. 11510—On agreeing to the amendment	No	112	271	
1707	12/19/73	H11755	H.R. 11510—On passage	Aye	355	25	
1708	12/20/73	H11793	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			326
1709	12/20/73	H11806	S. 1559—Recommit conference report	Nay	93	264	
1710	12/20/73	H11807	S. 1559—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	330	33	
1711	12/20/73	H11819	H.R. 11575—Recommit conference report	Yea	88	280	
1712	12/20/73	H11820	H.R. 11575—Agreeing to conference report	Aye	336	32	

See footnote at end of table.

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
713	12/20/73	H11832	H.R. 11771—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	216	149	
714	12/20/73	H11839	S. 1983—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	355	4	
715	12/20/73	H11844	H. Res. 754—Suspend rules and pass	Aye	319	26	1
716	12/20/73	H11877	H.R. 9142—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	284	59	
717	12/20/73	H11887	H.R. 11576—Agreeing to conference report	Yea	329	10	
718	12/21/73	H11959	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			306
719	12/21/73	H11960	H.R. 11333—Concur in Senate amendment	Aye	301	13	
720	12/21/73	H12004	H. Res. 759—Motion for a second	Nay	148	113	1

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 720)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	303	184	233	720
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	287	168	218	673
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	16	16	15	47
Voting percentage (presence)	94.7	91.3	93.5	93.4

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
721	12/21/73	H12011	H. Res. 759—Suspend rules and pass	Nay	169	95	
722	12/21/73	H12026	H. Res. 760—Suspend rules and pass	No	22	240	
723	12/21/73	H12030	H. Res. 761—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	36	228	
724	12/21/73	H12036	H. Con. Res. 411—On agreeing to the resolution	Nay	74	171	
725	12/22/73	H11969	Motion to adjourn	Nay	39	160	
726	12/22/73	H11970	Quorum—Call of the House	Present			218

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 726)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	307	185	234	726
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	291	169	219	679
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	16	16	15	47
Voting percentage (presence)	94.7	91.3	93.5	93.5

93D CONG., 2D SESS.

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
1	01/21/74	H1	Quorum call of the House	Present			362
2	01/21/74	H15	H.R. 11387—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	338	22	
3	01/22/74	H60	Quorum call of the House	Present			377
4	01/22/74	H103	H.R. 11537—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	355	25	
5	01/22/74	H107	H.R. 11809—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	375	1	
6	01/23/74	H135	Quorum call of the House	Present			380
7	01/23/74	H143	Quorum call in committee	Absent			385
8	01/23/74	H150	H.R. 11354—On passage	Yea	155	248	
9	01/29/74	H251	H. Res. 788—On agreeing to the resolution	Yea	380	5	4
10	01/30/74	H303	Quorum call of the House	Present			393
11	01/30/74	H306	H. Res. 787—On agreeing to the resolution	Nay	386	18	1
12	02/04/74	H409	Quorum call of the House	Present			324
13	02/04/74	H435	H.R. 4861—Suspend rules and pass	Yea	334	4	
14	02/05/74	H471	H. Res. 794—On agreeing to the resolution	Yea	397		4
15	02/05/74	H478	Quorum call in committee	Present			373
16	02/05/74	H493	H.R. 11221—On agreeing to the amendment	Yea	170	202	34
17	02/05/74	H494	H.R. 11221—Previous question on recommitment	Not voting	122	259	24
18	02/05/74	H496	H.R. 11221—On passage	Not voting	282	94	30
19	20/06/74	H527	Quorum call of the House	Present			390
20	02/06/74	H539	H. Res. 803—Ordering the previous question	Nay	342	70	

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD—HON. BILL FRENZEL—93D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NO. 20)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	11	8	1	29
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	10	7	0	17
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	1	1	1	3
Voting percentage (presence)	90.9	87.5	0.0	85.0

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Mem- ber's re- sponse	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Pres- ent
21	02/06/74	H539	H. Res. 803—On agreeing to the resolution.	Aye	410	4	
22	02/06/74	H549	Quorum—Call in committee.	Present			374
23	02/06/74	H552	do.	Present			365
24	02/06/74	H569	H.R. 5463—On passage.	Aye	377	13	
25	02/06/74	H575	Motion—Motion to adjourn.	Not vot- ing.	125	155	
26	02/06/74	H579	Quorum—Call of the House.	Absent			266
27	02/07/74	H621	H. Con. Res. 425—Concur in Senate amendment.	Nay	209	175	1
28	02/07/74	H627	H. Res. 835—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	384	10	2
29	02/07/74	H633	S.J. Res. 185—On passage.	Yea	374	6	2
30	02/07/74	H670	H.R. 11783—On motion to recommit.	Not vot- ing.	27	328	
31	02/07/74	H671	H.R. 11783—On passage.	Not vot- ing.	324	23	
32	02/13/74	H732	On resolving into a committee.	Not vot- ing.	248	2	1
33	02/13/74	H774	H.R. 11864—On passage.	Not vot- ing.	253	2	
34	02/19/74	H894	H.R. 12628—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	382		
35	02/19/74	H897	H.R. 10834—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	284	88	
36	02/19/74	H907	H.R. 10203—Agreeing to conference report.	Yea	374	4	
37	02/20/74	H929	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			375
38	02/21/74	H1027	do.	Present			388
39	02/21/74	H1037	Quorum—Call in committee.	Present			369
40	02/21/74	H1050	H.R. 12670—On passage.	Yea	320	67	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 40)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	23	14	3	40
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	17	12	2	31
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	6	2	1	9
Voting percentage (presence)	73.9	85.7	66.6	77.5

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Mem- ber's re- sponse	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Pres- ent
41	02/26/74	H1121	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			363
42	02/26/74	H1130	H. Res. 896—Ordering the previous question.	Yea	331	53	
43	02/26/74	H1131	H. Res. 896—On agreeing to the resolution.	Aye	373	7	
44	02/27/74	H1200	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			389
45	02/27/74	H1211	H. Res. 901—Ordering the previous question.	No	144	259	3
46	02/27/74	H1240	S. 2589—Strike sec. 110 of conference report.	Aye	173	238	1
47	02/27/74	H1241	S. 2589—Strike sec. 105 of conference report.	No	66	343	
48	02/27/74	H1241	S. 2589—Strike sec. 104 of conference report.	Aye	199	211	
49	02/27/74	H1242	S. 2589—Agreeing to conference report.	Aye	258	151	1
50	02/27/74	H1250	Quorum—Call in committee.	Present			383
51	02/28/74	H1278	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			372
52	02/28/74	H1295	Quorum—Call in committee.	Present			380
53	02/28/74	H1299	H.R. 2—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	179	217	
54	02/28/74	H1331	do.	Aye	183	206	1
55	02/28/74	H1333	do.	No	63	323	1
56	02/28/74	H1342	H.R. 2—On passage.	Aye	376	4	
57	03/04/74	H1379	H.R. 11143—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	308		
58	03/05/74	H1399	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			384
59	03/05/74	H1403	H. Res. 947—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	317	86	
60	03/05/74	H1409	Quorum—Call in committee.	Present			378

See footnote at end of table.

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 60)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	26	21	13	60
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	20	19	12	51
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	6	2	1	9
Voting percentage (presence)	76.9	90.4	92.3	85

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Mem- ber's re- sponse	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Pres- ent
61	03/05/74	H1415	Quorum—Call in committee.	Present			371
62	03/05/74	H1419	H.R. 11793—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	301	103	
63	03/06/74	H1489	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			384
64	03/06/74	H1474	Quorum—Call in committee.	Present			379
65	03/06/74	H1500	H.R. 11793—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	160	241	
66	03/06/74	H1510	do.	No	218	175	3
67	03/07/74	H1541	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			358
68	03/07/74	H1546	Quorum—Call in committee.	Present			358
69	03/07/74	H1565	do.	Present			375
70	03/07/74	H1571	H.R. 11793—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	163	216	
71	03/07/74	H1572	H.R. 11793—On passage.	Aye	353	29	
72	03/11/74	H1608	Quorum—Call of the House.	Absent			287
73	03/11/74	H1612	H. Res. 790—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	312	1	
74	03/11/74	H1614	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			288
75	03/12/74	H1637	On motion to read the Journal.	Nay	16	365	3
76	03/12/74	H1645	H. Res. 963—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	234	163	
77	03/12/74	H1647	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			382
78	03/12/74	H1652	Quorum—Call in committee.	Present			366
79	03/12/74	H1670	do.	Present			351
80	03/13/74	H1719	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			382

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 80)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	29	33	18	80
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	23	30	17	70
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	6	3	1	10
Voting percentage (presence)	79.3	90.9	94.4	87.5

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Mem- ber's re- sponse	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Pres- ent
81	03/13/74	H1724	H.R. 12341—On passage.	Yea	402		1
82	03/13/74	H1727	H.R. 12466—On passage.	Yea	331	75	
83	03/13/74	H1738	Quorum—Call in committee.	Present			380
84	03/13/74	H1745	H.R. 3858—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	121	286	1
85	03/13/74	H1748	do.	No	102	302	
86	03/13/74	H1750	H.R. 3858—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	162	239	2
87	03/13/74	H1752	H.R. 3858—On passage.	Yea	361	47	
88	03/14/74	H1783	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			359
89	03/14/74	H1802	H.R. 12471—On passage.	Yea	383	8	
90	03/18/74	H1839	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			313
91	03/18/74	H1849	S. 1205—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	301	21	
92	03/18/74	H1863	H.R. 10337—Suspend rules and pass.	Nay	133	199	
93	03/18/74	H1869	S. 2771—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	237	97	
94	03/19/74	H1906	Quorum—Call of the house.	Present			263
95	03/19/74	H1910	H.R. 12503—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	375		
96	03/19/74	H1921	H.R. 12417—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	380	6	
97	03/19/74	H1932	H.R. 11105—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	380	6	
98	03/20/74	H1960	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			378
99	03/20/74	H1990	H.R. 12435—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	167	231	
100	03/20/74	H1992	H.R. 12435—On passage.	Yea	375	37	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 100)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	40	38	22	100
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	34	35	21	90
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	6	3	1	10
Voting percentage (presence)	85	92.1	95.4	90

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD—HON. BILL FRENZEL—93D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
101	03/20/74	H2015	Quorum—Call in committee.....	Present			367
102	03/20/74	H2019	H.R. 11929—On passage.....	Nay	209	193	
103	03/21/74	H2035	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			376
104	03/21/74	H2042	H. Res. 994—On agreeing to the resolution.....	Yea	380	9	1
105	03/21/74	H2045	Quorum—Call in committee.....	Present			364
106	03/21/74	H2054	H.R. 12920—On passage.....	Yea	294	103	
107	03/25/74	H2077	H.R. 8748—On passage.....	Present	316	1	3
108	03/25/74	H2080	H.R. 12109—On motion to recommit.....	Nay	118	215	
109	03/25/74	H2091	H.R. 12109—On passage.....	Yea	227	111	
110	03/25/74	H2088	H.R. 12832—On passage.....	Yea	220	119	
111	03/26/74	H2124	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			396
112	03/26/74	H2132	Quorum—Call in committee.....	Present			388
113	03/26/74	H2139	H.R. 69—On agreeing to the amendment.....	No	87	326	
114	03/26/74	H2143	do.....	No	103	312	
115	03/26/74	H2177	do.....	No	293	117	
116	03/27/74	H2213	H.J. Res. 941—On passage.....	Not voting	398		1
117	03/27/74	H2228	H.R. 69—On agreeing to the amendments.....	Not voting	276	129	
118	03/27/74	H2241	Quorum—Call in committee.....	Absent			381
119	03/27/74	H2242	H.R. 69—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Not voting	239	168	
120	03/27/74	H2251	do.....	Not voting	95	308	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 120)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes.....	58	44	28	120
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against).....	41	40	24	105
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against).....	7	4	4	15
Voting percentage (presence).....	85.4	90.9	85.7	87.5

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
121	03/27/74	H2270	H.R. 69—On passage.....	Not voting	380	26	1
122	03/28/74	H2302	S. 2747—Agreeing to conference report.....	Not voting	345	50	1
123	03/28/74	H2311	H.R. 12412—On passage.....	NVF	276	124	
124	04/01/74	H2358	H. Res. 937—On agreeing to the resolution.....	Not voting	247	85	
125	04/10/74	H2362	H.R. 13515—Suspend rules and pass.....	Not voting	103	226	
126	04/02/74	H2395	H.R. 6186—Agreeing to conference report.....	Not voting	388	6	
127	04/02/74	H2411	S. 1585—Suspend rules and pass.....	Not voting	304	15	
128	04/02/74	H2416	H. Res. 1017—On agreeing to the resolution.....	Not voting	288	112	
129	04/02/74	H2428	Quorum—Call in committee.....	Absent			370
130	04/02/74	H2431	S. 2770—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Not voting	194	201	
131	04/02/74	H2433	S. 2770—On passage.....	Not voting	291	106	
132	04/03/74	H2513	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Absent			375
133	04/03/74	H2516	H. Res. 1025—On agreeing to the resolution.....	Not voting	372	20	1
134	04/03/74	H2522	Quorum—Call in committee.....	Absent			375
135	04/03/74	H2529	do.....	Absent			368
136	04/03/74	H2543	do.....	Absent			369
137	04/03/74	H2549	H.R. 13163—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Not voting	224	177	
138	04/03/74	H2550	H.R. 13163—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Not voting	176	223	
139	04/03/74	H2558	do.....	Not voting	149	241	
140	04/03/74	H2559	do.....	Not voting	236	147	

See footnote at end of table.

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NO. 140)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes.....	58	49	33	140
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against).....	41	40	24	105
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against).....	17	9	9	35
Voting percentage (presence).....	70.6	81.6	72.7	75.0

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
141	04/03/74	H2563	H.R. 13167—on passage.....	Not voting	293	94	
142	04/04/74	H2587	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Absent			360
143	04/04/74	H2593	H.R. 12253—Agreeing to conference report.....	Not voting	376	1	
144	04/04/74	H2601	H. Res. 1026—Ordering the previous question.....	Not voting	113	268	
145	04/04/74	H2609	Quorum—Call in committee.....	Absent			336
146	04/04/74	H2626	H.R. 12565—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Not voting	94	255	
147	04/04/74	H2635	H.R. 12565—On agreeing to the amendment.....	No	154	177	
148	04/08/74	H2678	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			325
149	04/08/74	H2691	H.R. 12473—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Aye	276	69	
150	04/08/74	H2693	do.....	No	142	205	
151	04/08/74	H2694	H.R. 12473—On passage.....	Nay	138	211	
152	04/09/74	H2726	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			367
153	04/09/74	H2729	H. Res. 1018—On agreeing to the resolution.....	Nay	311	84	
154	04/09/74	H2740	Quorum—Call in committee.....	Present			381
155	04/09/74	H2745	H. Res. 998—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Aye	252	147	
156	04/09/74	H2745	H. Res. 998—On agreeing to the resolution.....	Yea	374	27	
157	04/09/74	H2756	H.R. 14012—On passage.....	Nay	373	17	
158	04/10/74	H2793	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			373
159	04/10/74	H2830	H.R. 14013—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Aye	236	168	
160	04/10/74	H2834	do.....	Aye	254	149	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 160)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded Votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes.....	64	55	41	160
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against).....	45	44	30	119
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against).....	19	11	11	41
Voting percentage (presence).....	70.3	80	73.1	74.3

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
161	04/10/74	H2841	H.R. 14013—On agreeing to the amendment.....	No	97	302	
162	04/10/74	H2842	do.....	Aye	145	249	
163	04/10/74	H2843	H.R. 14013—On passage.....	Yea	375	22	
164	04/10/74	H2846	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			348
165	04/10/74	H2850	H. Res. 1029—On agreeing to the resolution.....	Yea	347	15	1
166	04/11/74	H2923	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			327
167	04/11/74	H2929	Quorum—Call in committee.....	Present			316
168	04/11/74	H2950	H.R. 13113—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Aye	158	179	
169	04/11/74	H2956	H.R. 13113—On passage.....	Yea	281	43	
170	04/22/74	H3006	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			217
171	04/23/74	H3019	do.....	Present			369
172	04/23/74	H3026	S. 2770—Agreeing to conference report.....	Yea	372	17	
173	04/23/74	H3049	H.R. 13919—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Aye	275	122	
174	04/23/74	H3051	do.....	Aye	115	283	
175	04/24/74	H3096	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			380
176	04/24/74	H3107	H.R. 12799—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Aye	152	239	
177	04/24/74	H3109	H. Res. 1010—On agreeing to the resolution.....	Yea	363	30	2
178	04/24/74	H3118	S. 628—On passage.....	Nay	296	102	3
179	04/24/74	H3145	H.R. 11321—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Aye	187	191	
180	04/24/74	H3147	H.R. 11321—On motion to recommit.....	No	77	300	

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD—HON. BILL FRENZEL—93D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 180)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes.....	70	61	49	180
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against).....	51	50	38	139
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against).....	19	11	11	41
Voting percentage (presence).....	72.8	81.9	77.5	77.2

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
181	04/24/74	H3147	H.R. 11321—On passage.....	Yea	320	54	360
182	04/25/74	H3200	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Absent			
183	04/25/74	H3231	H.R. 13998—On passage.....	Not voting	341	37	
184	04/25/74	H3246	Quorum—Call in committee.....	Absent			351
185	04/25/74	H3253	H.R. 13999—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Not voting	136	218	2
186	04/25/74	H3254	do.....	Not voting	281	58	1
187	04/25/74	H3255	H.R. 13999—On passage.....	Not voting	330	8	
188	04/29/74	H3290	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Absent			339
189	04/29/74	H3300	H.R. 11793—Agreeing to conference report.....	Not voting	356	9	
190	04/29/74	H3325	H.R. 11989—On passage.....	Yea	352	12	
191	04/30/74	H3349	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			374
192	04/30/74	H3371	Quorum—Call in committee.....	Present			381
193	04/30/74	H3381	do.....	Present			372
194	04/30/74	H3382	H.R. 14434—On agreeing to the amendments.....	Aye	190	207	1
195	04/30/74	H3383	H.R. 14434—On passage.....	Yea	392	4	
196	05/01/74	H3411	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			366
197	05/01/74	H3427	H.R. 12993—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Aye	308	84	2
198	05/01/74	H3432	H.R. 12993—On passage.....	Yea	379	14	2
199	05/01/74	H3447	Quorum—Call in committee.....	Present			370
200	05/01/74	H3458	H.R. 14368—On agreeing to the amendment.....	No	169	221	2

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 200)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes.....	77	69	54	200
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against).....	55	55	41	151
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against).....	22	14	13	49
Voting percentage (presence).....	71.4	79.7	75.9	75.5

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
201	05/01/74	H3462	H.R. 14368—On passage.....	Yea	349	43	
202	05/02/74	H3488	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Absent			359
203	05/02/74	H3502	H.R. 13053—On passage.....	Yea	390	1	
204	05/02/74	H3513	H.R. 6175—On passage.....	Yea	379	1	2
205	05/06/74	H3554	H.R. 296—Suspend rules and pass.....	Yea	296	23	
206	05/06/74	H3564	S. 1125—Suspend rules and concur in Senate amendment.....	Yea	301	17	
207	05/07/74	H3595	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			376
208	05/07/74	H3615	H.R. 11035—Suspend rules and pass.....	Yea	153	240	
209	05/07/74	H3628	H.R. 14117—Suspend rules and pass.....	Yea	396		
210	05/07/74	H3634	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			374
211	05/07/74	H3638	H.R. 14354—Suspend rules and pass.....	Yea	359	38	
212	05/08/74	H3685	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			368
213	05/08/74	H3688	do.....	Present			380
214	05/08/74	H3699	H. Res. 929—On agreeing to the resolution.....	Yea	197	204	
215	05/08/74	H3715	Quorum—Call in committee.....	Present			382
216	05/08/74	H3719	H.R. 8193—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Aye	227	176	
217	05/08/74	H3720	H.R. 8193—On passage.....	No	266	136	
218	05/14/74	H3807	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			338
219	05/14/74	H3811	H. Res. 895—On agreeing to the resolution.....	Yea	308	57	
220	05/14/74	H3822	S. 1752—On passage.....	Yea	238	139	

See footnote at end of table.

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 220)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes.....	88	76	56	220
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against).....	61	61	43	170
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against).....	22	15	13	50
Voting percentage (presence).....	75	80.2	76.7	77.2

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
221	05/15/74	H3851	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			376
222	05/15/74	H3867	H.R. 12000—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Aye	238	151	
223	05/15/74	H3868	H.R. 12000—On passage.....	Yea	302	90	
224	05/15/74	H3878	S. 3052—Agreeing to conference report.....	Yea	392		
225	05/16/74	H3934	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			365
226	05/16/74	H3947	H.R. 13973—On passage.....	Yea	225	152	
227	05/16/74	H3968	H.R. 7824—Recommit conference report with instructions.....	Nay	183	190	
228	05/16/74	H3969	H.R. 7824—Agreeing to conference report.....	Yea	227	143	
229	05/20/74	H4012	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			274
230	05/20/74	H4013	H. Res. 1112—On agreeing to the resolution.....	Yea	298		
231	05/21/74	H4185	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			381
232	05/21/74	H4187	H.R. 12526—Suspend rules and pass.....	Yea	386	9	
233	05/21/74	H4207	H.R. 13834—Suspend rules and pass.....	Nay	191	207	1
234	05/21/74	H4213	H.R. 14225—Suspend rules and pass.....	Yea	400	1	
235	05/21/74	H4217	H.R. 13221—Suspend rules and pass.....	Yea	396	3	
236	05/22/74	H4248	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			375
237	05/22/74	H4262	H.R. 14592—On agreeing to the amendment.....	No	94	309	
238	05/22/74	H4267	do.....	No	34	370	
239	05/22/74	H4283	do.....	Aye	163	240	
240	05/22/74	H4293	do.....	Aye	190	211	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 240)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes.....	98	81	61	240
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against).....	76	66	48	190
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against).....	22	15	13	50
Voting percentage (presence).....	77.5	81.4	78.6	79.1

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
241	05/22/74	H4305	H.R. 14592—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Aye	185	209	
242	05/22/74	H4321	H.R. 14592—On passage.....	Aye	358	37	
243	05/23/74	H4350	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			359
244	05/23/74	H4356	H. Res. 1141—On agreeing to the resolution.....	Yea	330	44	
245	05/23/74	H4369	H.R. 14832—On passage.....	Yea	191	190	
246	05/28/74	H4398	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			284
247	05/29/74	H4458	do.....	Present			346
248	05/29/74	H4464	H.R. 14449—On agreeing to the amendments.....	No	94	284	
249	05/29/74	H4470	do.....	No	122	164	
250	05/29/74	H4473	do.....	Aye	290	91	
251	05/29/74	H4501	H.R. 14449—On passage.....	Yea	331	53	
252	05/29/74	H4519	H.R. 10337—On agreeing to the amendment.....	No	129	199	
253	05/29/74	H4520	H.R. 10337—On passage.....	Yea	290	38	
254	05/30/74	H4554	Quorum—Call of the House.....	Present			359
255	05/30/74	H4561	H. Res. 822—On agreeing to the resolution.....	Nay	290	85	
256	05/30/74	H4584	H.R. 10265—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Aye	224	139	
257	05/30/74	H4586	H.R. 10265—On passage.....	Aye	333	20	
258	05/30/74	H4599	H.R. 13678—On agreeing to the amendment.....	Aye	152	161	
259	05/30/74	H4602	do.....	Aye	168	137	1
260	05/30/74	H4604	H.R. 13678—On passage.....	Yea	240	58	1

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 260)

	Yeas/ nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes.....	104	85	71	260
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against).....	82	70	58	210
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against).....	22	15	13	50
Voting percentage (presence).....	78.8	82.3	81.6	80.7

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD—HON. BILL FRENZEL—93D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
261	06/03/74	H4634	H. Con. Res. 271—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	273		1
262	06/03/74	H4650	H.R. 14833—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	278	2	
263	06/04/74	H4672	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			349
264	06/04/74	H4679	do	Present			328
265	06/04/74	H4683	do	Present			337
266	06/04/74	H4696	S.J. Res. 40—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	223	147	
267	06/04/74	H4697	H.R. 13595—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	365		
268	06/04/74	H4698	S. 2844—Suspend rules and pass.	Yea	355	10	
269	06/04/74	H4700	H.R. 12565—Agreeing to conference report.	Yea	354	14	
270	06/04/74	H4706	H.R. 14013—Agreeing to conference report.	Yea	339	27	
271	06/05/74	H4737	H. Res. 1152—On agreeing to the resolution.	Yea	370	13	
272	06/05/74	H4760	H.R. 14747—On agreeing to the amendment.	No	149	238	
273	06/05/74	H4769	do	Aye	244	143	
274	06/05/74	H4771	do	Aye	233	151	
275	06/05/74	H4782	H.R. 14747—On passage.	Aye	175	209	
276	06/05/74	H4783	H.R. 69—Motion to instruct conferees.	No	270	103	
277	06/06/74	H4809	Quorum—Call of the House.	Present			361
278	06/06/74	H4852	H.R. 15155—On agreeing to the amendment.	Aye	186	201	
279	06/06/74	H4853	H.R. 15155—On passage.	Aye	374	21	
280	06/06/74	H4888	H.R. 10701—On agreeing to the amendment.	Not voting.	311	27	

¹ Recorded vote.

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NUMBER 280)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded votes	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	112	89	79	280
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	90	74	65	229
Absences (absent, not voting, not voting-paired for or against)	22	15	14	51
Voting percentage (presence)	80.3	83.1	82.2	81.7

Roll No.	Date	Page in daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote		
					Yea	Nay	Present
281	06/06/74	H4873	H.R. 10701—On agreeing to amendment.	No	174	158	
282	06/06/74	H4873	H.R. 10701—On passage.	No	318	9	
283	06/10/74	H4832	Quorum call.	Present	(7)		
284	06/10/74	H4949	H.R. 15074—On agreeing to amendment.	No	273	56	
285	06/10/74	H4949	H.R. 15074—On passage.	Nay	314	17	
286	06/11/74	H5006	Quorum call.	Present			
287	06/11/74	H5019	H. Res. 1166—On agreeing to resolution.	Nay	402	1	
288	06/11/74	H5019	H.R. 12165—On passage.	Nay	403	8	
289	06/11/74	H5042	H. Res. 1110—On agreeing to resolution.	Nay	204	211	

MOTHER M. BERNADETTE DE LOURDES, O. CARM.

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, recently, Mother M. Bernadette De Lourdes, O. Carm., a true servant of God and a dedicated and hard working individual, was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree from Sacred Heart University in Bridgeport, Conn.

Mother Bernadette is a friend of Connecticut's elderly for whom she has labored for many years. Her efforts in behalf of our senior citizens reflect her deep and sincere compassion for all God's children, and her commitment to accomplishing the work of the Lord.

Together with her colleagues at the Connecticut State Department of Aging, Mother Bernadette has worked to make old age a truly happy and fulfilling time for countless Connecticut senior citizens.

It is with great pride and affection that I acknowledge the accomplishments of this noble woman, and congratulate her upon receiving an honorary degree—another shining achievement.

The following citation from the Sacred Heart University commencement program is inserted for the benefit of my colleagues. It describes the beauty and grandeur that is Mother Bernadette:

MOTHER M. BERNADETTE DE LOURDES, O. CARM.

"What you have done to these, the least of My brethren, you have done to Me;" such is the theme that pervades the edifying career of Mother M. Bernadette De Lourdes, O. Carm. Born in Dublin, Ireland, where she received her early education, she entered the Congregation of the Carmelite Sisters for the Aged and Infirm in 1932. She continued her education at College of Misericordia, Ford-

ham, New York and Columbia Universities. Her great ability was recognized early by her Religious Community which had her assume ever increasing responsibilities. Governmental appointments to Committees, Conferences, and Councils have come as a recognition of her great talents. Despite her busy work and religious life, she has given untold time to Community Service and to that field which is so close to her heart and religious dedication, the field of Gerontology, in which her expertise has been acclaimed internationally. Great indeed must be her happiness to see her efforts rewarded by an ever expanding interest in problems of the aging, aged and infirm; greater, however, must be her joy to know that what she has done to the least of His brethren, she has done to Him. Sacred Heart University is privileged to honor Mother M. Bernadette De Lourdes, O. Carm. for the Christian love and humanitarian concern she has brought to her work, the example and standards she has set for the entire profession, and for the inspiration her life has been to Sacred Heart students; proudly, do we confer upon her, *honoris causa*, the degree of Doctor of Laws.

JUNE 15—A HAPLESS ANNIVERSARY FOR LITHUANIAN AMERICANS

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, June 15 is a hapless anniversary for Lithuanian-Americans and all Americans who cherish personal freedom and national independence. In this era of détente, let us not forget the tragedy that befell this Baltic State. On that date in 1940, the Soviet Union forcibly annexed the once-sovereign nation of Lithuania. This brazen act of aggression was facilitated by the climate of the time. The international environment had been thrown into tumult by the forces unleashed by the

Second World War. The Soviet Union, taking advantage of the German attack on Poland, moved troops into Lithuania and reestablished Russian control of this country.

Previous Russian domination had come to an end in 1915 when Lithuania was overrun by German armies. After the First World War, Lithuania proclaimed its independence on February 16, 1918. However, the newly established Soviet Government sent in its troops and installed a Communist government. Poland, interceding in Lithuania's behalf, managed to drive out the invaders. In a peace treaty signed on July 12, 1920, the Soviet Union recognized Lithuania's right of sovereignty. Independence was short-lived, however, for 20 years later the Soviet Union completely disregarded this formal treaty in an obvious thirst for power and territory.

The years of Soviet domination have not dimmed the spirit of the Lithuanian people. They continue to protest against the Soviet's violation of their basic human rights—no matter what the consequences.

Protests have led to arrests and to constant political and religious persecution. In 1971, Simas Kurdirka, a Lithuanian radio operator, attempted to escape from a Soviet ship to the United States but was returned to Soviet custody by the U.S. Coast Guard. Echoing the thoughts of many in his country, Kurdirka said:

I do not consider Russia to be my fatherland.

For his action, this valiant seaman was sentenced to 10 years in a corrective labor camp.

We can only hope that some day Lithuania will once again regain its lost freedom, which is still cherished in the hearts and minds of the Lithuanian people and free people everywhere.

GOLD SKEPTICS HOLD ODD NOTIONS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, inflation, more and more Americans are coming to realize, is making it increasingly difficult for individuals and families to maintain their savings, much less increase them. Those who put \$1,000 in a savings account 5 years ago, even though they have received significant interest dividends, saw that \$1,000 shrink, not increase.

Recently, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns, speaking at commencement exercises of Illinois College, declared that, "If past experience is any guide the future of our country is in jeopardy" from inflation. He said that if the "debilitating" inflation continues at anything like present rates, it would "threaten the very foundation of our society."

Burns took sharp issue with the standard governmental explanation of the main origins of inflation—that is, skyrocketing food and fuel prices outside of its control. Burns placed more emphasis 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."

One of the few ways for citizens to avoid the perilous effects of inflation is to invest in commodities which maintain their value. One of these is gold, and it is gold which our Government has made it illegal for Americans to own. I am confident that we are rapidly moving to eliminate this barrier, as virtually all other Western societies have done.

There are some who maintain that gold is really of no importance. Responding to such critics Nick Poulos, financial editor of the Chicago Tribune, writes that—

The truth of the matter is that the rise in gold reflects in great part the eroding confidence in the currencies of the Western world. So long as the governments continue to "go along" with inflation, their currencies will continue to decline in value and gold will remain in demand.

Mr. Poulos notes that—

Investors and consumers are losing more and more confidence in their governments. Inflation has not only debased their currencies, it has caused them to lose money in the stricken stock and bond markets . . . Because Americans are prohibited by law from buying gold bullion, some of them have participated in the gold rise thru the purchase of gold mining stocks and gold coins. William Simon . . . said he favors permitting Americans to buy gold bullion. When the time comes, the gold rush should be something to behold.

I wish to share Mr. Poulos' column, "Gold Skeptics Hold Odd Notions," with my colleagues and insert it, as it ap-

peared in the Chicago Tribune of May 19, 1974, in the RECORD at this time:

THE MONEY SCENE: GOLD SKEPTICS HOLD ODD NOTIONS

(By Nick Poulos)

The declining trend in the price of gold in recent weeks has inspired a number of newly-surfaced "experts" on the subject to bray loudly that the yellow metal's soaring flight is over.

They note that gold, which rose to an all-time high of \$179.50 an ounce on April 3, has broken an uptrend line dating back to last November, when it sold for \$90 an ounce.

Gold got as low as \$157.75 an ounce May 8, and is currently at the \$165 level.

Argus Research Corp. recently indulged itself in a screwball attack on gold asserting the metal is no longer a bargain.

"Since gold is not about to be restored to its monetary throne, the investor would be wise to view it as just another commodity," Argus proclaimed in a report.

Argus doesn't explain how it knows gold won't play any role in a restructured monetary system.

It also entertains the odd notion that because South Africa produces 76 per cent of the non-Communist world's gold, "the free market price of gold is what the South Africans want it to be."

If that's the case, you have to wonder why the South Africans haven't pushed the price of gold to at least \$1,000 an ounce.

Finally, Argus says the demand for gold is subject to "strange psychological quirks"—that gold has a "mysterious appeal" to many people.

Sigmund Freud, Argus tells us, studied this "mysterious appeal" and came to the conclusion that an undue attachment to gold is a sign of "deep psychic sickness."

So much for the baloney. The truth of the matter is that the rise in gold reflects in great part the eroding confidence in the currencies of the Western world.

So long as the governments continue to "go along" with inflation, their currencies will continue to decline in value, and gold will remain in demand.

Strong currencies presumably reflect strong, stable governments that keep inflation in check. But there's not much evidence of strong, stable political leadership in the Western world.

Pierre Trudeau's Liberal government has fallen in Canada, West Germany's Willy Brandt has resigned as chancellor, France will be electing a new president soon, Britain's Harold Wilson is hanging on desperately, and President Nixon faces possible impeachment as a result of Watergate.

Where are the strong governments to support strong currencies?

It is reasonable to assume that given this background, international currency affairs will continue to drift aimlessly while gold becomes more attractive.

Investors and consumers are losing more and more confidence in their governments.

Inflation has not only debased their currencies, it has caused them to lose money in the stricken stock and bond markets.

Edson Gould, a market analyst with an extraordinarily good record as a prognosticator, believes that any further decline in the price of gold would level out in the \$140 to \$150 range.

"Should that prove a bottom, we believe gold could then double that bottom just as it has doubled three times before—from \$35 to \$70 an ounce, from \$65 to \$127, and from \$90 to \$181-\$182," he said.

The correction in the price of gold was expected in view of its big runup. Also, higher

international interest rates induced selling of gold held on margin.

The dollar has turned weak again and touched a new yearly low last Tuesday.

Because Americans are prohibited by law from buying gold bullion, some of them have participated in the gold rise thru the purchase of gold mining stocks and gold coins.

William Simon, the new Treasury Secretary, said he favors permitting Americans to buy gold bullion.

When that time comes, the gold rush should be something to behold.

WEST VIRGINIA AND OTHER APPALACHIAN STATES THREATENED WITH ECONOMIC DISASTER BY SURFACE COAL MINING BILL

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, reproduced below is a letter I recently received detailing how West Virginia and other Appalachian States might be made economic disaster areas if H.R. 11500 is enacted.

The pity of all this is that what that bill's proponents say they want, and what most everybody really wants, is a tough law requiring the proper reclamation of mined land. H.R. 11500 in pursuing this objective threatens the miserable side effects mentioned in the letter.

Yet, with the substitute bill, H.R. 12898, we can have proper reclamation without such side effects, because we can dig coal, too, to meet the country's energy needs.

The course of wisdom would be to lay H.R. 11500 to rest and substitute H.R. 12898 when or if this proposition comes for a vote.

The letter follows:

WEST VIRGINIA SURFACE RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION,

Charleston, W. Va., May 28, 1974.

HON. CRAIG HOSMER,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER: In 1973, the State of West Virginia produced 19,791,256 tons of coal by the surface mining method. This year we expect production to remain about the same.

A study recently completed by the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources estimates that 50 percent of our surface operations are by the mountain top removal method, 32 percent by the boxcut or "lateral movement" and 18 percent by conventional contour mining. By the end of 1974, it is doubtful whether there will be any operations employing the conventional method of mining.

After careful review of HR-11500, as recently amended, we feel certain that the passage of this bill would have the following adverse effects on the coal industry in West Virginia:

1. Eliminate all operations doing mountain top removal (50%) since the House bill makes no provisions for valley fills or the head of the hollow fill, which are essential for this unique mining method. We, in West Virginia, believe this method to be of great advantage in mountainous regions for economic development of normally undevelopable land. Level land in West Virginia is at

a premium, but with the passage of HR-11500, this would be illegal in the permanent guidelines.

2. The 18 percent of the surface operations now doing conventional stripping would be eliminated by HR-11500 if it hasn't already been done so by existing state laws.

3. The 32 percent of the surface operations now involved in new mining methods would also not be permitted under HR-11500. The boxcut and "lateral movement" methods are the newest and most successful mining methods known today. Representatives from the Environmental Protection Agency, Bureau of Mines, MESA and mining people from Germany, Japan, China, France, Italy, England, Poland and Russia, who have seen examples of these methods, agree that it is by far more superior than any other mining method seen previously. We invited the House Interior Committee and Bruce Driver, Staff Counsel, to see these operations for themselves, but to date, they have been too busy.

4. In addition to all of the surface operations in West Virginia being eliminated by passage of HR-11500, approximately 18 percent of the deep production would be eliminated. In our state, deep mining and surface mining are interrelated. One depends on the other. One cannot survive without the other. Deep mining in West Virginia could not possibly continue to be competitive with the huge surface operations of the west without the advantage of stripping in the east. It's hard to accurately estimate what HR-11500 would do to deep mining in Appalachia, but according to the Stanford Research Institute, if the surface mining industry is eliminated in West Virginia, the deep mining industry would definitely be curtailed, at least by the same ratio of surface to deep, which is now in existence. Therefore, if surface mining is eliminated in West Virginia, then 18-20 percent of the deep mine industry would immediately be sacrificed.

If the above four results of HR-11500 do occur, then the following adverse economic effects would be expected:

1. Approximately 9,900 people involved directly and indirectly with the surface mining of coal would be without employment.

2. Approximately 6,000-8,000 deep miners whose operations depend directly on the blending of surface mined coal will be displaced, at least temporarily.

3. The State of West Virginia would lose 19.8 million tons of surface mined coal and an estimated 17.2 million tons of deep mined coal. This would lower our total production from 115 million tons annually to 78 million tons.

4. The economic results from a loss of 37 million tons of annual production would mean:

- a. Over \$100,000,000 in wages lost.
- b. Over \$95,000,000 in supplies and services lost.
- c. Over \$81,000,000 lost in transportation income (rail, truck and barge).
- d. Over \$60,000,000 in state and local taxes lost.

Needless to say, if HR-11500 passes, West Virginia would suffer economic consequences of a tremendously great magnitude. Moreover, West Virginia appears to be in the same position as other Appalachian states and if our projections are accurate, then the entire Appalachian region would be even more depressed economically. I would think that Congress would be more interested in helping our area economically rather than eliminating one of its major industries.

Please help us defeat HR-11500. It's essential for our survival.

Thank you for your time and kind consideration.

Sincerely,

BEN E. LUSK,
Executive Director.

SHOULD NIXON BE IMPEACHED?

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. MIZELL, Mr. Speaker, because of the interest of Members of this body and the general public in the on-going impeachment investigation of the House Judiciary Committee, I place in the RECORD a copy of an interview I recently had which appeared in the Winston-Salem Journal on June 9, 1974, and which reflects my thoughts at that time on this important issue.

The interview follows:

SHOULD NIXON BE IMPEACHED? MIZELL
REMAINS CAUTIOUS
(By Charles Osolin)

WASHINGTON.—In his annual legislative questionnaire mailed to 5th District residents late last month, Rep. Wilmer Mizell leads off with the following question:

"On the basis of your knowledge at the present time, do you believe the President should be impeached?"

Although the questionnaire calls for a "Yes or No" answer, Mizell himself is not yet ready to cast his vote on what could well be the most important issue in his—or anybody else's—congressional career.

Like most conservative congressmen, Mizell has had little to say, either on the floor of the House or elsewhere, about President Nixon's handling of the Watergate scandals, the White House tapes, or the Committee's impeachment investigation.

That doesn't mean, though, that Mizell hasn't given a lot of thought to the complex and troublesome questions which have preoccupied Washington for more than a year.

Mizell granted his first extended interview on Nixon's problems last Tuesday, over lunch at the House dining room. The main topic for the on-the-record interview had been agreed in advance, and Mizell was relaxed, chatty and well-prepared—realizing, no doubt, that he will be answering many of the same questions during the coming month as he campaigns for re-election.

For starters, Mizell was asked to respond to the same question he is asking his constituents in his legislative questionnaire: based on what he knows right now, does he think President Nixon should be impeached?

Mizell was good-humored about the blatant attempt to hoist him on his own petard. He laughed, reddened a bit and pretended to be ducking away from an inside pitch.

His answer followed quickly, however, and it was the same cautious noncommittal response he has given all along to similar questions:

"Sooner or later," he said, "I could very well be faced with having to make this decision, and I intend to make it based on the facts available at that time."

His vote on impeachment, Mizell went on, will depend on the recommendations and evidence presented to the House by the Judiciary Committee, as well as the arguments for and against impeachment which will be made during House debate on the issue.

Asked what weight he would give to the results of his questionnaire and other measures of public opinion, Mizell said there is "no question but what I'm interested in what the people think."

But, he added, "I think the decision is going to have to be a legal one," as opposed to a political one based on public opinion.

"When I make my decision," he said firmly, "it will not be a political decision, it will not be a partisan decision, and it will not be

a politically expedient decision. It will be based on the facts on hand at the time."

Mizell, now in his third term in Congress, has been a consistent supporter of Nixon's policies. A photograph of Nixon and Mizell shaking hands, which is prominently displayed in the congressman's office, is inscribed, "To Congressman Wilmer Mizell, a great team player."

Mizell's faith in the President may have been shaken, however, by the release of the White House transcripts on June 30. After a thorough reading of the 1,200-page document, Mizell said he was disappointed in much that he read, and that the transcripts had caused him deep concern.

"The impact of these White House conversations," he said, "reveal a conduct foreign to me as related to American law and institutions. I cannot condone such action, or lack of action, as the case might be."

Despite that apparent breach, though, Mizell continues to echo the White House line on questions related to the Judiciary Committee's impeachment investigation and Nixon's refusal to supply tapes and documents the committee says it needs to determine the President's guilt or innocence.

"I have said all along that the President should make all relevant material available," Mizell said. "He turned over an enormous amount—including many manuscripts and some tapes. The President says they have all they need."

But should the subject of an impeachment inquiry be allowed to say what's relevant and what isn't?

"If they have any questions," Mizell said, "they should accept the President's invitation to go to the White House and listen." (Nixon has offered to allow the chairman and the ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee to listen to the tapes and verify the transcripts at the White House, but they have refused to do so.)

"After that," Mizell went on, "if they think they need to take their counsel with them, or if they think there may be some additional tapes related to the material in the transcripts, then maybe they could work something out."

Mizell said it is difficult for someone who is not on the committee to judge the relevance of the material which the committee has subpoenaed.

"I think if he turned over 2,000 items, somebody's going to say we need 2,001," Mizell said. "At what point can they come to a conclusion and move on?"

Mizell said he would not draw an inference of guilt, or a belief that the President had something to hide, from Nixon's refusal to give the committee what it wants, as some congressmen have suggested.

"The Judiciary Committee, (Leon) Jaworski (the Watergate special prosecutor) and the (Watergate) defendants are all demanding evidence," Mizell said. "It's very difficult for the public to keep all these things straight."

Noting that Jaworski's request for evidence to be used in the Watergate trials will apparently be considered by the Supreme Court, Mizell said, "That's a strictly legal situation, which involves protecting the rights of the accused. That should be handled in the courts."

When asked if a refusal by Nixon to obey a Supreme Court ruling that he should turn over subpoenaed documents would be an impeachable offense, Mizell said he "wouldn't speculate on the grounds for impeachment."

Mizell criticized the Judiciary Committee for conducting its hearings behind closed doors, and for what he called a "scrambled egg approach" to the investigation. He said the committee should "go public" with its hearings and "permit the American people to have the benefit of these proceedings."

"Let them make some judgments of their own," Mizell said. "Let them decide between what's fact and what's fiction, what's truth and what's rhetoric, what is partisan politics and what isn't."

Mizell also suggested that the committee deal with the charges against Nixon one at a time—completing the Watergate phase of the inquiry before moving on to campaign contributions, political favors, and other issues.

He said television coverage of the House impeachment proceedings, and the Senate trial as well if the House impeaches Nixon should be allowed. "This is something that's important to all of the people," he said, "not just 435 House members."

Throughout the interview, the only question that momentarily seemed to stump Mizell was the last one. "If it turns out that you have to vote on impeachment," he was asked, "would that be the toughest vote of your career in Congress?"

While his guests fidgeted, Mizell spent what seemed like several minutes—it was actually about 30 seconds—staring into space before giving this carefully-worded reply:

"In terms of the impact on the nation," he said, "it would be the most important issue Congress would be confronted with since I've been here."

DEATH OF TWO POLYVINYL CHLORIDE WORKERS FROM RARE TYPE OF CANCER IS VERIFIED

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, 700,000 to 800,000 workers in the United States shape a white plastic resin called polyvinyl chloride into thousands of different plastic products.

Trapped within the resin is a clear, odorless, and deadly gas called vinyl chloride which is emitted when the resin is heated to be forged and processed into consumer products. Although we have been aware since January that the vinyl chloride gas is causing a rare liver cancer and numerous other diseases among the 6,500 American workers whose jobs bring them into direct contact with it, scientists have been uncertain as to the effect working with the plastic resin is having on the polyvinyl chloride workers who represent a group more than 100 times larger than the vinyl chloride workers.

The following article from the Wall Street Journal indicates increasing evidence that exposure to the resin can cause at least some of the same deadly ill effects as exposure to the gas:

DEATH OF TWO POLYVINYL CHLORIDE WORKERS FROM RARE TYPE OF CANCER IS VERIFIED

(By Barry Kramer)

A second death from angiosarcoma of the liver, a rare form of cancer previously linked to vinyl chloride occupational exposure, has been discovered in the polyvinyl chloride plastic fabricating industry, the Connecticut Health Department announced in Hartford.

The two deaths increase concern that the occupational danger of cancer from vinyl chloride, a gas used to make polyvinyl chloride plastic, may be more widespread than had been thought. Since January, 13 cases of liver angiosarcoma have been detected among vinyl chloride workers from plants that manufactured the gas or that

polymerized the gas into the plastic. Six other cases have been reported abroad.

But the Connecticut cases are the first known in the polyvinyl chloride fabricating industry, which turns the plastic into a myriad of finished products ranging from furniture to coated fabric to electric cable covering. German scientists recently reported finding "precursors" of angiosarcoma in the livers of six workers in a plant that turned polyvinyl chloride plastic into floor tiles.

But the Connecticut cases, confirmed as angiosarcoma by the National Cancer Institute in Bethesda, Md., are the first actual cases. In the U.S., an estimated 6,500 persons work in the vinyl chloride industry, while the number working in the polyvinyl chloride industry numbers in the hundreds of thousands.

The Connecticut Health Department announced the first case last week, and General Electric Co. disclosed that it was a 60-year-old employee who for 30 years had operated machines at a Bridgeport cable manufacturing plant that processed various plastics, including polyvinyl chloride. The man died last July, GE said.

The second case involved a man who worked as an accountant in a polyvinyl chloride fabricating plant in the same part of the state. A health department spokesman declined to identify the factory involved, and a Labor Department spokesman in Washington identified it only as a Stratford plant that makes polyvinyl-coated fabrics. A further investigation is being undertaken to learn if the accountant ever worked on the production line.

Although a definite relationship between occupational exposure and angiosarcoma in the two polyvinyl chloride workers cannot be made, the Labor Department spokesman said contact with all other chemicals, drugs and diseases than can affect the liver had been ruled out in the two cases, leaving only polyvinyl chloride as a known possibility.

Connecticut's cancer registry, which uncovered the two cases and which is one of the oldest and most accurate in the nation, lists six confirmed cases of angiosarcoma of the liver since the registry was begun in 1935. The other four cases didn't have known exposure to either vinyl chloride or polyvinyl chloride, according to Dr. Barbara Christine, chief of the health department's chronic disease section. She said the link between polyvinyl chloride and the two angiosarcoma deaths "might just be chance."

The link between vinyl chloride gas and liver angiosarcoma is strong, and scientists believe that if a link is determined between exposure to polyvinyl chloride plastic and the rare cancer it will be because the plastic contains pockets of unpolymerized vinyl chloride monomer that are liberated in heating the plastic when it is fabricated into different products.

Labor Department hearings designed to set permanent standards for vinyl chloride atmospheric concentrations in factories are scheduled to begin June 25 in Washington. A temporary ceiling of 50 parts vinyl chloride per million parts of air is currently in effect and the Labor Department has proposed a limit at levels too small to be detected, a requirement the industry has said would be impossible to meet.

THE RUNAWAY MILITARY BUDGET

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Pentagon won another round over those in Congress who seek to bring mil-

itary expenditures under some meaningful control. Regrettably, we lost three amendments to curb spending, limit troops abroad, and eliminate funding for the new manned bomber. In spite of losses, the efforts of the losing side should be placed in perspective.

For years now, in the name of an adequate defense, Pentagon spenders have literally run amuck with the Federal Treasury. When any voice has been raised against the quantum jumps in military expenditures, those of us who have raised our voices have been either pooch-pooched or indirectly accused of indifference to an adequate national defense.

Therefore, we have had to undertake an effort in the Congress similar to that required to end American participation in the Vietnam imbroglio. As a Congressional veteran of that years-long effort, I see a pattern developing. And I feel that in the end, just as in the case of Southeast Asia, we shall eventually and inevitably have successes of some kind.

There is no desire on my part to hurt vital aspects of national defense. Rather, I wish to see this country as strong as any nation in the world and then some. Senator JACKSON's distrusting views of Soviet intentions certainly strike an echo in my mind. Nonetheless, we cannot spend the Nation to fiscal death and ruin in the name of defense. There must be a limit, and regrettably, the Pentagon has refused to heed our warnings.

It is ridiculous for the Nation to pursue procurement of every military toy emerging from the fertile minds of military scientists. For example, the B-1 manned bomber. It is costing us double the original projections to keep up the production effort. Yet the unfortunate evidence of the recent Middle East war indicates that the day of the manned bomber is largely over. In fact, military observers have been claiming that for years. The last waves of North Vietnam bombings with B-52's and the casualties we sustained then surely brought home that lesson. We have enough ICBM's in various forms, and MIRV's, to annihilate mankind, yet the Air Force bomber jockeys in the Pentagon insist on reliving the "wild blue yonder" days of World War II at taxpayer expense.

A similar mentality prevails regarding American troops overseas. Hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of U.S. service personnel are stationed in the most useless places performing the most unnecessary tasks at crippling taxpayer expense. We presently maintain approximately 350,000 American troops in Europe to hold the hands of our NATO allies. A corporal's guard would suffice to show the flag. Instead, we maintain a massive human tripwire which would serve no useful purpose in case of a massive invasion of Western Europe by the Warsaw Pact countries. These troops are costing America's taxpayers billions annually, filling European pockets and adding not one whit to our real defense.

It is, however, a cushy tour and billet for a number of officers who require a reason for being. What is worse, our forces in Europe are encumbered with their dependents, a questionable policy on the part of a military force supposedly

on duty for combat duty. These dependents in their turn cost our balance of payments mightily every year.

Taken all together, the situation is a luxury America can no longer afford in these present times of shortages, rampant inflation and crying domestic needs. If the military will not see that this situation is rapidly becoming intolerable, and will not yield an inch, then the time is coming for us here in the Congress to draw the lines and fight them annually every inch of the way until we inevitably win out, as was the case with the Vietnam involvement.

This year we lost every battle save one. Next time, we shall assuredly mount a stronger, more determined effort to curb this military spending machine, which is hurting America domestically. My district cannot obtain desperately needed aid in areas like old age assistance, urban mass transit aid, pollution control, housing and a number of other sectors of concern. This is the case because so much is being spent on unnecessary concerns like the endeavors I have alluded to in these remarks. So Members like myself, recognizing the needs of our constituents, have no option but to take the route we have chosen. And in the end, we shall prevail.

SOCIETY NEEDS BOOSTER SHOT OF ETHICS

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, when our Founding Fathers created this Nation, they injected a strong dose of morality into its leadership system.

Regrettably, this moral potency has dissipated over the years and in recent decades we have witnessed the rise of materialism and its companion philosophy of the end justifying the means. Just how deeply this philosophy has infected our society is obvious to anyone reading his daily newspaper.

What we need now to immunize us from future infections is a good booster shot of ethics into every vein of society, from education and government to business and labor.

One of the most eloquent arguments for this treatment was presented by Donald O'Toole, chairman of the board of Heritage Bancorporation, at Lewis University, a school in my home district in Illinois.

I am submitting his remarks for the RECORD and I hope my colleagues will read them and think hard about them:

THE NEED FOR GRADUATES OF RELIGIOUSLY ORIENTED UNIVERSITIES

(Commencement address, Lewis University, by Donald O'Toole)

The leadership of the United States was never so highly educated as today. Never have our businesses, industries, professional, labor, and farming activities been headed by so many with college degrees. Never especially has our political leadership included so many lawyers and other educated men who hold masters' and doctorate degrees. And

they all lead the most broadly and highly educated nation in the world.

Yet today we find ourselves shocked by daily discoveries of cheap, shoddy, and disgraceful actions by Americans who have been holding our most honored and respected positions of leadership. And we are further shocked that most of the other nations in the world are disgusted and fed up with us—are treating our political and business leaders with contempt, seizing the properties of American corporations and throwing them out of their countries, and defying us. Less than thirty years ago we began a twenty-year outpouring of enormous generosity to those same nations, billions of dollars of outright gifts of food and clothing, money, equipment, and American know-how, to establish and build up their industrial and farming economies, and to bring new educational and social sciences to their disordered and often savage lives.

Watergate and its endless disclosures of disgraceful activities far beyond the stupid attempt to burglarize the Democratic Party's national headquarters have brought all these things into focus. But they have been a long time abuilding. We started on the downward path from respect for ourselves and from the entire rest of the world a long time back, at least as far as World War II.

Watergate has stripped the thin veil which blurred our image of the many men who led us into the whole mess of today. They have been playing evil games with each other on a stage which could no longer contain them—their numbers and activities burst through the veil and into the laps of the ordinary Americans who have been paying, and will long continue to pay, for the whole evil performance.

Watergate has brought into focus a terrible series of crimes against the Constitution, our laws, and our rights as men, as well as the men of other nations. We have witnessed the indictments and convictions of high government officials who have violated their oaths of office, sold political favors, granted exemptions from anti-trust and other laws; arranged embargoes and high tariffs on low-priced foreign goods and on oil we badly needed for the benefit of powerful corporations and wealthy individuals; sought and accepted political contributions in thinly veiled violations of newly enacted laws; and on and on through an endless list of high crimes. Worst of all, they have been found to have lied under oath and to have induced others to testify falsely. And every official indicted or under investigation thus far is a graduate of an American college or university, most of them educated as lawyers.

Along with them American business and industrial leaders have been brought to the bar of justice to confess their guilt, often in tears, to having bought political favors, bribed and made illegal contributions to campaign funds, to gain exemptions from prosecutions for violations of laws, to secure embargoes and protective tariffs behind which they could exact high prices from American consumers, and to get wholly unreasonable exemptions from taxes. Labor leaders have been tried and found guilty of stealing from their unions, using pension funds to finance personal undertakings, executing sweetheart contracts for bribes from employers.

For all of them the end has been the penalties that men fear worst—disbarments, heavy fines, imprisonments, and disgrace for the rest of their lives.

The shock and anguish the ordinary American people have had to suffer from these awful disclosures constitute their realization that they have been paying and will long continue to pay for all of this. It was the heavy tax burden they bore that made up for the unreasonable exemptions granted to the powerful, it was they who paid for the horrible Viet Nam War in billions of dollars and the lives of their own sons. Their

money and trust in their government enabled power-hungry military men and politicians, and manufacturers of war materials, to gain higher rank, power, and profits from spending those billions on death-dealing planes and bombs which killed millions of simple Oriental people who never hurt us, destroyed their schools and hospitals, and defoliated their rich fields and lush forests. And it is they, the ordinary Americans, who must now strike down these evils, and regain our own self-respect and that of the rest of the world.

We must find new leaders to guide us out of this. Who will they be? How will we be able to recognize them?

Let us take one more look at Watergate. If we examine into the evidence, we find one common excuse throughout: The end justified the means. For all of these men the election of a certain man or party justified the breaking of any laws which might impede; the blocking of the spread of Russian influence—misleadingly by the single word "Communism"—was justification for killing Vietnamese and ruining their villages and lands; the protection of the welfare of giant corporations was justification for interfering in the political affairs of other nations and permitting gross violations of anti-trust laws. And so on and on, and the same excuse—the end justified the means—has been boldly stated again and again by political administrators, military leaders, and corporate executives. For all of them the ends were always identical with their own selfish enrichments and pleasures.

How could a once moral people have become so imbued with the wholly immoral philosophy that the end justifies the means, that truth is always relative, that one's own selfish interests come first and foremost, that there is no obligation on public leaders to make any self-sacrifices for their followers and fellow citizens? What has happened to the heirs to the mantles of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt? What caused the collapse of morality in our leadership?

The answer lies in large part in two causes: The enormous growth of state-supported colleges and universities, and the decline in moral objectivity in private colleges and universities, most of which were originally established by deeply religious groups. The loud voices of defenders of the separation of church and state required state schools to operate without religious philosophies, and this has meant no moral content to their educational courses. Private schools found themselves bowing lower and lower to get financial support from governmental bodies and wealthy individuals and corporations who were totally disinterested in the teaching of morality, and their moral objectivity declined in some cases to anemia or absolute zero.

Materialism moved into the breach. The end result was the teaching of courses in every phase of education without any reference to morality—moving downward progressively into high schools and grade schools. At best students have been left to glorify selfish materialistic gains and successes as their main goals, and at worst they were taught that ends—always their personal ends—justified means. We realize today how many brilliant students who graduated from these programs and adopted those concepts actually became our leaders in politics, business, science, labor, every phase of human activity, trampling over moral principles, their obligations to the people they served, and elementary human rights, to secure their own selfish objectives.

This is not to say that there have not been honest, highly moral, and genuinely successful men and women during these troublesome times. There were and are hundreds of thousands, millions of them—politicians, businessmen, teachers, scientists—who have

Lived totally moral lives and led, governed, managed, and taught their organizations and followers according to rigid moral principles. But they have permitted themselves to be out-shouted and shoved aside by a vocal minority who seized power as they went up and used it ruthlessly and effectively. We listened to too much talk about how we could not effectively check the abuses and advances of such powerful politicians and wealthy individuals and corporations. Most of us made no real effort to seek out each other and unite as they did.

When Viet Nam began to climax and we felt the real agony of lost sons and neighbors, and the weight of taxes brought on by the war, we began finally to listen to critical observers of Viet Nam, returned and jaded veterans, and articulate students whose researches were unchallengeable. We reacted, however, with no action, in fact with amusement, disgust, and even disbelief. We missed our great opportunity when we permitted naive and undisciplined radical groups to force a weak Democratic candidate for the presidency on the ballot. The old guard, richer by far in campaign funds and corporate influence, and cockier than ever, moved in and finally went too far to their inevitable end.

Now we must get about repairing the damage where it can be done best—by reinstituting the teaching of morality throughout our entire educational system. We must look to those religiously oriented colleges and universities which have faithfully preserved the indoctrination of all their courses with moral principles, as the wellsprings of the teaching of morality we know now to be so necessary. In all our colleges: Politicians must be taught not only how to govern, but also that they must carry out the public trust in enacting laws which protect the welfare of all men alike, and repealing those which don't; lawyers must learn that observance of the law is their own responsibility as well as their clients', and that they are responsible for the presentation of evidence that is complete in its scope and accuracy; businessmen must learn that they must discharge the positions in which they are placed with true fairness and honesty to their communities, other nations, customers, shareholders, and workers alike; persons of means must learn that they must pay their full fair share of the costs of government, and that they cannot seek special privileges.

All college graduates must learn that truth is the essential quality without which society cannot survive, and that its observance lies first and foremost with them.

And all men must learn that the penalties for violation of moral principles are to be made sure and painful by a morally aware body of college graduates—that public exposure, heavy fines, disbarment, disenfranchisement, imprisonment, and lifelong disgrace are the certain ends of violation of the moral code.

American leaders of the future—leaders of business, professions, politics, and other activities—are going to have to observe high standards of justice, equity, and truth—if your generation of college graduates and mine and the ones between us join militantly to enforce these standards. Ruthlessness and lawlessness are out, honesty and complete fairness are to be the rule of the day, and the Watergate and other investigations stemming out of it must run their full gamut if we are to know just what crimes to prevent and how to prevent them. If colleges expect their graduates to succeed, they must inculcate deeply within them the principles of justice, honesty, and responsibility to one's fellowmen.

You graduates of Lewis University are fortunate indeed. You have been taught the principles of morality throughout all of your studies here in this morally dedicated and religiously oriented center of learning. You have been taught your own disciplines, the

sciences, the basic elements of law, the accounting and economic languages of business, the methods of administering mercy and justice efficiently to men of all kinds, and you have been taught how to practice them within the strictures of moralism and ethics.

The worlds outside—the worlds of business, law, politics, science, medicine, sociology, education, whatever your chosen career—are hungry for men and women such as you. Go out and get into your chosen field. Observe well the old rules of hard work and dedication to your job, plus the necessary qualities of keen imaginations and restless ambitions, stimulated by never-ending studies of your fields and the whole world about you, never failing to think and act within the strictures of complete morality, and you will discover the paths to leadership and the ultimate satisfactions of lives you will know to have been spent in the improvement of the lots of your fellowmen. Your material rewards, I can assure you, will be virtually automatic. In your Lewis University graduates are the ingredients for which all living generations hunger, in the United States and indeed in the whole world.

This is truly a great day for you graduates of Lewis, and for us too, for you are our hope.

BOB McMAHON OF DUNDEE IS THE NEW COMMANDER OF ILLINOIS VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, June 23, 1974 at the O'Hare Sheraton Inn in Chicago my friend, Bob McMahon of VFW Post No. 2298 of Dundee, Ill.—in my 13th Congressional District—will be installed as the new commander of Illinois Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Speaker, this distinguished veteran of World War II has earned this recognition through his gallant military service in the U.S. Navy's South Pacific Operations in 1944 and 1945, as well as during his subsequent service to our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, Bob McMahon has attained his role of State and national leadership through his unselfish service to his local post in Dundee as well as in the district and other State positions which he held preliminary to this special honor which is being celebrated Sunday in Chicago and in Dundee.

Mr. Speaker, following his service as commander of the Dundee Post in 1958, Bob McMahon served as public relations officer, special events director, and in other positions of responsibility and leadership in the Illinois Department of the VFW—becoming junior vice commander in 1972 and senior vice commander last year.

Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with Commander Bob McMahon's devoted service to his community, State, and Nation, including service to veterans and nonveterans. He and I have participated jointly in numerous public affairs where his dedication to service in behalf of his fellow man has been evidenced.

Mr. Speaker, following the installation ceremonies in Chicago, an open house will be held in the VFW hall at Dundee

Sunday evening where Commander McMahon, his lovely wife, Patricia, and their children, Michael, William, Peggy, Jo and Timmy, will receive their friends and well-wishers. I regret exceedingly that I will not be able to join with those who will be attending this open house.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I take this means of calling to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives the honor and distinction which has come to my constituent, Bob McMahon, as the commander of the 112,000 member Illinois Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and I join in this public expression of congratulations and best wishes.

GETTING HAZARDOUS PRODUCTS OFF THE MARKET

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, scandals dealing with unsafe products are not news these days. For years now, we have known that the various food and drug companies have been placing a variety of products on the market with blatant disregard for the well-being of those who consume them at the other end of the chain. In fact, as a result of weak enforcement of existing Federal laws by Federal agencies, the situation in the past few years has gotten worse rather than better. The most recent example involving vinyl chloride is a perfect illustration of the situation.

The Food and Drug Administration is a perfect example of an agency with authority to protect the public becoming largely unwilling to oppose those it is supposed to regulate. That, for example, is the reason why the Consumer Product Safety Commission was brought into being by the Congress; because FDA was not doing the kind of job it was required by statute to perform on behalf of the public. A number of excellent consumer protection measures were taken away from that Agency and given to the CPSC to enforce, among them the Safe Toy Act, Flammable Fabrics Act, Hazardous Substances Act and Poison Prevention Packaging Act. This situation, however, in all fairness, prevails in virtually every Federal agency charged with protecting the public through regulation. Many of them have become open scandals in the past few years.

In spite of these legislative actions, however, the Food and Drug Administration is left with several vital responsibilities, including that of policing the foods and drugs we consume. In this area, the agency is notably sluggish in performing its assigned tasks, and the vinyl chloride situation points up this state of affairs in the most complete sense.

Even if foods, drugs, or cosmetics are found to be dangerous to human health, the Food and Drug Administration currently has no power to require a manufacturer to recall a dangerous product. Today, the agency's power is limited to a voluntary recall or seizure. Neither

method is really satisfactory from a consumer protection point of view.

What we need is a tougher law, and this requires legislation. H.R. 14805, originally sponsored by our distinguished colleague, **Ed Koch**, of New York, would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to halt the sale and distribution of hazardous foods, drugs, and cosmetics and to require their recall, if in his opinion such action is warranted.

The vinyl chloride situation was most revealing and quite shocking in that it showed how little satisfaction the public can get in respect to a dangerous product. HEW staged a voluntary recall of hair sprays for women using vinyl chloride. Yet we know there is a strong possibility of a link between this substance and a rare form of liver cancer.

In April, HEW stated that:

The only statutory instrument under the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act is seizure, and this procedure has major limitations.

The most important of these deficiencies, according to HEW, is "the time required to implement a seizure action" where numerous lots of a product are distributed nationwide.

Obviously, the initiative is now in the hands of Congress, the agencies will not act in a vigorous way to initiate any action on behalf of consumers because of the power exercised in their areas of concern by the lobbies of the affected industries. Congress can and should legislate to close this loophole. It should take the form of giving the agencies in question the powers provided in H.R. 14805. Therefore, I am pleased to be able to join **Ed** and others of our colleagues in sponsorship of this measure. Hopefully, as more evidence is produced respecting vinyl chloride, we can anticipate some action in this area.

DRILLING COSTS SKYROCKET

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the best investment America can make today is to encourage more domestic gas exploration. With this country 35-percent dependent on oil imports, we need to concentrate more on gas development domestically.

Last week, in hearings with the Federal Power Commission, it was brought out that a British thermal unit of energy costs about four times as much if we produce it from oil than if we produce it from gas. This means that it would be better for our economy to increase the price of gas to encourage more gas availability, as it is definitely the cheapest energy source that we have at this time.

The most practical approach is to pass legislation which would deregulate the price of gas at the wellhead. By encouraging increased exploration, we could develop additional sources of gas, and all gas is cheaper than the \$15 per barrel Arab oil that is our energy import.

While I was in Texas this weekend,

I was reviewing some of these cost figures. John Wisenbaker's son is a young oil man out in Midland, Tex. John gave me the cost figures that he had just received from Michael on a dry hole. On this west Texas well, they had drilled 17,400 feet on an Ellenburger test, and the total well cost for a dry hole was \$1,032,900. About one-half of this was for the rig contract, but the other half went into everything else that goes into drilling a dry hole. And remember, this is a dry hole with no completion costs.

Let me give you some figures that Michael Wisenbaker submitted on the Allison well out there in Pecos County. The Allison came in and they have production on it. But what is interesting is to see how fast inflation has been hitting into the drilling business. They had a very careful estimate made in December 1973, of what their costs would be for a dry hole and what their costs would be for a producer. In this case, they brought in a 13,000 foot Montoya test producer.

In December, they had figured their costs at \$605,200 if they could get a complete producer. This included everything in every way. By March, Wisenbaker said that they had to revise and reestimate and they figured that it would be \$703,400. In June 1974, when all bills were in, and the well was actually completed, the cost was \$812,000. Here was a well that had no trouble at all drilling. The well was actually completed and drilled before the final schedule date. But despite everything going perfectly, the well cost 34 percent more than planned 6 months earlier.

This illustration of a 34 percent increase in drilling costs within 6 months and the cost of having to walk away from a million dollar dry hole are examples of what is involved in finding new gas.

But remember this—gas is still the best buy that we can make for energy. We could pay \$1 MCF out there at the wellhead and still have the cheapest source of energy that we have here in this country.

It takes drilling to find the gas. Michael Wisenbaker's experience out in Midland is typical of all of these wildcat drillers all over the country. For America to move forward, we must be self-sufficient with energy. It is better for us to buy gas that is produced domestically than to buy \$15 per barrel Arab oil.

UNITED STATES CONSULTS LABOR ON LOANS

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, it is deplorable that departments of the Federal Government at times rely on private special interest groups for input on their final administrative decisions. These practices of the past should be eliminated and any future collusion should be prohibited.

An article by William Claiborne, a Washington Post staff writer, appeared in that paper on June 9, 1974, which

relates to one appalling deviation. I submit the article in its entirety for the benefit of the Members of this House:

UNITED STATES CONSULTS LABOR ON LOANS (By William Claiborne)

The Labor Department routinely consults with the AFL-CIO about rural industrial loan applications made to the government, department officials acknowledged yesterday.

Since January, the names of approximately 500 applicants for Farmers Home Administration business loans have been forwarded to the union federation's research division, a Labor Department official said.

The purpose of the referrals, according to Labor Secretary Peter J. Brennan, is to "obtain information which may be relevant to our determination."

So far, AFL-CIO affiliates have returned adverse findings on approximately 18 loan requests, most of them involving the textile and garment industries. Of those, three have been turned down, the Labor Department said.

Some others still have not received final clearance on the basis of adverse comments by the AFL-CIO affiliates.

The practice of allowing private labor unions to review industrial loan requests submitted to the government was termed "shocking" by Sen. Clifford Hansen (R-Wyo.), who said he uncovered the procedure while making a routine inquiry on the status of a loan application by a constituent.

Hansen said the practice "indicates scandalous invasion of the applicant's privacy, and gives the labor union unprecedented influence on government function."

Rep. W. R. Poage (D-Tex.), chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, said he was "appalled" by the practice and had requested an explanation by Brennan.

Brennan, however, defended the practice as necessary because the union information is used in determining whether a loan approval would undermine business competition in proposed plant location, or whether it would cause unemployment in a city from which an applicant plans to move a factory.

In a letter to Hansen, Brennan emphatically denied that the AFL-CIO participates in the decision-making process. He said the federation's information is used as leads for further government investigations.

Moreover, Brennan said, the AFL-CIO is given no information about the size of an applicant's requested loan, volume of sales or expected employment.

Instead, he said, the Labor Department sends to the union federation each week a list of loan applicants, their addresses and the products involved.

The union is advised it has two weeks to comment on the application, and if comments are not submitted in that period the Labor Department will "assume their concurrence," Brennan said.

Hansen last week wrote Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats asking that the General Accounting Office investigate "any misuse of government lending powers" involved in the loan screening process.

Hansen said he had also been told that labor unions had been given the right to screen applications for capital grants for urban transit programs.

In a letter to Transportation Secretary Claude Brinegar, Hansen said a former employee of the Urban Mass Transit Administration claimed that "organized labor has a veto over all capital grants and that local governments understand that if the unions are not favorable toward a grant, the local government need not even apply."

Hansen asked Brinegar to respond to that allegation.

The basis for the loan screening procedure, the Labor Department said, is the 1972 Rural Development Act, which provides for government assistance to small businesses and industries in attempt to revitalize de-

pressed rural areas. In fiscal 1974, the Agriculture Department's Farmers Home Administration has approved about \$200 million worth of such loans.

Brennan said the act specifically authorizes the Labor Department to help process the loan applications, partly to forestall government subsidization of "runaway shops," or industries that abandon strong union cities in favor of the cheaper labor markets of rural areas.

Brennan argued that the statute does not specify what sources of information the Labor Department may or may not use in passing judgment on loan requests.

He said he believed the department can use "whatever sources of information will enable us to follow the statutory mandate" of protecting employment and competitive business.

Apart from the union organization, Brennan said, the department consults state and federal employment agencies.

When asked whether the department checks with any other private organizations, Harold Kuptzin, acting technical support director of Labor's Manpower Administration, said, "sometimes we call trade associations." He said, however, that the AFL-CIO is the only private group that is regularly asked for comments about loan applications.

In defending the practice, Kuptzin said, "It's almost like looking at press clippings. We felt the union might have information about runaway plants, and we didn't want that kind of operation to be subsidized by the government."

Kuptzin added that even though the Labor Department was given the burden of screening loan applications made to the Agriculture Department, no additional manpower was provided.

In a second letter to Brennan last week, Hansen indicated he was not satisfied with the Labor Secretary's explanation of the screening procedure.

Noting Brennan's pledge that no detailed information is given to the union about an applicant, Hansen said, "Without this information, how is the AFL-CIO able to comment on the possible effect of applications on competitors and employment?"

An official of the AFL-CIO headquarters here disputed Hansen's interpretation of the screening policy.

"It's crazy to think that this procedure is not in the public interest. He must be for secrecy," said Mark Roberts, of the federation's research department.

"One reason we did not propose the (rural industrial development) legislation is that it included the requirement that urban workers would not be displaced by the building up of the labor market in rural areas. The law forbids that kind of runaway activity, and I don't see how anybody can oppose public knowledge of what's happening in this area," Roberts said.

Roberts said that when he receives the Labor Department's weekly list, he "alerts the appropriate union about the (loan) activity in their area." The individual unions, in turn, "take it up with the Labor Department," Roberts said.

As a current example, he cited the Textile Workers' Union's opposition to a loan application submitted by a municipal agency in Snow Hill, N.C.

The agency is seeking funds to build a sewer line to a textile plant owned by a manufacturer considered by the Textile Workers to be anti-union. The union is opposed to such federal assistance and concerned that the company may transfer urban jobs to the rural plant.

The Labor Department is not opposing that application, Roberts said. "It raises serious questions about the rural development program," he added.

STANLEY S. SURREY

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Stanley S. Surrey is not only a professor of law at Harvard Law School, he is also a distinguished public servant who served 8 years in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy. His article on the provisions of the Domestic International Sales Corp. which appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, June 16, 1974, should be must reading for all those who think of that legislation as helpful to our national interest. The article follows:

DISC REPEAL CALLED NEEDED TAX REFORM
(By Stanley S. Surrey)

Repeal of the Domestic International Sales Corp. export subsidy provisions would be an income tax reform of high priority. Repeal would prevent an annual revenue loss that will be close to \$1 billion by 1975. It could be simply achieved—clean-cut elimination of the provisions is all that is needed. Repeal would not affect our export trade. And finally, repeal would remove from the statute a tax atrocity that was a mistake from the very start.

DISC was adopted in 1971, at the insistent urging of the Treasury Department, as a tax subsidy incentive to exporters. That department, spurred by statements from the Commerce Department and others that the Treasury was doing nothing to improve our export position, had desperately looked about for some subsidy device and in 1970 had come up with DISC.

But then came the new monetary policy of 1971 and the first devaluation of the dollar, making any search for artificial export incentives beside the point. Yet the Treasury clung to its anachronistic idea of a DISC tax incentive and pushed it before the Congress late in 1971. A reluctant Congress adopted only half of the DISC proposal.

As enacted, DISC allowed a new type of export subsidiary corporation to be formed, half of whose income from export activities would be relieved from current income taxation.

Most companies initially thought of DISC presumably as a complex device requiring adoption of a new method of conducting export operations, which would necessitate restructuring their present organizations and procedures.

They soon learned that DISC is purely a paper procedure requiring no real change in port operations. All that is needed is creation of a new subsidiary. This new corporation need not have any employees, any operating activities, any substance whatever. A DISC requires only \$2,500 of capital and a separate bank account. With that, a manufacturer can have its accountants start the paper work that immediately reduces its income tax by eliminating from taxable income one-half of the DISC's share of the profits attributable to the export sales of the manufacturer.

Once manufacturers with export sales caught on to the idea that DISC was a tax reduction gift with no needed change in their operations, they were eager to accept the DISC bounty. Thus, there were 1,000 DISCs by March 1972, some 3,439 at the end of 1972 and more than 5,000 by February 1974.

The repeal of DISC would involve no interruption of or effect on export activities.

Instead, the tax-reduction paper work that DISC brought about simply would end. Unlike some other tax reform situations, repeal is not in any way hampered by claims to equities based on actions not quickly reversible.

The real facts must be kept squarely in mind. DISC was deliberately planned by the treasury as a paper device—as an elaborate file drawer—as a schedule on a tax return.

But this paper device meant a revenue loss of \$250 million for 1972 and an estimated loss of \$500 million in 1973. By 1975, the loss is estimated to be \$920 million. We are thus talking about a device that will soon be costing the government more than \$1 billion a year. Who receives these benefits? Treasury data show:

Twenty-two per cent of the untaxed DISC export income was earned by eight firms in 1972.

More than 90 per cent of the DISC receipts go to parent corporations whose asset size places them in the top 1 per cent of U.S. corporations.

DISC is thus a windfall handed over to our largest corporations. Our largest corporations are our largest exporters and DISC simply reduces the current tax on export activity. A Treasury official was recently quoted to the effect that DISC has not significantly helped to add new exporters to the roster of existing ones.

There is a reason for most small firms to stay clear of DISC. While a DISC is a paper corporation, the paper work can be immense. The DISC statutory provisions and accompanying Treasury regulations are a monstrous technical morass. DISC rules are replete with percentage tests, special pricing rules, special computations—all a technical paper wonderland.

For the big companies, elaborate attention to the paper work can enlarge the DISC payoff. The special pricing rules a DISC enjoys are an elaborate facade, for they allow a DISC to claim as its profit—for doing nothing whatsoever—50 per cent of the difference between the costs of the export product and its final sales price, in complete disregard of the arms-length pricing rules developed by the IRS and the courts.

In retrospect, it is remarkable—and sad—how little the Treasury and the Congress that relied on it knew about this paper device it was fashioning. The Treasury estimated the first year's revenue loss to be \$100 million—it turned out to be \$250 million. The second year's loss was said to be \$170 million—it is now estimated at \$500 million.

The Treasury now says the reason for the difference is that the rate of return on export sales is about twice as great as the Treasury expected—it is 15 per cent as against the expected 8 per cent, which is the average for domestic sales. This one fact alone shows how little analysis was really made of the situation—and it also raises the question of why the most profitable part of a manufacturing and selling operation must be subsidized.

Congress was also told that the tax on the DISC untaxed income would only be deferred, so that some day it would be paid. But Congress was not told that the deferral could be lengthy and that the present value of such deferral often would be worth about as much as current exemption.

DISC is thus built on paper and myths. There is the myth that a DISC is an aggressively exporting organization, when in reality it is only a paper company.

There is the myth that the tax benefit of DISC is "only deferral" so that not much is involved, when in reality the deferral is so long delayed it can become the equivalent of exemption.

There is the myth that DISC-benefitted income must be invested in "export-related assets," when in reality that is but a drafting term that can cover any assets of the parent.

There is the myth that the DISC-benefitted income cannot be used by the parent for manufacturing activities abroad, when in reality a properly guided parent can use those funds to build a plant abroad.

The ultimate question remains to be asked—of what benefit is the DISC provision to the United States? We know about the windfall to exporters—more than three times as large as the Treasury estimated—and we know that the only operational price paid by exporters for this windfall is that of paying accountants and lawyers to handle the work that keeps this intricate paper-consuming machine properly nourished. But do we as a nation gain anything?

The answer is no. The Treasury in its first report on DISC could come up with no solid evidence that our export position had at all been improved because of the presence of DISC. Our exports have indeed increased—from \$48.8 billion in 1972 to \$70.3 billion in 1973. But behind this increase are such major developments as two devaluations of the dollar, a new monetary system, a worldwide inflation and a worldwide food shortage leading to a huge increase in agricultural exports.

Exporters who benefit from the policy changes should not also be handed a tax reduction windfall through DISC—a windfall that increases automatically as exporters reap the benefits of these and other policy changes.

So the time has come for Congress to set the match to this huge paper monument of DISC and to end the wasteful revenue loss—a loss that it never anticipated would reach the \$1 billion figure that is now projected. A quick repeal of DISC is the only sensible response to this absurd tax situation.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY LOANS

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1974

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, when the Rural Development Act was passed, Congress stipulated that the Farmers Home Administration would ask the Labor Department for comments on all applications for business and industry loans.

This procedure has been followed, but the Secretary of Labor has taken it upon himself to have the AFL-CIO screen each application, and I feel this act is deplorable. While it might not be illegal, it certainly constitutes a breach of ethics.

In answering the charges, Mr. Brennan said that—

It is appropriate for us to call upon various organizations, including labor unions, who may have facts or information to offer with respect to possible adverse employment or competitive business impact.

All I can say is that if the Labor Department does not have the necessary manpower or expertise to evaluate these considerations, then the Department is sorely lacking in leadership, and I would suggest that the Secretary resign.

Furthermore, the contention that labor organizations would provide useful information on "competitive business impact" is highly questionable. If the Secretary has any concept of what the free enterprise system means, he should know there is no way in which business competition could be construed as "adverse" with regard to the American way of life.

I have not verified at this time that

five applications have been rejected based on AFL-CIO comments, but I intend to verify and suggest that the Labor Department and the Farmers Home Administration change its policy immediately by administrative action. If not, I can assure both that legislative action will be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by simply saying that this practice not only slaps the business community in the face but once again proves that Government agencies continue to act outside the statutory authority given to them by Congress. I, for one, am getting fed up with it.

CAMPAIGN REFORM IN THE STATES

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more and more evident that there is a need for campaign reform in this country. There are many different provisions to the proposed bills on this issue. Because of the need for this reform, I would like to insert the following article for the benefit of my colleagues.

[From the Wall Street Journal,
June 11, 1974]

CAMPAIGN CLEAN-UP IN THE STATES

(By Norman C. Miller)

WASHINGTON.—The Watergate-inspired reform effort to reduce the influence of money and secrecy in government is making significant progress in some strange quarters.

With little national notice, state legislatures, long known as breeding grounds of corruption, have passed a remarkable array of reform laws during the last 18 months. As many as 67 reform measures—dealing with campaign finance, ethical standards for officeholders and requirements for open meetings by governmental units—have been enacted by 40 legislatures, according to Common Cause, the self-styled citizens' lobby.

While the quality of the reforms obviously is uneven, the record of the legislatures is impressive as a whole. In the key area of campaign finance, for example, 25 states have enacted new laws requiring disclosure of, or limits on, campaign contributions, while also imposing some curbs on spending by candidates. Eight of these states have further authorized experiments with public financing of campaigns. Perhaps most importantly, many of the states have established independent commissions to enforce the reform laws; it was lack of effective police power that made a practical nullity of many earlier efforts to clear up political financing.

ACTION IN SEATTLE

The reform movement got a further lift last week when the nation's governors, at their annual conference in Seattle, called on "all levels of government" to enact comprehensive "clean government" measures. Among other things, the governors endorsed: broad campaign finance reforms, including experiments with public financing; ethical codes for public officials, including disclosure of their personal finances; open meetings of all public bodies; registration of lobbyists, coupled with "full disclosure" of their activities.

The governors passed their resolution just a day after voters in California overwhelmingly approved a proposition on the

primary ballot, putting into effect the toughest set of campaign and lobbying restrictions yet enacted. In addition to strict contribution, spending and disclosure rules for campaign financing, the new California law hits hard at traditionally powerful lobbying groups. The measure sharply limits direct spending for lobbying and requires disclosure of those outlays that are permitted. And its most controversial section flatly forbids registered lobbyists from making campaign contributions.

The upsurge of activity at the state level is in striking contrast to the inaction in Congress. There is no serious consideration there of reform of loophole-ridden lobbying regulations that now allow the most powerful interests, both business and labor-oriented, to escape detailed public scrutiny of their efforts to influence legislation. And while the Senate has passed bills to reform campaign financing on three separate occasions, key members of the House seem determined to stall the legislation to death if they can get away with it.

Campaign-finance legislation has been languishing in the House Administration Committee for fully 18 months. Chairman Wayne Hays, an Ohio Democrat who scorns reform, waited until last October to even begin public hearings. It took the committee another eight weeks to conduct just six hearings. Almost four more months passed before the panel started bill-drafting sessions in late March.

Only nine working sessions of about two hours each have been held since March. The last four sessions scheduled by the committee were abandoned for lack of a quorum. After all this time, the committee has "worked" its way through less than 10 pages of a 30-page draft bill. Now, with the impeachment crisis threatening to block all legislation that hasn't cleared committees within a month or six weeks, the campaign-finance legislation is in increasing danger of dying.

That would be no accident. The Senate-passed legislation contains a number of proposals that Rep. Hays and many other House members dislike intensely. One is a provision allowing public financing of congressional primary and general election campaigns; House members fear this would guarantee that they would face strong opponents, while also diminishing other advantages incumbents enjoy. Another is a plan for an independent commission to enforce campaign rules; House members like the existing cozy set-up that gives police power to employees of Congress—who are hardly of a mind to be tough on their bosses. And there is fierce resistance in the House to proposals for disclosure of members' personal finances.

While the House undoubtedly can stall campaign reforms to death if it wishes, the experience at the state level suggests that Congressmen may be underrating the public demand for thorough-going reform in the wake of the Watergate scandals. The reform proposition in California passed last week by better than 2 to 1; so did similar plans approved earlier by voters in Colorado and Washington state. Many of the legislatures that enacted reform bills did not do so because their members were extra-virtuous, but simply because they were prodded into action by Common Cause and similar public-interest lobbies.

Indeed, it was ironic that at the Seattle conference several governors grumbled about the very reform measures that do-good outfits like Common Cause have applauded the states for enacting. Republican Governor Jack Williams of Arizona complained that too many reforms were based on a "presumption of guilt instead of innocence" of politicians. Democrat William Waller of Mississippi denounced the resolution endorsing a reform package as a "demeaning and debilitating" idea.

But most of the governors have found it impolitic to resist the reform movement. Several of the most widely respected governors, like Democrats Reubin Askew of Florida and Patrick Lucey of Wisconsin and Republicans William Milliken of Michigan and Dan Evans of Washington, have identified themselves strongly with the reform movement and reaped political benefits as a consequence.

Many members of Congress, on the other hand, appear willing to take the risk that the public doesn't care much about legislation aimed at cleaning up the political process. That is a high-risk bet, especially since Common Cause and other public-interest groups are gearing up to focus attention on reform issues in the fall campaign. "In effect, we are going to become a campaign organization in September and October" and "take incumbents to task on the reform issues," says Thomas Belden, director of state activities for Common Cause.

GOVERNOR NOEL'S WARNING

It is probable that public pressure ultimately will persuade Congress to enact campaign-finance reforms and perhaps others as well. A deeper question is whether new laws will make much difference. Philip Noel, the Democratic governor of Rhode Island, properly warns that people shouldn't be "de-luded" that enactment of reform laws will "insure integrity in government."

Strict laws certainly won't do that, but there is reason to expect that they will establish a framework in which it will be harder for shady politics to flourish.

Thus, open meetings do not rule out dirty political deals, but they do make it tougher to bring them off. Campaign contribution limits, disclosure rules and candidate-spending curbs don't guarantee election of honest men, but they do tend to curb undue influence of moneyed groups. Changing to public financing of elections isn't a panacea either, but it would further diminish the power of money to corrupt politics. Strict regulation of lobbyists wouldn't prevent big interests from wielding a lot of clout, but it would tend to restrain questionable uses of power.

Fred Wertheimer, the legislative director of Common Cause, sums up the potential of the reform bills well: "This is not an attempt to legislate morality," he says. "It is an attempt to set ground rules for the way people conduct public affairs," and those ground rules alone can result in a "fundamental and profound difference" in political behavior.

DR. JAMES S. GORDON

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, my training and experience as a psychiatric social worker have indicated the critical importance of dedicated and innovative persons in that profession.

Over the past months I have become aware of the important work being conducted by Dr. James S. Gordon, a staff psychiatrist at the Mental Health Study Center of the National Institute of Mental Health in Adelphi, Md.

Dr. Gordon's consultations to runaway houses, hotlines and group foster homes in the Washington metropolitan area have been extremely valuable. He has been instrumental in supporting and documenting the effectiveness of a variety of nontraditional, grassroots so-

cial services for young people. His writings and his contribution to the National Institute of Mental Health effort on behalf of runaway youth has been of great help not only to those persons throughout the country who are trying to work with troubled and searching young people in noninstitutional settings, but also to the Congress as we draft potential legislation in this important area.

If we are to deal effectively with these problems, it will be because of the work of dedicated persons such as Dr. Gordon, and I commend him for his valuable contributions.

A HOUSE COMMITTEE ON URBAN AFFAIRS MAKES SENSE TO LOCAL OFFICIALS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, as the time nears for the Hansen committee to report its recommendations for further consideration of committee restructuring in the House, a gratifying number of local officials from around the country have endorsed my proposal to establish a permanent Committee on Urban Affairs. Mayors from Honolulu to Providence, from Miami to Denver and St. Paul have registered their support for such a committee, illustrating the commonality of urban problems and needs regardless of the section of the country.

The House has not enacted significant internal reforms since 1946. We cannot wait another 28 years to revise our jurisdictional treatment of national concerns which are the result and culmination of the changing living and working habits of the American people. More than 70 percent of the population are now considered urban dwellers, yet there is no permanent legislative committee in the House to deal with the regional problems of urban areas including their closely related suburban jurisdictions. The urbanization of the United States is accelerating, and the changing needs of a changing society are simply not being addressed by the Congress.

I include in the RECORD some of the latest letters I have received in favor of a new orientation of the House so that its work more closely approximates the new shape of our society:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,

New Haven, Conn., June 6, 1974.

HON. HERMAN BADILLO,
Member of Congress,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BADILLO: Thank you for your letter of May 23, 1974. I want you to know that your amendment to the Bolling Committee reform bill has my full support. As the Mayor of an urban center I would welcome the existence of a committee established to address problems that are unique to large cities.

An urban affairs Committee would be an excellent forum for the discussion of problems and the development of activities and programs that would move toward their solution.

Sincerely,

BARTHOLOMEW F. GUIDA.

CITY OF MADISON, WIS.,

June 5, 1974.

HON. HERMAN BADILLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BADILLO: I'm in receipt of your letter of May 29th and find your proposal to create a House Urban Affairs Committee to be quite useful. I don't think it is necessary for me to critique the failures of the administration dealing with urban problems. As the Mayor of a mid-sized city, I would like to point out that we are not beset as critically with urban decay as is New York, Detroit, or Los Angeles. We, too, need a strong voice and greater responsiveness in Washington.

Because urban affairs has traditionally been left to the administration of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Congress has not been able to effectively deal with the problem. I do believe that a strong committed House effort would be of particular benefit so that the nation's cities might take an effective and aggressive role rather than simply being on the defensive.

Sincerely,

PAUL R. SOGLIN,
Mayor.

CITY OF PROVIDENCE

EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,

Providence, R.I., June 3, 1974.

HON. HERMAN BADILLO,
House of Representatives Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BADILLO: I wish to express my full support of your efforts to establish a standing Committee on Urban Affairs in the House of Representatives.

As mayor of an old but proud city I am well aware of the need for such a committee to re-order priorities and to make the necessary funding and legislation available to cities to meet the challenges of renewal and rehabilitation.

I encourage you to continue in your efforts to establish this very worthwhile and needed committee.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, JR.,
Mayor of Providence.

CITY HALL,

Jersey City, N.J., May 29, 1974.

HON. HERMAN BADILLO,
U.S. Congress, House Office Building, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BADILLO: I have read your House floor speech proposing the establishment of a standing Committee on Urban Affairs in the U.S. House of Representatives.

I fully agree with your proposal as an important measure in helping to focus national attention upon the grave problems of urban areas and as a mechanism for comprehensive consideration of matters of importance to cities.

The present fragmented approach has proven to be ineffective in solving the urban crisis as you have well noted in your floor remarks.

I am requesting Congressman Daniels to support your efforts in behalf of this crucial matter and I remain most willing to further support this proposal in whatever way might be appropriate.

Very truly yours,

PAUL T. JORDAN, M.D.,
Mayor.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,

Cedar Rapids, Iowa, June 3, 1974.

HON. HERMAN BADILLO,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BADILLO: I wanted to take this opportunity to respond to your May 29, 1974 letter, concerning your proposal to establish a standing committee on Urban Affairs in the U.S. House of Representatives.

I wholeheartedly support the concept you proposed, although I would withhold final comment until I have actually reviewed the legislation itself. I strongly support the concept of consolidating those programs which have such a dramatic impact on the existence of America's urban centers.

I believe it vitally important that the members of the House have an opportunity to at least vote on the Bolling Committee reform proposal. Probably the greatest obstacle to implementing needed legislative proposals is the antiquated committee system as it now exists in both houses of Congress.

I can assure you that I will follow your proposal very closely.

If I can be of further assistance, please contact me.

Sincerely,

DONALD J. CANNEY,
Mayor.

ENERGY RESOURCES—AND THE PUBLIC

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, on June 3, 1974, at the 42d annual convention of the Edison Electric Institute in New York, Mr. Rawleigh Warner, Jr., the chairman of the board of Mobil Oil Corp. addressed the delegation on "Energy Resources—And The Public."

Mr. Warner's remarks show some of the complicated problems relative to supplying adequate energy to the American public.

In his statement, Mr. Warner points out the difficulties which have been encountered by his company in trying to make more information about the energy supply situation available to the public.

I am sure his remarks will be of interest to Members of Congress and the general public. I commend them to you.

The remarks follow:

ENERGY RESOURCES—AND THE PUBLIC
(Remarks by Rawleigh Warner, Jr.)

It is particularly flattering to be asked to speak to you about Mobil's efforts to communicate with the public, since most of us in the oil industry feel that if we had done a better communications job over the years, we would enjoy greater public understanding and esteem than we do today.

It became clear to us in Mobil three or four years ago, just as I am sure it must have become clear to the management of companies such as yours, that our country was heading for a severe energy crunch.

Here was the greatest industrial power in the world, with its entire economy built on an abundance of low-cost energy, about to enter an era of unnecessarily heavy reliance on other countries—mainly because, for one reason or another, industry was not being allowed to develop our very strong domestic energy resource base adequately.

There seemed to be very little understanding of this situation or of the economics of business in the press, in the Congress, or among the general public. We in Mobil felt there was an urgent need to try to inform people.

That, in brief, was the setting in which we initiated our communications program. What are we doing in it, what results have we had, and what problems have we encountered?

To some extent, we do pretty much the same sort of nuts-and-bolts things many large companies do. Probably our most ef-

fective tool, however—and, I suppose, the one that sets us apart—is our use of paid advertising in newspapers. We have found it ineffective to rely on letters to the editor to rebut even the most misinformed reporting. Retractions by the press are rare, and seldom catch up with the original charge. News releases are of limited usefulness.

We elected initially to rely mainly on newspaper advertising because we felt we had to address ourselves primarily to opinion leaders as the group best able to grasp complex issues.

We publish a quarter page advertisement virtually every Thursday, year-round, on the page opposite the editorial page of *The New York Times*—called, as you might deduce, the op-ed page. This is the only space the *Times* will sell on those two facing pages. It therefore has pretty high visibility, which we try to enhance with an off-beat approach. The space gives us enough room for essay-type ads similar in tone to other material appearing on those two pages.

We try to surprise readers of the *Times* with our selection of subject matter, our headlines, and our brisk and often irreverent text. We try to be urbane but not pompous. We try not to talk to ourselves and we accept that we can never tell the whole story in any one ad.

Our ads have ranged over a wide gamut—the energy crisis in its many ramifications, the role of profits, earnings as expressed in rate of return, capital requirements and capital formation, the need for national energy policies . . . why we support the New York Public Library, public television, the United Negro College Fund, the Better Business Bureau . . . the need for economic growth . . . the dangers of simplistic knee-jerk reactions . . . the need to conserve energy, and ways to use less gasoline. The list is a long one.

We try to help people understand what options are open to them and what sort of costs are involved in the various trade-offs. The response has been strong and generally favorable, though in addressing ourselves to opinion leaders, we deliberately opted for a rather thin cut of the total public. We believe we have had some impact and that we have been reaching people other than just those already wedded to the free market, but we realize we have not yet done enough to reach the public at large. In sum, we think the exercise has been useful, albeit somewhat expensive *in toto*, and sufficiently productive to continue.

One reason we think our advertisements, along with those of other oil companies, may be having some effect is that several Congressmen and Senators have recently tried to inhibit us. We believe *The Wall Street Journal* was close to the target when it said, "Indeed, the reason their critics are rushing to have them gagged is that the oil companies have been making legitimate arguments worthy of being heard."

We have recently been publishing these institutional ads regularly in 15 to 20 papers, in addition to the *Times*, and are this week enlarging the program to around 100 papers. We'll be glad to send a representative sampling of our ads to any of you if you'll drop us a line.

We have our differences of opinion with various of the newspapers in which we are buying space. But what we are trying to do in the mass media is to broaden the spectrum of information and viewpoints available to the American people, to help them reach the conclusions necessary to sound public policy in a democratic society. We believe the continued viability of our open society depends heavily on robust debate and controversy in the marketplace of ideas. We are in no sense eager to stifle those who oppose us. On the contrary. We just want to be heard, too.

That brings me to the biggest roadblock

we have encountered—the refusal of national television networks to sell us time in which to state our viewpoints on matters of great public import.

When the energy crisis hit full-blown last October, there were very few reporters in any media anywhere in the country, outside of oil-producing areas and the oil trade press, who knew much about oil. This was particularly true of commercial television, and seems still to be true. As a result, we have a very difficult communications problem, and we recognize that. The energy crisis is complex, both in its origins and in its manifestations. The TV networks, by their very nature, seldom seem able to do justice to such a complex issue.

There appear to be at least five major elements that account for the structural deficiency of network television news programs.

The first is time limitations. A 30-minute news program, such as the Cronkite show, shrinks after commercials to around 23 to 24 minutes. An essay by a Seavard or a Brinkley will consume about three minutes, leaving only 20 to 21 minutes for news. During this tightly limited time the show will often try to cover as many as 15 or more items, which would average out to a little over a minute for each item. But the biggest stories may consume close to two minutes each. So you end up with a good many stories being handled in well under a minute each.

Also, if the newsrooms are to have time to develop and edit film and to add the requisite dramatic elements, topical stories for the evening news show usually have to be filmed in the morning or at the latest in the very early afternoon. Otherwise, they may get short shrift.

Second, there are the economic limitations. Camera crews and transmission by satellite, for instance, are expensive. The cost to a network of keeping camera crews in many different locations could be prohibitive. Even when willing to spend the money, a network cannot always fly a crew to the scene of a news development in time to obtain the film that is TV's lifeblood. Also, most national TV news personalities earn far more than newspaper reporters.

The third limitation has to do with the networks' tendency to personalize the news. By this I mean their ever-present need for the highest ratings. We have the Cronkites, the Chancellors, the Reasoners, the Howard K. Smiths. As these people fight for the highest ratings, they sometimes tend more toward showmanship than toward balanced presentation of the news. As a former executive director of the ABC Evening News put it, the evening news is not the highest form of journalism. It is partly an illustrated headline service and partly a magazine. And, yes, it is part show business, using visual enticement and a star system to attract viewers.

The fourth of the elements that tend to emasculate network news is personnel limitations. There seems to be little room for specialists. Indeed, the only ones I can think of are the sports announcers and the weather forecasters. Understandably, most of the rest of TV's news correspondents are generalists, competent to cover hard-news stories and features of several kinds, but limited in the spheres of economics, finance, and technology.

Finally, the fifth element of weakness: TV is by its very nature an entertainment medium, and a highly visual one at that. The problem was summed up this way by a former president of NBC News: "Every news story should, without any sacrifice of probity of responsibility, display the attributes of fiction, of drama. It should have structure and conflict, problem and denouement, rising action and falling action, a beginning, a middle, and an end."

While we are not accusing the networks of bias in their reporting, we nevertheless feel that their structural deficiencies have

combined to make much of their coverage of oil news inaccurate and misleading.

By way of characterizing our problem, it seems to us almost as simple as having to try to talk about elementary economics to people who are essentially illiterate in that field. As you can appreciate since you, too, are in a capital-intensive industry, we try to relate our earnings to our invested capital. This is one of the few ways we can satisfy ourselves that our rate of return is adequate to attract or amass additional capital to continue to do what is expected of us.

But this is a very difficult concept to get across to the consuming public, which sees only two things: the price of the product, which has risen dramatically; and the size of our earnings, which in absolute terms are large. All too few people in public office or in the media are adequately equipped or motivated to help understand that it is primarily the oil-exporting countries that have increased the price and that, in Mobil's case, our 1973 earnings of almost \$850 million have to be viewed in light of the more than \$10.5 billion of assets required to generate those earnings.

We therefore start out with an almost insurmountable problem, which is bad enough in and of itself. But when we then have to cope with television reporters and commentators who usually know next to nothing about the business and seldom seem to have the time or the desire to learn, and when we have to try to impart some understanding in the very limited time allotted—that really is impossible.

Let me illustrate this for you with a personal experience. About a year and a half ago, when I was chairman of the American Petroleum Institute, two other oilmen and I went up to CBS, at its request, and had lunch with Walter Cronkite. Mr. Cronkite told us that CBS was planning to broadcast a series designed to give the viewing public some insight into the energy crisis that was shaping up, and he assured us of CBS's determination to be fair.

We therefore agreed to cooperate. I personally spent more than three hours with CBS reporters and camera crews trying to answer their questions and to impart information on the energy situation in our country. The fellow in charge of those interviews assured me CBS was going to do the "most thorough study they'd ever done on any subject for the Cronkite show," and I think those are very close to his exact words. The problem was that the reporter was simply rounding up the raw material. That raw material was cut and edited by a group of people we never saw; who, as far as we could tell, had not been exposed to any first-hand discussion of what was involved; and to whom, I can only surmise, fairness did not seem an overriding preoccupation.

Our reaction to what CBS finally broadcast, in January and February of 1973, was one of utter dismay. What we saw and heard struck us as being one-sided and unfair to the industry. For all my own pains, I believe I got about a minute and a half on the air and was identified as "chairman of the industry lobby," which by implication would make me the chief lobbyist for the oil industry. The basic points I had tried to make died on the cutting-room floor.

I would be less than honest and less than fair myself, however, if I failed to point out that NBC has done special energy broadcasts that were quite well-balanced. The producers of those programs kept their promise to us—that we would have our day in court, along with those holding opposite views. We got a fair shake.

Incidentally, those NBC producers showed their understanding of the complexity of this subject by allotting three consecutive hours of prime time to it last fall in the first of their special broadcasts on energy.

When they followed that up last March, they devoted an hour of prime time to the subject on each of two evenings a week apart.

Mobil has sought to buy air time for commercials that would convey our point of view—commercials that would deal in ideas rather than in products. But networks have refused to sell us time for many of the commercials we have submitted. Their position was pretty well summed up in a letter of February 27, 1973, from the law department of the Columbia Broadcasting System to a vice president of Mobil, from which I quote: "... it is the general policy of CBS to sell time only for the promotion of goods and services, not for the presentation of points of view on controversial issues of public importance. CBS has adopted this policy because it believes that the public will best be served if important public issues are presented in formats determined by broadcast journalists."

In simple terms, that means that what the people of this country are to see and hear on commercial television is to be decided largely by two or three people at each of two or three TV networks—an extraordinary concentration of decision-making.

Interestingly enough, that letter from CBS was written right around the time the Cronkite evening news show presented—in a format determined solely by broadcast journalists—that one-sided material I mentioned earlier.

It occurred to us that the networks might be afraid they would have to give free time to opponents of our points of view. We therefore offered to pay twice the going rate to have our commercials telecast, which would have covered the cost of any free time given to someone holding different views to reply to us—Ralph Nader, the Sierra Club, or anyone else selected by the network. We felt this underscored our basic posture: that we are not trying to alter what the TV networks broadcast as news. We just want to offer a broader spectrum of information and viewpoints to the American people and are perfectly willing to take our chances in the marketplace of ideas. If our ideas are no good, the public most assuredly will shoot them down, and deservedly.

"According to the U.S. Geological Survey, there may be more oil beneath our continental shelf than this country has consumed in its entire history."

"Some people say we should be drilling for that oil and gas. Others say we shouldn't because of the possible environmental risks. We'd like to know what you think."

"Write Mobil Oil, Room 647, 150 East 42nd Street, New York 10017."

"We'd like to hear from you."

NBC accepted this commercial.

ABC rejected it, saying it had reviewed the commercial and was "unable to grant an approval for use over our facilities."

CBS also rejected it, saying, "We regret that this message addresses a controversial issue of public importance and as such cannot be considered under our corporate policies."

I have these comments to make on that. First, this country was founded in controversy—hard, openly expressed controversy—and it has remained free and democratic through the continuing clash of opinion and of value patterns.

Second, if the networks dedicate themselves almost exclusively to merchandising products, via the entertainment route, they may raise serious questions as to whether what they merchandise as news is actually just entertainment.

Third, today's energy crisis is controversial largely because the media have helped make it controversial by printing and broadcasting material so inaccurate that anyone with any knowledge of our industry would have to disagree with it.

When a powerful and pervasive medium

as television will not sell time for controversial issues, it seems to me our country has reached a rather critical juncture. How can a democracy operate effectively without broad public access to clashing points of view?

It is worth recalling what the U.S. Supreme Court said in 1969, in what is known as the *Red Lion* case: "It is the right of viewers and listeners, not the right of the broadcasters, which is paramount. It is the purpose of the First Amendment to preserve an uninhibited marketplace of ideas in which truth will ultimately prevail, rather than to countenance the monopolization of that market, whether it be by the Government itself or by a private licensee. It is the right of the public to receive suitable access to social, political, esthetic, moral, and other ideas and experiences which is crucial here."

The real issue seems to be whether the commercial networks should have total control over what is broadcast to the American people. Since network broadcasting is among the most concentrated of U.S. profit-making industries, it would appear that our country may be facing a danger of monopoly censorship.

I hope you realize how reluctant we in Mobil are to adopt any posture that would appear to place us in an adversary position. We would much rather just live and let live. But we have concluded that we have no alternative to standing up for what we believe to be right. It is a dreadful set of circumstances at which we have arrived. What we're battling for is something at least approaching fair treatment in a medium that seems to be the main source of news for the vast majority of the public, yet one that seemingly has decided that in order to be successful, it must concentrate more heavily on showmanship than on presenting news in any depth.

It might interest you to know that in our industry no one company has as much as 8.5% of the U.S. gasoline market, as much as 9% of the domestic refining capacity, or as much as 10% of U.S. crude oil production. The three largest oil companies in each of the following categories together have less than 22.5% of the gasoline market in our country, less than a quarter of the refining capacity, and only a quarter of the crude oil production.

In national commercial television, three major networks dominate the scene. They particularly dominate the scene with respect to national and international news, since the news programs prepared by the local stations tend to present mostly local news. The three commercial networks combined have an audience estimated at more than 50 million people for the evening news programs broadcast at 7:00 p.m. Eastern Time. It is my understanding that no newspaper in this country has a circulation larger than about 2 million daily and 3 million on Sunday.

Among the newspapers there are some such as *The New York Times*, which not only dominates certain parts of its market—including, I believe, the New York market for help-wanted ads—but is also vertically integrated to the extent of owning substantial equity interests in three Canadian companies that make newsprint.

The *Times* is quite critical of oil company earnings. It called Occidental Petroleum's 718% increase in the first quarter of this year "a mirror image of what consumers are paying." Well, I doubt that anyone in this country is paying seven times as much for gasoline now as a year ago, but the *Times* neglected to mention that Occidental does not market in the United States. Nor did the *Times* tell its readers that Occidental's earnings in the first quarter of 1973—the benchmark period in this comparison—had dropped to a meager 6 cents a share, down more than 80% from eleven years earlier.

The *Washington Post* said recently that

the government had an "urgent" duty to correct what that paper called the "vast enrichment" of the oil companies. This offers the opportunity for an instructive comparison. The net earnings of Texaco, one of the more profitable oil companies, increased 57% between 1970 and 1973. During this same period, the net income of the Washington Post Company increased about 160%.

True, 1970 was a bad year for the Washington Post Company but, taking the media as our models, we would have to conclude that benchmark years are not very relevant in such comparisons, because few of the media seem to have mentioned how bad 1972 and the first quarter of 1973 were for a lot of oil companies.

Last year Mobil's worldwide earnings were up 48% over 1972. Those of the New York Times Company were up 58%; of the Washington Post Company, 37%. The networks also apparently had a good year in 1973. According to a news release from the Federal Communications Commission, the pre-tax profits of the three television networks combined—excluding earnings of the stations they own—were up 66.7% over 1972. The FCC doesn't seem to report profits after taxes, and the networks don't seem to report them very widely on either basis.

It seems to me we might witness a most interesting development if reporters and editors in electronic and print media were suddenly to develop an interest in the business side of their businesses and start poring over the income statements and balance sheets of their employers and their competitors. Once they learned how to pick their way through the figures to which few of them seem ever to have paid much attention . . . once they learned how to calculate rate of return, and grasped its importance as an index of profitability . . . and once they developed enough skepticism and reportorial curiosity to do some research on their own employers' price increases . . . once some of this transpired, they might well feel they had discovered a new and different world.

The more perceptive and open-minded among them would probably be shocked to discover that in some instances their own employer—whether a newspaper holding company or a network or whatever—was more profitable than many of the industries it was criticizing daily. With respect to concentration, they might learn that the overwhelming majority of the approximately 1,500 cities in which daily newspapers are published can be considered newspaper monopoly areas and that, as I mentioned earlier, national commercial network television is possibly the most concentrated U.S. industry. They might, in fact, in the process of overcoming deep-rooted preconceptions, develop additional insights and learn things that would make them better informed and more competent.

I hope nothing I have said here will be construed as ignorance or insensitivity on my part toward the contributions a free press has made throughout our country's history. Quite the contrary. We could not have remained a free people without it. Freedom of the press is clearly an essential ingredient of a democratic society—essential not only to the press itself, but to all of us. I submit, however, that it is inseparably linked to freedom of speech, and that both are in turn linked to a free economy.

Unlike some politicians, I am urging not less but more free speech, and for everyone—including most importantly those whose views some of us may find totally abhorrent. I would hope that those who write and speak the most about freedom of the press will come to comprehend that if they help to destroy our free economy, no matter how unwittingly, it could be only a matter of time before they lost their own freedom. I do not know which of our freedoms might be the

first to go, but I do know that once we lose any one of them—whether free speech, free press, or our free economy—the others are apt soon to follow.

THE POLITICAL ROLE OF THE MEDIA

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include for the perusal of the Members of this fearless forum an editorial by one of the greatest and most respected writers in our country. I submit that we should be thankful that men of great stature such as Joseph Alsop, Marquis Childs, and Crosby Noyes can visualize the forest rather than focusing primarily upon one tree. I think we should be thankful that they see the great accomplishments of the greatest Secretary of State in the history of our country.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 14, 1974]

THE POLITICAL ROLE OF THE MEDIA

(By Joseph Alsop)

It is a time to stop being mealy-mouthed. If the U.S. government loses the invaluable services of Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger, the enormous, Watergate-induced self importance of the American press will be to blame.

If the U.S. dollar—your dollar and my dollar—loses a lot of its value on the world markets; and if American foreign policy also joins American economic policy on the dungheap of disorder, you can thank your friendly media.

The plain fact of the matter is that we now have in Washington, not just a double standard but a triple standard. You have to begin right there to understand the resulting orgies of hypocrisy. And the first part of this triple standard for public judgment of public men concerns the political role of the press, or media.

It is the smarriest kind of hypocrisy to pretend that the press was not directly responsible for Dr. Kissinger's decision to resign his office unless his name could be promptly and decisively cleared.

On last Thursday, he had just returned from one of the greatest and most totally exhausting diplomatic feats in rather more than a century. The secretary was being very modest if he merely thought he had "deserved well of the Republic"—in the phrase of old Rome.

His reception was a savage and disgusting press conference, during which he was treated like a common criminal. At one point, one of his interrogators even suggested that he might well be indicted for perjury, and bellowingly inquired whether he had already retained counsel to represent him in case of a perjury indictment. To be sure, only a minority thus disgraced the formerly honorable reporter's trade.

Yet in the subsequent commentaries, the members of this minority were never rebuked by their colleagues. Instead, Dr. Kissinger was rebuked. The climax came on the evening of Monday, when *The New York Times* hit the streets with an editorial accusing Dr. Kissinger of "dissembling" in tones majestically combining self-righteousness and pecksniffery. Telegraphed to Salzburg, the editorial promptly triggered Dr. Kis-

singer's press conference and resignation statement on Tuesday.

Those are the plain facts. What has happened cannot be comprehended without those facts. Yet this reporter has seen no account of Dr. Kissinger's threat to resign that has set forth the facts either fully or forthrightly. Over all, it seems a mite odd for the major political role of the press to be left out of the accounting, when we have taken to holding our public men so strictly accountable.

This is the first part of the prevailing triple standard in Washington. As to the other part that justifies the word, "triple," it is simple enough. Dr. Kissinger has in fact been accused of "dissembling," and has even heard the word "perjury" hurled at him, because of a crucial national security matter involving less than a score of wiretaps. Under the law, such wiretaps are entirely permissible for national security purposes.

One wonders, then, why it was so shocking for a servant of the Nixon administration to worry about national security to the extent of knowingly approving under a score of wiretaps. After all, national security wiretaps were very much more numerous in the Truman administration, and they were vastly more numerous in the administration of President Kennedy.

This reporter, with a known three wiretaps to his credit, all pre-Nixon, has long held the doctrine that if you have not been tapped, you have been slacking on your job. As to the Johnson administration, President Johnson sensibly did not trust the late J. Edgar Hoover—so he had the Secret Service do the tapping for him, again on a major scale. In short, the servants of the Nixon administration are plainly being judged, by different tests than those that prevailed in happier times.

So we come back to the Watergate-induced self-importance of the American press that was noted at the outset, noting this is not meant to detract for one moment from the great achievement of exposing the crimes and squalors that now go by the name of Watergate.

Yet it seems this success has now led to a new and dangerous situation. Some people have now openly begun to follow the rule: "I'll be judge, I'll be jury," said Cunniff Old Fury; "I'll try the whole cause, and condemn you to death."

Meanwhile Sen. J. William Fulbright, who has seen more than mere leaked bits of the total date, is reportedly confident that Dr. Kissinger did not dissemble when he appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee. Furthermore, even with Cunniff Old Fury, one supposes that some vague notions of national interest usually prevailed.

JOSEPH ALSOP AND DALLAS MORNING NEWS DEFEND DR. HENRY KISSINGER, CONDEMN CRITICS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a column written by Joseph Alsop, dated June 14, 1974, and also an editorial entitled "Stupidity or Malice?" which appeared in the Dallas Morning News on June 13. The two insertions follow:

THE POLITICAL ROLE OF THE MEDIA

(By Joseph Alsop)

It is a time to stop being mealy-mouthed. If the U.S. government loses the invaluable services of Secretary of State Henry Kissin-

ger, the enormous, Watergate-induced self importance of the American press will be to blame.

If the U.S. dollar—your dollar and my dollar—loses a lot of its value on the world markets; and if American foreign policy also joins American economic policy on the dung-heap of disorder, you can thank your friendly media.

The plain fact of the matter is that we now have in Washington, not just a double standard, but a triple standard. You have to begin right there to understand the resulting orgies of hypocrisy. And the first part of this triple standard for public judgment of public men concerns the political role of the press, or media.

It is the smartest kind of hypocrisy to pretend that the press was not directly responsible for Dr. Kissinger's decision to resign his office unless his name could be promptly and decisively cleared.

On last Thursday, he had just returned from one of the greatest and most totally exhausting diplomatic feats in rather more than a century. The secretary was being very modest if he merely thought he had "deserved well of the Republic"—in the phrase of old Rome.

His reception was a savage and disgusting press conference, during which he was treated like a common criminal. At one point, one of his interrogators even suggested that he might well be indicted for perjury, and belittlingly inquired whether he had already retained counsel to represent him in case of a perjury indictment. To be sure, only a minority thus disgraced the formerly honorable reporter's trade.

Yet in the subsequent commentaries, the members of this minority were never rebuked by the colleagues. Instead, Dr. Kissinger was rebuked. The climax came on the evening of Monday, when *The New York Times* hit the streets with an editorial accusing Dr. Kissinger of "dissembling" in tones majestically combining self-righteousness and pecksniffery. Telegraphed to Salzburg, the editorial promptly triggered Dr. Kissinger's press conference and resignation statement on Tuesday.

Those are the plain facts. What has happened cannot be comprehended without those facts. Yet this reporter has seen no account of Dr. Kissinger's threat to resign that has set forth the facts either fully or forthrightly. Over all, it seems a mite odd for the major political role of the press to be left out of the accounting, when we have taken to holding our public men so strictly accountable.

This is the first part of the prevailing triple standard in Washington. As to the other part that justifies the word, "triple," it is simple enough. Dr. Kissinger has in fact been accused of "dissembling," and has even heard the word "perjury" hurled at him, because of a crucial national security matter involving less than a score of wiretaps. Under the law, such wiretaps are entirely permissible for national security purposes.

One wonders, then, why it was so shocking for a servant of the Nixon administration to worry about national security to the extent of knowingly approving under a score of wiretaps. After all, national security wiretaps were very much more numerous in the Truman administration, and they were vastly more numerous in the administration of President Kennedy.

This reporter, with a known three wiretaps to his credit, all pre-Nixon, has long held the doctrine that if you have not been tapped, you have been slacking on your job. As to the Johnson administration, President Johnson sensibly did not trust the late J. Edgar Hoover—so he had the Secret Service do the tapping for him, again on a major scale. In short, the servants of the Nixon administration are plainly being judged by different

tests than those that prevailed in happier times.

So we come back to the Watergate-induced self-importance of the American press that was noted at the outset, noting this is not meant to detract for one moment from the great achievement of exposing the crimes and squalors that now go by the name of Watergate.

Yet it seems this success has now led to a new and dangerous situation. Some people have now openly begun to follow the rule: "I'll be judge, I'll be jury," said Cunning Old Fury; "I'll try the whole cause, and condemn you to death."

Meanwhile, Sen. J. William Fulbright, who has seen more than mere leaked bits of the total data, is reportedly confident that Dr. Kissinger did not dissemble when he appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee. Furthermore, even with Cunning Old Fury, one supposes that some vague notions of national interest usually prevailed.

STUPIDITY OR MALICE?

In its attack on Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, the impeachment crowd has stormed into more than just Nixon's last preserve of credibility—foreign policy. The irresponsibles in rumor-ridden Washington are fooling with the peace of the world.

They couldn't have chosen a worse time to declare that Kissinger ordered security wiretaps on White House personnel and newsmen three years ago. Only a triumph of stupidity or malice could burst a bomb like that over a delicate peace mission.

Rep. Joshua Ellberg's declaration that the House Judiciary Committee has "positive proof" that the wiretap orders came from Kissinger must, given the circumstances, qualify as one of the most irresponsible incursions of politics into foreign policy in our history. He simply couldn't wait to add his say to the "leaks and innuendos" that Kissinger denounced from Austria in his passionate threat to quit.

The question isn't whether Kissinger did wiretap. He has flatly denied doing so twice—and until the facts are established he has a right to his honor and credibility. But whatever the truth of the wiretap allegations (and even proof that Kissinger did order them is not necessarily culpable) is the Mid-East mission so trifling that a trial of the truth can't wait?

Whether stupidity or malice spurs the effort to drag Kissinger—at this time—into the malarial mist of rumor and allegation that is Watergate Washington, Congress must know that it is pushing the probe game into an area where it has no business: Foreign policy, American security, the peace of the world.

Are the impeachment-minded so blind to the world beyond the Potomac that they can sabotage a world peace offensive as casually as they have destroyed Nixon's effectiveness at home? Or is the drive to get Nixon so consuming that everything else comes second—even great achievements with old enemies and adversaries who have made our lives less secure in the past?

The irresponsibles cheapened Nixon's and Kissinger's accomplishments as much as they could before the mission began—questioned even Nixon's right to go and secure the peace while under threat of impeachment at home. Now they have pursued him and Kissinger abroad.

Not on the basis of established fact, but on the same basis on which so much of the impeachment movement has so far proceeded: Rumor and repetition overrunning each other to establish new rumor and repetition while truth trails far behind.

That is the nature of the beast—little responsibility, less concern. The Potomac cloud will follow the presidential party and do as much harm as malice and stupidity can do to wreck a great venture in world diplo-

macy—one which any other president and secretary of state of another party or time would have been honored to the skies for even attempting.

A FOREIGN AID SHOWDOWN

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives is gearing up for a showdown with the Senate and the administration over a foreign aid program.

At stake is a program already shot down once by the House but revived in the Senate: a request for a contribution of an additional—\$1.5 billion—for the International Development Association—IDA—an arm of the World Bank.

The House originally rejected the request in January, 248 to 155, and the vote was interpreted as a sign that Congress, at long last, was getting the message that Americans were tired of scattering billions of tax dollars over the face of the earth. Since the end of World War II, the taxpayers have shelled out more than \$260 billion in foreign aid and a poll I conducted in the 20th District revealed that more than 95 percent of the people I contacted wanted to see foreign aid eliminated or, at least, drastically reduced.

IDA's request for more money was revived by the Senate and, with the backing of the administration, it was passed in late May, 55 to 27, setting the stage for the rematch in the House.

Supporters of the program still argue America owes it to the world to be the leader of all things, including the development of other nations. They claim our country's honor is at stake and that Americans cannot walk away from their obligations and responsibilities.

I do not agree with them. I believe the United States has more than met any responsibility it has in this area. It has carried the load for more than 30 years. But time and the world has changed. The burden must be lifted from the backs of Americans.

Our Government today has many problems it did not have three decades ago, not the least of which is a massive Federal debt approaching the half-trillion dollar mark. If that figure staggers you, try this one. The interest alone on the national debt is rising at the rate of \$980 per second, \$59,000 per minute.

If Congress grants IDA's request for another \$1.5 billion, the money will have to be borrowed—at 9 percent interest. It is given to the World Bank, which in turn, lends it to other nations at 1 percent interest. The loans do not have to be repaid for 40 or 50 years and no one seriously expects they will ever be repaid. Ultimately, they will be written off and forgotten.

I oppose the IDA loan as I have opposed every foreign aid bill since entering Congress. No longer can I accept the

theory that America must constantly prove its generosity or concern for other nations and other people. America has proved it. Time and time again, the United States has met the challenge with men as well as money. The courage and generosity of our Nation and other people is well-documented. No government, no individual can question it.

I just do not believe our Government today, wrestling with the worst inflation in its history, should borrow an additional \$1.5 billion at 9 percent interest at the expense of the hardworking, hard-pressed taxpayer and give it away. I must reject this proposal, particularly since there already is—\$10 billion—earmarked for foreign aid in the Federal budget for fiscal 1975, which starts July 1.

That is in addition to an estimated \$26 billion still in the foreign aid pipeline from previous years; money that was appropriated but not yet spent.

And, do not think for 1 minute that by denying IDA's request Congress will be dooming foreign aid. IDA is just one of many programs in the package. In fiscal 1974, there were 28 different foreign aid programs funded by American taxpayers. Here are just a few of them and what was appropriated:

Foreign Assistance Act, \$2.4 billion.
Overseas Private Investment Corporation, \$72.5 million.

Foreign military credit sales, \$525 million.

Inter-American Development Bank, \$693 million.

Asian Development Bank, \$106 million proposed and another \$24 million to maintain the value of prior contributions effected by the devaluations of the American dollar.

IDA, the same bank asking for another \$1.5 billion, \$161 million to offset the dollar devaluations.

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, \$774 million for maintenance of value.

International Monetary Fund, \$756 million for the same purpose.

Military assistance—defense budget—\$1.9 billion.

Export-Import Bank, \$3.8 million in long-term credits; \$2.2 million for regular operations and \$1.6 billion for short-term credits.

Peace Corps, \$77 million.

In all, the 28 programs totaled \$18 billion, not including IDA's latest request, according to information supplied by a Subcommittee on Appropriations for Foreign Operations.

I am concerned the real impact of IDA's request for another \$1.5 billion may be lost in lofty rhetoric about America's duties, responsibilities, honor, et cetera. Congress must not lose sight of the stark fact our people are hurting, our Government deeply in debt.

Inflation today is ripping apart the paycheck of every wage earner, every pensioner and the family budget of every housewife. It is constantly being fueled by the Federal Government's continued accumulation of massive budget deficits.

How then can the borrowing of additional billions of dollars at 9 percent interest to give away at 1 percent with little or no hope of repayment be justified?

Everybody says: "Cut Federal spending." "I say, here is a time and a place to start."

IS IT A BIRTHDAY OR A FUNERAL?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, along with other Members who were present, I was deeply inspired by the Flag Day ceremony in the House Chambers last Thursday, June 13. We were all especially pleased to welcome the guest of honor, Henry "Hank" Aaron. This was certainly one of the most impressive ceremonies that has become such a great institution of the House of Representatives.

Coincidentally, many publications across the country were turning their editorial attention to the subject of Flag Day. A very penetrating editorial in the West Cook County Press in Illinois devoted itself to this subject last week:

IS IT A BIRTHDAY OR A FUNERAL?

Flag Day, 1974, is the 197th birthday of the American flag.

June 14 used to be quite a day. It was almost as important as the Fourth of July in its patriotic appeal; parades, speeches and ceremonies abounded.

June 14, 1974, as far as we can determine, will be another Friday and nothing else. To the best of our knowledge, there isn't a single commemoration planned in any of our towns.

Why is this? Why has it become so unfashionable to be proud of our country and its symbol, the flag. Patriotism has almost become un-American. Is the spirit of America, like God, dead?

In his commencement address to the graduates of Triton College last week, James Thompson, United States attorney for Northern Illinois, pointed out that this country is in the mess of Watergate because Americans have come to expect so little of their elected representatives. They have become so concerned with self, he said, that they can't be bothered with what is happening to the country.

This is a tragic turn of events in a history which has had so many brilliant chapters of bravery and devotion to America and its ideals.

Honoring the flag on Flag Day is not so important an act by itself. What is important is the change in attitude of Americans that this Flag Day symbolizes.

A flag is a symbol. The cloth that makes a flag has no significance by itself. The spirit that drove the Marines to plant the flag on Mt. Suribachi to symbolize the conquest of Iwo Jima is significant.

The "Star-Spangled Banner" is just another melody, except for the symbolism of seeing that "our flag was still there."

Red, white and blue are just three colors, until they are joined to make "The Stars and Stripes Forever."

Throughout our history, the flag has been the symbol of our country, the visible sign of America.

Flag Day is one day of the year set aside to honor the flag and the United States.

Show your colors Americans. Honor your country by honoring your flag.

METRIC CONVERSION STILL HIGH PRIORITY

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that conversion to the metric system in the United States is desirable—and, I might add, inevitable. It is, therefore, imperative that we make realistic plans on a nationwide basis if this conversion is to take place in an orderly fashion, and I was disappointed by the outcome of the vote May 7 when legislation to establish a national board to plan for conversion failed to pass the House under suspension of the rules. I hope that Members who voted against the bill will consider carefully the many compelling arguments in favor of orderly planning for metric conversion.

Two recent news items made some good points in behalf of metric conversion legislation. One is a letter to the editor of the Washington Post, appearing on June 1. The second is an editorial from the Des Moines Register which was reprinted in the Christian Science Monitor. These items follow:

CONVERTING TO THE METRIC SYSTEM

On May 7 the House of Representatives amply demonstrated its continuing sensitivity to special interests and lack of concern for the general public. I refer to the fact that the bill on conversion to the metric system failed to pass. The reason it failed was probably that a number of congressmen want to attach amendments to the bill which would benefit their own special interest groups. They refuse to let it pass without those amendments, despite its obvious benefits to the general public.

Most experts agree that the nation is going metric, with or without legislation. With legislation the change will be coordinated and many problems will be minimized. Without legislation there will be little planning and the change will proceed in an uncoordinated, haphazard fashion. It should be obvious which type of change would be of most benefit to the general public.

My main area of interest is education. Failure of Congress to enact this legislation is particularly destructive in my field. We need to plan programs for young children so that they are not too much out of phase with the current society. At the same time, we need to plan ahead and allow for the fact that, to some extent, the education which is provided today must prepare the child for the society as it will be some years hence. If there were a national plan to coordinate the metric change, we could do much to minimize the burden which the change will impose on these children. Without this minimal leadership from our federal government, we are left to play guessing games.

It is my understanding that the House may yet have an opportunity to enact this needed legislation. I hope they take some important factors into consideration. It is a fact that the metric system is a much simpler system of measurement. It will make mathematics a simpler subject for children. It will make measurement tasks and computations simpler for everyone. A coordinated transition would minimize school costs. Even if these overriding factors are ignored though, it remains that the House of Representatives may once again be about to demonstrate its

inability to accept the responsibility for leadership which it should be providing.

THOMAS E. ROWAN.

SIMPSONVILLE, Md.

MIRROR OF OPINION: ON GOING METRIC

A ten-year conversion in the United States to the international metric system of weights and measures met a temporary setback May 7 when the House of Representatives balked at a non-amendment procedure on a bill to start the change. Some in Congress want to saddle the federal government with the cost of conversion; the committee wanted the costs to lie where they fall.

Every delay will increase the costs to the United States; the costs of not converting and hence having units different from most of our trading partners; the costs of the changeover when the United States takes the plunge. The change is bound to come.

Most English-speaking countries except the United States are in process of converting, leaving the United States the only major holdout. With foreign trade far more important to the United States than in earlier generations, staying a holdout costs money and inconvenience and lost sales. Senator Claiborne Pell (Dem., R.I.) estimates this cost at \$10 billion to \$25 billion a year.

There was no Commerce Department in George Washington's presidency, but Thomas Jefferson, who was secretary of state and almost everything else, proposed that the United States adopt the international metric system, then new, with its convenient decimal units. The most he could get out of Congress was a decimal system of money.

Congress should have said yes then.—Des Moines Register.

URGES RIGHT TO COMMUNICATE BE INSURED

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, as you and many of my colleagues know, telephone service was recently discontinued to a number of Jews in Moscow who are seeking to emigrate to Israel. I sincerely hope that the current détente with the Soviet Union is broad enough to insure an American citizen's right to freely communicate with a Soviet citizen by mail and telephone. Stuart Lotwin of Los Angeles spoke on the telephone with Yevgenya Lapidus of Moscow on May 22, the day before her service was discontinued. I would like to enter the transcript of that conversation in the RECORD as a further example of the continuing anguish of Soviet Jews:

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION BETWEEN YEVGENYA LAPIDUS IN MOSCOW, USSR, AND SHERI BERLIN, STUART LOTWIN IN LOS ANGELES, ON MAY 22, 1974

SB. Hello, Yevgenya?

YL. Yes, it's me. Good morning.

SB. How are you?

YL. Thank you very much. We are the same.

SB. Good. I'm glad to hear it. I want to tell you first of all I received 3 letters from you—

YL. Oh, I'm very glad you did.

SB. —two exactly the same, from May 5th.

YL. That is the way I send the letters—otherwise you don't get anything.

SB. I understand. Are those the only letters you sent me?

YL. Yes. That was all.

SB. Good, then they all arrived. I have them all. We would like to tell you that our synagogue is going to have a baby-naming for Ruth, in your honor. We would like to know the date she was born on.

YL. The 4th of November.

SB. O.K. We will have a cake in her honor, and we will send you a picture of that along with a certificate from our synagogue.

YL. Oh. You know, I have no words to tell you what I really do feel.

SB. I understand. Also we want to tell you that Jay Rothschild told Stuart that over 1,000 cables are going to be sent to the Central Committee. We have seen the letter. We would like to know, is there any other family involved, or is it just your family alone?

YL. Everything we don't want can exist if you decide your personal program. Do you understand me?

SB. No.

YL. If there is something more, than it can't exist. If there is a hint of organization then they oppose us I mean a trial. Everyone decides his personal program alone. Do you understand what I mean?

SB. Yes, you each must work yourself.

YL. And if somebody begins to employ you, then the person would have a lot of problems, as well as you. So, I mean the work problems can exist. Do you understand me?

SB. Yes, I understand you.

YL. And we, when we come for a demonstration, we all say that "I came alone. I didn't know that anyone else intended to come. I came alone." See?

SB. Yes.

YL. Do you understand what I mean?

SB. Yes, I do. O.K. I would like to tell you that last Friday evening, in our synagogue, we had a special Sabbath service for you, telling our congregation all about you, your family, and Ruth.

YL. Oh. You know Sheri, I feel so obligated to you. You know, it's a large debt that cannot be paid. Do you understand what I am talking about?

SB. Yes, I want to tell you that the best payment that we can have is for you to be in Israel. Hopefully we will meet you there someday. But just for you to get there will be enough payment for us.

YL. O.K. I do not need anything on earth but VISA. And, I hope there in life we'll meet personally. One more thing. Did you ask a person to come?

SB. Yes. That was another thing. Have you had a visitor?

YL. No, I haven't yet. Before, he called me.

SB. Oh good. Yes, Stuart asked me to tell you that Dr. Rothschild knows about the visitor.

YL. Oh, I see. You know, he called me from his hotel room. I was so astonished.

SB. Yes.

YL. That was something! He shouldn't call from his hotel room.

SB. Oh. Are you afraid now that you you shouldn't meet him?

YL. No, but that means that they wouldn't allow us to talk more or less openly.

SB. Yes. I think Stuart would like to talk to you. He has a few things that he wants to tell you, and then you may speak to him a little further. O.K.?

YL. All right Sheri.

SB. I want to tell you, before I give the telephone to Stuart, that when we call you next month, it will be Wednesday morning, June 19th, Moscow time, in the morning at the same time.

YL. All right.

SB. —in the morning. Is this hour too early for you, or is this hour good?

YL. It makes no difference for me what time you call. It's nice, all the day.

SB. O.K., good. Until then, I will turn the phone over to Stuart, and tell you "shalom" and "T'hitra-ot." (Peace, and see you soon.)

YL. "Toda raba!" (Thank you very much.)

SB. "B'yakasha!" (You're welcome.)

YL. God bless you for everything you do, because it's all priceless. A lot of people here, when I come to synagogue, always ask me what news I have from abroad? Because, they thank you—they mostly can't speak English. And they are trying to find out if the replies came in on our position. I wrote about it. When we talk for years, and see all the same faces, it's rather difficult to carry the load.

SB. Yes.

YL. Everyone is waiting. Everyone is tired. And everyone is tense. When I have nothing to tell to them, it is so difficult, because they wait for something from me; do you understand me?

SB. Yes, I do and I want to—

YL. Hello?!

SB. Yes. In understand you Yevgenya, and I want you to know that even when we don't have specific news, we are still working on your behalf during the time that intervenes—between our calls. There are many of us here still working for you, and many other people.

YL. You know, I don't know for you the words, I don't know how to express it, personally for me, because everything you do for the Soviet Jewry is very, is a big strength for everyone here, because it means that they won't have the ability to break us. Do you understand me?

SB. Yes.

YL. If there is a sounding board for the few of us here that means that they wouldn't be able to put us all in prison as soon as they can. They will have to take into consideration that the force and the care with American Jews pay to us. Do you understand me?

SB. Yes I do. Yes, I do understand.

YL. And, it doesn't matter whether you care for one person personally or not. I mean the Soviet Jewry as a whole.

SB. Yes, and that is what we are working for—one at a time, but all of you together. Let me give the telephone to Stuart. He has some questions to ask you also.

YL. All right.

SL. Jane? Have you received any mail?

YL. No I haven't.

SL. Well, there's one letter on it's—several letters are on it's way to you.

YL. Oh yes?

SL. One of them is from Senator Harrison Williams. He is the Senator from New Jersey to the United States Congress.

YL. I see.

SL. I have been asked to tell you that he has written to you, that he is concerned about you. I also wrote a letter to you on May 2nd. I want to read the letter because I don't think you're going to get it.

YL. No, I know. I'll never get it.

SL. Well, let me read it to you.

YL. Yes, sure.

SL. O.K., I wrote, "Dear Yevgenya, I've enjoyed talking with you on the telephone. All of our conversations have been heard by many people already, and your strength in your situation has inspired many of these people to become involved. In February, 1972, I first spoke with Lev Lerner in Leningrad. He is now living in Israel. His situation, too, was very bad then. In despair, I asked him what I could do for him. His reply, "Do not forget us!!!" was answered not only by me, but also by other people in the United States government, and also the English governments." Are you still there?

YL. Yes, I'm here.

SL. Good. "These are the same people, several United States Senators, American congressmen, and official in the United States Department of State, and a British Member of Parliament, now know about you, Simon, and Ruth. They have assured me

that they will not only not forget you, but they will do everything in their power to help you. One American congressman wrote to me that Soviet"—are you still there?

YL. I am here.

SL. "—that Soviet Jewry 'is one of my first, foremost personal concerns.' He will not forget you." Now, I don't think you'll get the letter, but I think you've got the message, so let's talk about some other things. Are you there?

YL. Yes, I'm . . . I'm here. (Crying)

SL. Now, a number of aerograms, which is like a letter,—

YL. I know.

SL. —have been sent to Andre Varein of the OVIR office in Moscow,—

YL. Oh yes?

SL. —asking for the immediate granting of exist permits for your parents and for yourself.

YL. Thank you very much. I am very sorry you haven't ever seen him. He is worth looking at. You know, I have never seen such cruel faces. That is the way all people look in those places which communicate with Jews.

SL. Yes, well I think with this phone call he now knows that there are American people who are not only concerned, but are getting impatient. And that we expect something to happen, and I think we should tell him that. O.K.? Now, on a personal side, how are your parents?

YL. Oh, wonderful. They were arrested last Thursday. You know about it fully I hope.

SL. No, I don't.

YL. About 60 Jews went to the Lebanon Embassy to protest against the killing of children in Israel. And they were arrested, and they kept them in the Hospital of Drunkens. Now, that's the way of letting Jews—they always arrest the—to scare them, to the Hospital of Drunkens.

SL. Yes, I know.

YL. Yes, and in the evening, when the underground stops working, they all put them into cars, and took them to the Suburbs. And, you know, Simon came home about, oh, at night, and my father came later. But we were so happy they came back. And they yesterday, everyone of those who went to the Lebanon Embassy were told, that the OVIR—do you know what is OVIR?

SL. OVIR? Yes.

YL. Yes, Department of Visas and Registration. And so now they go there up to twelve, and want to hear what they will show them. They will try to intimidate them, you know. And after that they will promise them that they all will go out. It's very typical conversation after Jews demonstrate. Yesterday, my mother was very worried. Ruthie, she is told, will probably won't be given visa. And after that she found out that everyone was told. So, the path, if it's the word, because much more easier.

SL. Yes, I hear you. Continue please. What I don't hear now, I will hear later. OK. Now, is your mother still working?

YL. Yes, she is.

SL. And Simon, is he working?

YL. No. He works, but he doesn't earn anything. He is in the registered at the (unintelligible), you know.

SL. Yes, I know from last time, you told us.

YL. Yes.

SL. Yes, he does as he's called.

YL. He came home one morning, about a month ago, and said, "You know, nothing will be until the 10th of August." No earlier, he meant. There is no work now because workers—they went on their vacation—and so the whole factory is closed until the 10th of August.

SL. Not until the 10th or August. Can he get other work?

YL. No, surely he can't because he's not allowed to get work at the time. So, you know,

I, few times, know I type in English. But, you know, one cannot earn much typing.

SL. Yes, I know all about your teaching of English.

YL. Oh, yes!

SL. Yes. We, as you said, we know much about you, yes, quite a bit. Your father is still not working, is that correct?

YL. If he'll stop and pick up a work card, then he'll probably know everything.

SL. Yes, but he's not working now though?

YL. No.

SL. Now, one of the things I would like to know is some dates. What is the date that you were sent to prison for 15 days?

YL. Oh, it was a long time ago—

SL. What date?

YL. It was the 18th of December, of 1972.

SL. Yes, that's when the Olympics—

YL. No, those were not Olympics!

SL. I didn't mean the Olympics, the Sporting Events in Moscow?

YL. Ah, yes.

SL. What was the date of the last refusal you and your family had from the OVIR office?

YL. You know, after you apply to OVIR with refusal, you never apply to OVIR again. Then you apply to different officials. And last time we had refusals, that was on the 18th of May, 1974.

SL. You mean just last Saturday?

YL. Yes, the problem was received or accepted—I don't know what the word—by a very high KGB official. And he told him that "My wife moved out of that house." Do you remember about the house?

SL. Yes, yes.

YL. "What's wrong now?" he said. Well, after that case, you see, he had to think about the matter again, and again, and again, and that, in time, we shall get the permission from OVIR, or something of the same. We shall never get it—that's the way they answer, always. They try to calm you, you know, whether you are or not, to demonstrate, or you, or whether you don't—I don't know their slogans and so on. That's the way they do answer, always.

SL. O.K.

YL. Hello?

SL. Well, in the meantime, to hopefully help you, the States Department in the United States has copies of our conversations, and other things. They have a file on you.

YL. Oh, you tape it?

SL. Pardon?

YL. You don't tape the conversation?

SL. Yes.

YL. I see. Then, probably you are not the only one.

SL. That's right. I think someone else is doing it right now, too. And that's why I read you the letter.

YL. Who are the people there laughing, I wonder?

SL. There are people here in the room listening to the conversation, also.

YL. I see. You know, sometimes, when we talk, in Moscow, from Moscow, conversations with . . . I don't know, me and my sister, sometimes, some official is on the line.

SL. No . . . people are with me. When you are in Israel, you will have a chance to read all the conversations.

YL. Oh. You know, when I'm in the middle of the conversation, someone giggles.

SL. No, this was Sheri and friends.

YL. Oh, yes.

SL. Now, your baby Ruth was born on November 4th?

YL. Yes.

SL. One of the people in the room, listening to our conversation, is my oldest daughter, Nicole. She is 14.

YL. Fourteen? My sister is 14, too!

SL. Yes. My daughter speaks Hebrew, she is planning to go to Israel in the summer of 1975. She was also born on November 4th.

YL. Oh.

SL. That was her birthday. She was my first, and your first is also on the same date.

YL. I wish my sister could go to Israel as easily as your daughter, as she also speaks Hebrew very well. She speaks Hebrew best in our family.

SL. Yes, I know.

YL. She knows everything, really.

SL. She cannot go as easily as my daughter can. But it is our intention, that your sister will be in Israel, that is what we are working for, that is what the congressmen are trying to help us do. And, as Lev Lerner, went to Israel, you too will go to Israel, too. I cannot promise you, but, you will be there. Now, my last thing I want to tell you is that you are helping another person in Russia to leave. Because, last Sunday night, two nights ago—

YL. Yes.

SL. I spoke to another synagouge, in Los Angeles, to ask them to work for a man who lives in Irtusk.

YL. Ah yes, I know him.

SL. Boris Gurovitch, is that right?

YL. Yes. That's right—

SL. I read to them the letter which Mr. Miller, from Philadelphia wrote to a newspaper about you, after he returned from visiting you.

YL. Yes, I got a copy of this article. Everything is mixed there, but the idea is left. Only the main idea, that we do need, need help here, that we do suffer here, is left. And all the rest is wrong.

SL. Yes.

YL. In it, all the details are in a mess. Hello?

SL. Hello? The information may have been wrong, but between that, and listening to our last telephone conversation, these people said, "We want to help." They are going to work for Boris, just as we, Jay Rothschild, and other people in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, are working for you. So, in Moscow, you have done a Mitzvah. (Good deed)

YL. Ah, yes, I know.

SL. For Boris.

YL. Mr. Rothschild used the same Hebrew word.

SL. Yes. Now, that is all that I have for this time.

YL. You know, I want to tell you one thing. Here, our authorities and our officials, do not expect of us, they are afraid of you—do you understand me?

SL. Yes.

YL. If everything depended—we would have perished already, or we would have gone to Siberia. But, when they know that our faith is in you, and our strength is in the United States, then they do not dare to. And, if you are concerned about it, they do realize it, they do understand that our destiny completely depends on you. So we couldn't be, and more dependant than exists in such situations. That's all.

SL. Well, in closing, I want you to know that the most important thing, for myself, for Sheri, for the other people in this room, for Jay Rothschild—the most important thing that matter to us, is you! And, we are going to do everything we can. Our most important priority is for you to be able to go to Israel. Everything else comes after that. And, just as we feel this for you, others in the United States feel this for other people. And together. . .

YL. All right.

SL. O.K. Now, you take care of yourself, take care of the baby—

YL. If everyone takes care of yourself, who will make things—

SL. It's important. We want you to keep your health, and your family too. Know that we here have you as our major thought every day, and that we're going to continue to work hard—us here, Jay in New Jersey, the American senators and congressmen. As we say in the United States, we will win!

19550

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 17, 1974

YL. We shall overcome!
 SL. We shall overcome, right!! Nachon!
 (Correct)
 YL. Yes. Sometimes when I walk along the street, and try to hold back tears, I sing this song that we shall overcome, but I do not believe it anymore. You see?
 SL. It's hard to believe, but it will happen. It will happen. Believe that. We will all celebrate together, hopefully in the not too distant future.
 YL. Yes.
 SL. But believe in it, and believe in yourself.
 YL. Thank you.
 SL. And believe in the baby, and it will happen.
 YL. I hope it will. B-shana Hazot B-y'rushalayim! (This year in Jerusalem)
 SL. Nachon! (Correct) Jane?
 YL. Yes?
 SL. And you keep believing, and it'll happen. We will call you next month on the nineteenth.
 YL. Thank you so much from all the Moscow Jews. I say the same because I have a lot of friends here who are much more miserable, and much more suffer than I do. And, each time when I tell them that two people exist, who care for them, you know, life is better.
 SL. Yes.
 YL. Thank you very much.
 SL. O.K. We will talk to you next month.
 YL. All right.
 SL. Shalom.

DOLLAR DIPLOMACY QUESTIONED

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, why is it that the United States is so free with the taxpayer's money when it comes to our enemies, and so tight when it comes to the needs of its own people?

A case in point is Dr. Kissinger's June 5 comments before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The venerable Dr. Kissinger, our deservedly much-honored Secretary of State, remarked that the administration "would look favorably" on any effort by Congress to allocate \$100 million to help Syria rebuild its border towns, such as Quneitra, which were heavily damaged during the recent Israeli-Arab war. Since Dr. Kissinger has commented earlier that Congress should also explore giving funds to North Vietnam to rebuild from the damage which occurred during our war with that country, it is becoming clear to me that a major part of American diplomacy abroad is reversion to that old standby of "dollar diplomacy."

Quite frankly, I, along with the majority of the American people, am very pleased with Dr. Kissinger's successes in foreign affairs. He has achieved what at times seems to be almost a miracle of negotiations, overcoming almost insurmountable barriers to deliver the most precious gift of all—peace.

But peace at what cost? A couple of billion to buy the North Vietnamese? A \$100 million to placate the Syrians?

The news that the United States is ready to negotiate with unlimited dollars is nothing new to the American citizens

of Guam. We have watched for years while Uncle Sam has poured billions into the coffers of those who fought against us, while our island, which suffered tremendous damage as a consequence of our loyalty to this country, has been repeatedly forced to beg Washington for the same funds which others receive freely.

I give as an example Guam's request for assistance after World War II. During the American invasion of Guam, which successfully drove out the Japanese invaders, our island was literally smashed to bits. Most of our homes were destroyed; our public buildings were gone; and so on.

Although experts testified before congressional committees that more than \$23 million was needed to repair the damage to Guam, what we received was far less—74-percent less, as a matter of record. After all was said and done, Guam received only \$6 million, in 1946.

Obviously \$6 million was not nearly enough, and to his everlasting credit, Admiral Pownall, then the Naval Governor of Guam, requested another \$15 million. This amount was reduced by the Bureau of the Budget to \$10 million to construct badly needed new public facilities on Guam. In January, 1950, the request for the \$10 million was shelved.

In 1962, Guam was struck by one of the worst typhoons in our history and the island was again devastated. What little we had striven to build up after the war was again reduced to wreckage. And, once again, the people of Guam faced the necessity of petitioning Washington for more assistance, which we did in 1963.

As an outcome of that petition, Guam received, in loans and grants, an initial amount of \$45 million from the Federal Government. Later, due to rising costs and additional planning, government of Guam officials again petitioned Congress for more funds which resulted in \$30 million being approved by Congress thus bringing the total assistance to \$74 million.

Unlike the vast amounts we dole out to friend and foe alike in our foreign aid program, Guam's portion was not free, however. Sixty percent of the total amount received from what is known as the Guam Rehabilitation Fund, is in the form of a loan which must be paid back to the U.S. Treasury by the people of Guam at interest rates that are anything but low.

Speaking as one of the individuals who petitioned Congress for that assistance, I am most grateful to my fellow Americans for coming to our aid. Guam was in desperate straits in 1962, and the funds came at a time when it was sorely needed and when Guam could turn to no one else.

What disturbs us, however, is the continual sight of other countries lining up at the U.S. Treasury's trough for millions of dollars which often come as an outright gift or in no-interest or extremely low-interest loans. At the same time, the economic squeeze is put on totally American areas, such as Guam, who are forced to either go without or to pay back assistance at interest rates much higher than we seem to be charging our "friends."

Somehow, it seems that something is wrong with this kind of policy.

THE 1973 FINANCIAL STATEMENT

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, today I am placing into the RECORD a complete statement of my financial worth as of December 31, 1973. This statement includes a listing of all assets which are held in my name individually or which are held jointly with my wife, as well as all assets which are held by my wife in her individual name.

I have also included a statement of our income, from all sources, for calendar year 1973 as developed from our income tax return for that year.

I have placed a full financial disclosure into the RECORD yearly since coming to the Congress. I shall continue this practice for each year it is my privilege and honor to serve in the Congress of the United States.

The statement of finances is as follows:

ROMANO L. AND HELEN D. MAZZOLI STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL WORTH AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1973

Cash on deposit:	
Lincoln Federal S&L Assn., Acct. #37339	\$6,847.58
Liberty National Bank & Trust Co., Acct. #09-013390	2,491.14
Liberty National Bank & Trust Co., Acct. #08-33-816-7	336.82
Liberty National Bank & Trust Co., Acct. #08-33-817-5	100.00
American United Life Insurance Co., Policy #1116312	80.56
American United Life Insurance Co., Policy #1011729	677.45
Northern Virginia S&L Assn., Cert. of Deposit L50021	1,017.72
Northern Virginia S&L Assn., Account #6084	2,032.33
Government Services S&L Assn., Acct. #034231-9	2,050.30
Securities, stocks, and bonds:	
U.S. Government bonds, series E	805.10

Real property: Residential:	
939 Ardmore Dr., Louisville, Kentucky Assessed Value	22,720.00
Less: Mortgage, Portland Federal S&L	11,733.03
	10,986.97

1030 Anderson St., Alexandria, Virginia Assessed Value	54,000.00
Less: Mortgage, Cowger & Miller Co.	53,776.00

	224.00
Commercial or investment	0
Household Goods and miscellaneous personalty (estimated)	5,000.00
Cash surrender value of life insurance policies:	
American United Life Ins. Co., Policy #1011729	2,553.50
American United Life Ins. Co., Policy #1116312	241.08
Federal employees retirement system: Contribution to Fund	9,897.7
Automobiles:	

1965 Rambler, fair market value	\$440.00
1973 Chevrolet, fair market value	3,339.00
Less: mortgage, GMAC	1,722.89
	1,616.11
Law books	545.07
Net assets	47,943.45

ROMANO L. AND HELEN D. MAZZOLI, RECAPITULATION OF INCOME AND EXPENSES FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1973

INCOME

Interest and dividends:	
Lincoln Federal S&L Association	\$283.57
Liberty National Bank & Trust Company	276.18
American United Life Insurance Company	28.83
Government Services S&L Association	50.30
Northern Virginia S&L Association	50.05
Law practice, income	0
Honorarium (Western High School)	75.00
U.S. House of Representatives: Salary	42,500.00
Gross income	43,263.93

EXPENSES, DEDUCTION, AND EXEMPTIONS

Congressional expenses in excess of reimbursements	4,073.00
Miscellaneous congressional reductions	2,410.07
Law practice expenses	217.00
Itemized personal deductions	6,285.93
Personal exemptions	3,000.00
Moving expenses	2,740.00
	18,726.00
Total taxable income	24,537.93

CAMPAIGN LIMITATIONS NEEDED FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS IN SEPTEMBER AND NOVEMBER

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the bill reported from the House Committee on the District of Columbia, H.R. 15074, is badly needed if the first mayor-city council elections in our Nation's Capital in 100 years are to be free from over-spending and the unhealthy influence of large campaign contributions.

CEILINGS ON CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES

Ever since 1955 the D.C. Code has provided rather loose ceilings on contributions and expenditures. An individual was permitted to contribute up to \$5,000 "in connection with any campaign for election..." Whether that meant \$5,000 to each candidate was not clear.

Ceilings on committee expenditures were "\$100,000 for any campaign". Whether that meant \$100,000 for the primary campaign for one candidate and \$100,000 for the general campaign, was unclear. Certainly there is no restriction on setting up a number of separate committees, all in support of the candidate, and each spending the \$100,000—

perhaps in the primary and again in the general. Thus, a candidate for mayor could legally spend a million dollars or more for his campaign by using several committees.

PRESENT LAW INADEQUATE

All witnesses appearing before the committee at hearings on the new bill agreed that the present D.C. Code provisions were inadequate. Meaningful ceilings must be placed on expenditures by candidates, and the candidate made responsible for not exceeding those expenditure limitations.

The ceiling on contributions should be lower and should be specific enough that an individual knows what he is permitted to do and when he would be in violation of the law.

LIMITATIONS ON CONTRIBUTIONS

In H.R. 15074 ceilings are placed on the amount that an individual can give to any one candidate. This ranges as low as \$100 for the whole campaign for ward seats on the Board of Education, to as high as \$1,000 for the whole campaign to a candidate for mayor. It is to be emphasized that the limitations I have cited apply to individual people making contributions to be used by the candidate and his political committees to spend on the campaign.

Higher ceilings are permitted for groups than for individuals. Groups such as the familiar COPE of a labor union or political action committee of a business or professional group are permitted to contribute twice that amount to each candidate.

CEILINGS ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO A NUMBER OF CANDIDATES

A second ceiling is placed on an individual that prevents him from giving the maximum amount to his favorite in each of the fourteen election races scheduled for this Fall. The second ceiling is an overall aggregate ceiling of \$2,000 an individual may contribute in all races during the primary and an additional \$2,000 he may contribute in all races during the general election.

There is no second or aggregate ceiling for groups, but if a group contributed the maximum amount to one candidate in each of the fourteen races, it would total \$10,700.

PREVENTING UNDUPLICATE INFLUENCE

When the amount an individual can contribute for each office is compared with the ceiling on total expenditures for that office, it can be seen how the bill accomplishes its goal of preventing one person or one group from having an inordinate influence through the size of a contribution. When an individual can contribute up to \$1,000 to a candidate for mayor, that is only a fraction of one percent of the amount that a mayoral candidate is permitted to spend in a campaign. Similarly, when an individual is permitted to contribute only \$100 to a ward candidate for the School Board, that is only one-half of one percent of the \$20,000 a ward candidate for School Board is permitted to spend in his entire campaign, including the primary and general.

CEILING ON EXPENDITURES IN A CAMPAIGN

The bill sets out clear maximums beyond which expenditures are not permitted by a candidate and his committees. The \$100,000 limit in present D.C. law permits multiple committees and no overall limitation on the candidate.

The D.C. Committee gave a great deal of thoughtful consideration to setting these limits. We are faced by the problem of setting the limits low enough to prevent runaway campaign expenditures but yet high enough to permit a strong challenge to an incumbent. If we had set expenditure limits for mayor, for example, at too low a level, it is certain that the first elected mayor would have a lifetime job. No one would be able to mount the type of city-wide campaign reaching 750,000 people of Washington, D.C., if he was unable to spend money for a reasonable or-

ganization and a certain amount of literature and use of public media.

\$150,000 CEILING FOR THE PRIMARY

We have set the maximum for mayor at \$150,000 each during the primary election and an additional \$150,000 for the winners of the primary races conducting their general campaigns. These figures were supported in quite some detail item by item on what a reasonable campaign would cost in a city this size. In the report accompanying the bill on page 26 and 27 we have set out one suggested budget which seems to us to be quite reasonable. The American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees presented a witness who had made this calculation. It totals \$147,000, at the bottom of page 26, which is the basic cost of the 5-month primary campaign plus \$64,000, toward the bottom of page 27, the cost of a 3-week media campaign just before primary election day. The basic sum would not have to be completely duplicated during the two months between the primary and general elections but the media campaign would, no doubt, be repeated—thus the figures of \$150,000 for the primary and \$150,000 for the general are well exceeded by these professional estimates.

BROAD SUPPORT FOR REASONABLE CEILINGS

Support of this type of calculation existed throughout the hearings. On page 24 of the committee report is a letter from City Council Chairman John Nevlus indicating that these maximums are reasonable. On page 29 of the committee report is a letter from the organization called "Voice of Informed Community Expression" estimating the need for figures in this range. The Board of Trade letter on page 30 of the committee report endorses the maximums set in the bill. Finally, the report of the Congressional Research Service listed on page 33 of the committee report indicates that in large cities such as Houston and Boston, election campaigns cost this amount or more.

TWENTY CENTS PER CAPITA

Those maximums figure out on a per capita basis to be the following: twenty cents per capita for the primary election for mayor; thirteen and one-half cents per capita for the primary elections for council chairman; ten cents per capita for council members-at-large for the primary; and, twenty-one and one-quarter cents per capita for candidates to the City Council from the wards. Successful candidates in the September primary and independent candidates will be allowed to spend the same per capita amount for the general election in November.

PRESENT D.C. LAW ON REPORTING

In 1971 Congress passed a law to require reporting of contributions and expenditures in political campaigns in Washington, D.C. The Board of Elections which handles the preparations for the ballot box, was also given the responsibility for receiving reports from candidates and enforcing the new law.

Detailed recordkeeping by the treasurer for a committee, registration of political committees, and detailed reporting to the Board were set out in the D.C. Code.

REPORTING ONLY 5 DAYS BEFORE AN ELECTION

But public disclosure requirements of the present D.C. Code are totally inadequate. No report needs to be filed by a candidate or his committees until five days before the election, according to the law adopted by Congress in 1971. An additional report thirty days after the election is required.

One of the changes effected by H.R. 15074 is to move up the first report to August 10, or earlier if the bill clears Congress and is signed before July 10th.

Periodic reports made thereafter are exactly as required for members of Congress, including reports five days and fifteen days

before the primary and again five days and fifteen days before the general election.

FEATURES OF BILL TO MAKE CANDIDATE RESPONSIBLE

The bill attempts to prevent a proliferation of committees and sky-rocketing expenditures for which a candidate can claim no responsibility.

First, the candidate himself must have a principal campaign committee.

Second, any other committees organized in his support must report to that committee.

Third, all committees must have a central depository from which campaign expenditures are made by check.

Fourth, cash contributions and expenditures are restricted to items of \$50 or less.

In this way, it is hoped that the public will have a feeling that the candidate is not trying to evade responsibility for the flow of money in his campaign and has the help of the law and the auditing agencies to keep it that way.

LIMIT ON INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES NOT AUTHORIZED BY A CANDIDATE

The basic theory of this bill is that a candidate is responsible for all campaign expenditures being made in his name and must keep them below the stated ceilings.

Sec. 401(d) spells that concept out more clearly when it sets a \$1,000 ceiling on unauthorized expenditures.

It does not prohibit any one from spending money on a candidate without his permission but limits that unauthorized expenditure to \$1,000. Without that restraint, any person could place an expensive series of TV spot commercials, for example, and avoid the candidate ceiling by saying he didn't ask the consent of the candidates.

Without that restraint, others could make ineffective—even purposefully ineffective—expenditures in the candidate's name and reach his ceiling and stop him from spending on his own campaign.

\$1,000 LIMIT IS NOT A LOOPHOLE

No abuse of this section is likely because a candidate is responsible for keeping expenditures "by or on behalf of the candidate" and his agents within the ceilings on expenditures set in the bill. Only genuinely independent expenditures, in no way authorized or suggested, or requested by the candidate, his committees or agents, are permitted under the \$1,000 limitation of Sec. 401(d).

IDENTIFICATION OF CAMPAIGN LITERATURE

Present D.C. Law does not require any identification on leaflets and bumper stickers used in campaigning. The bill before the House has a provision (Sec. 210) requiring the literature to be identified by the words "paid for by—" followed by the name and address of the payor or committee or other person and its treasurer on whose behalf the material appears.

LOBBYIST REGISTRATION AND REPORTING

Title V of the bill provides the same type of registration of lobbyists as is now covered in the federal regulation of lobbying act applying to Congress.

Title V sets out a definition for lobbyists and provides for a system of accounting for receipts and expenditures and reporting this to the Board of Elections.

These are among the main features of a bill that has been carefully worked out by the District of Columbia Committee to start the first elected officials of the District of Columbia on a path of public confidence and open democratic government.

BOLLING COMMITTEE CONTINUES TO ATTRACT CRITICISM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the secret action of the Democratic Caucus in attempting to smother the reform of the House proposed by the Bolling Committee continues to attract the criticism such a betrayal deserves. The Flint Michigan Journal has called this "callous" shunting of the reform effort by a "disgraceful alliance between old-line conservatives and established liberals" an "outrageous performance." John Gardner, writing in the New York Times, registered "astonishment" at the "arrogant behavior of leading Democrats" in sidetracking the proposed reforms. Terming the Democratic caucus' action a "shocking return to backroom politics," Gardner provides my Democratic colleagues with their only possible response to queries as to what they have done to further reform; Gardner writes:

Most House Democrats, if they are honest, will have to answer, "We did as little as we possibly could."

Here are the full texts of the articles: [From the New York Times, June 12, 1974]

ALBATROSS IN THE HOUSE

(By John W. Gardner)

WASHINGTON.—This is going to be a hard year for Republicans on the campaign trail. But observers are saying that it may also prove to be a tough year for incumbent Democrats. Some of the voter sentiment is indiscriminately anti-incumbent.

Given that consideration, one can only register astonishment at the arrogant behavior of leading Democrats in the House of Representatives. They are writing a record that will hang around their neck like the Ancient Mariner's albatross. We have seen in recent weeks three shocking examples of that arrogance.

First, on May 9, the House Democrats, meeting in secret caucus and acting by secret vote, sidetracked a major restructuring of the House's antiquated committee system. Twenty-eight years have passed since the last modernization, and a bipartisan committee headed by the able and highly respected Democratic Representative from Missouri, Richard Bolling, had submitted excellent (and unanimous) recommendations. A strange coalition of entrenched, aging chairmen and younger more liberal party members joined hands with outside special-interest groups to block the measure.

The secrecy of the move was particularly offensive. In 1973, in a statesmanlike move toward open, accountable government, the House reversed its long tradition of doing the public's business behind closed doors, and opened more than 80 per cent of its bill-drafting sessions. In the first half of 1974 the tally has risen to 88 per cent. Against that background, the caucus action on the Bolling report was a shocking return to backroom politics. Not only was the ballot secret—even the vote to take a secret ballot was secret.

Second, the old-line Democratic leadership in the House has worked consistently to pre-

vent a floor vote on the oil-depletion allowance. It is typical of the pre-Watergate, public-be-damned sheldgame approach to legislation that in all its controversial history that oil-depletion allowance has never been voted on alone by the full House of Representatives. It has always come to the House floor as part of the total tax bill under a "closed rule" that prevented amendment of any portion of the bill.

Last month, a vigorous young Congressman, William J. Green of Pennsylvania, drafted an amendment to the Oil and Gas Energy Act that would repeal the depletion allowance as of Jan. 1, 1974, and the Democratic Caucus—over the opposition of Carl Albert and Wilbur D. Mills—directed the Democratic members of the Rules Committee to make his amendment "in order"—that is, allow the full House to vote it up or down.

The Caucus also voted for similar treatment of an amendment by Representative Charles A. Vanik of Ohio that would have the effect of increasing taxes on the foreign oil profits of United States companies.

The Caucus action was taken to assure that these crucial matters would be decided by the full House, but in the face of white-hot oil-industry opposition there has been feverish maneuvering by powerful Democrats to thwart the will of the Caucus.

Third, the most spectacular bit of Democratic obstructionism is the ten-month marathon stalling of action on a campaign finance reform bill. Representative Wayne L. Hays is nominal field general of the obstructionist campaign. The House leadership, glad to let Hays take the onus of public criticism, is hiding under the desk and pretending that nothing is amiss.

Republican candidates will face some rough questions on the campaign trail—and they should. But what will the House Democrats say when they are asked: "What did you do to prevent future Watergates? To make Congress a more respected institution? To get away from the old, sleazy tactics of backroom politics?" Most House Democrats, if they are honest, will have to answer, "We did as little as we possibly could."

[From Flint, Michigan Journal, May 21, 1974]

DEMOCRAT LIBERALS FAIL—AN OUTRAGEOUS ACT

Seldom has the need for major congressional reform been more clearly demonstrated than in the handling by Democrats in the House of Representatives of a proposal which held great promise for just such reform.

In a disgraceful alliance between old line conservatives and established liberals (many of whom had posed for years as favoring congressional reform), a comprehensive bill to improve House practices with bipartisan support has been callously hunted from a showdown vote.

The Bolling-Martin plan for reform was the result of extensive hearings and more than a year of hard work and was designed to restructure the antiquated and stifling committee system of the House which has been in effect since 1946. Its salient feature was elimination of placing the majority of committees in the hands of a few powerful members who achieved rank through seniority. It held promise of wide support because although it did remedy some of the evils of the system, it did not directly attack the seniority concept.

It was carefully contrived to clear up the jurisdictional jungle under the present system and prevent ridiculous situations such as when 14 of 21 House committees held hearings on energy proposals last year. The too-powerful and overworked Ways and Means Committee would lose jurisdiction over certain health, foreign trade, unemployment

ment and pension matters to other committees, freeing it to concentrate on tax reform for one thing. The plan also would divorce education and labor by dividing that committee, a worthy objective. Much of the reform was based upon the simple, logical step of forbidding any one member from serving on more than one of 15 designated major committees.

Hopes the plan would reach the floor and be passed were high for several reasons, chief of which was the often expressed consternation of members over the low public esteem of Congress.

Although the Bolling-Martin proposal was bipartisan, the Democratic caucus chose to consider it because of its importance, paving the way for an act which showed the utmost contempt for public opinion and indifference to good government.

It was expected that conservatives heading powerful committees such as Wilbur D. Mills (Ways and Means), Wayne Hays (House Administration) and Harley Staggers (Commerce) would oppose the plan. But what had not been expected was that a number of outspoken liberals, led by Philip Burton of California, would desert past standards and join their opposites to prevent the bill from reaching the floor.

"They did it because they feared the plan would reduce their own growing power in the House," Common Cause has charged. "In effect, they joined members of the senior Democratic Establishment who have always resisted reform of ancient House methods because it would diminish their own spheres of authority."

The methods used to deny the House the challenge to stand up and be counted were resorts to the very tricks which have brought Congress to its lowly status in public opinion.

Instead of an honest yes or no vote on the plan, the vote was to refer the proposal to a committee well-stacked against such a plan. Furthermore, the decision was made in a rare secret ballot (a procedure which Burton himself had unsuccessfully tried to outlaw last year). Finally, the secret ballot was established by a method in violation of the rules that usually govern the caucus.

In addition to Burton, a number of other members of the liberal faction deserted principle to smother reform (including Michigan's James O'Hara and John Dingell) and placed their desire for clout above the need to break Congress free from the iron castle of privilege which has so alienated it from the public.

It is an outrageous performance. And any Democrat who does not take up the fight to undo this act, loses all plausibility if he seeks to blame the low position of government on Republicans alone.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret my unavoidable absence from the floor during the vote on the National School Lunch Act Amendments conference report. The importance of continuing the school lunch program cannot be overstressed and I am pleased to note that the conference report, which includes several strengthening Senate provisions, has been approved by the full House.

PROCLAMATION: PATRIA NEWSPAPER, 15TH ANNIVERSARY, JUNE 22, 1974

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago on June 22, 1959, two distinguished Cuban dignitaries, refugees from Communist Cuba, founded the newspaper Patria at Miami, Fla.

Patria was the brainchild of the Honorable Senator Armando Garcia Sifredo and Sr. Alberto Rodriguez who came to the United States from Cuba shortly after Castro delivered Cuba to the Communists, but not before Castro committed both to Havana jails.

Senator Sifredo had been a teacher until 1936 when he began a 16-year career in radio, 10 years of which he was new director of Cuba's well-known radio station RHC. In 1952 he was elected to Cuba's Senate where he served with distinction until Castro destroyed Cuban democracy. His strong opposition to communism and support of a free and democratic system of government for Cuba resulted in his being jailed in El Principe Jail in Havana in 1959. Gaining his release he came to the United States to continue his fight to free his homeland.

Sr. Alberto Rodriguez is a second generation journalist of considerable renown. He was the administrator of the Cuban newspaper El Tiempo. Sr. Rodriguez was jailed in Havana's famed La Cabana Fortress in 1959 for his efforts to continue a free and democratic Cuba. Upon release from La Cabana he too came to the United States to continue the fight to remove tyranny and oppression from his homeland.

I well remember those early days of Castroism and while I was fortunate in not suffering the confinement of Castro's jails, I was the first U.S. Congressman to feel the lash of Castro's tongue when Castro publicly denounced me and declared me persona non grata. Coming from this source I consider the denunciation a sign of honor.

Patria began June 22, 1959 in a small room in Senator Sifredo's rented apartment in Miami, Fla., with a staff of just three: Senator Sifredo, Sr. Alberto Rodriguez and one Cuban refugee. Using the existing facilities of a local newspaper they printed and distributed 5,000 first edition Patria newspapers.

Today, Patria has offices in Coral Gables, Fla., where it employs over 50 people and is distributed not only in south Florida but in major metropolitan areas such as Chicago, New York, New Jersey, California and other areas where Cubans have migrated and settled. Patria's readers now number well over 200,000. In south Florida, Patria is a major news medium in a bilingual community.

Patria is a member of the Inter-American Press Society. Patria has received much deserved recognition and many awards including:

The Lincoln-Marti Award given by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Proclamations for outstanding contributions to the City of Miami, Fla. from its last four mayors; and

Over 60 trophies and proclamations from professional and Civil Associations.

Patria and its entire staff have made outstanding contributions to the cause of freedom everywhere. A grateful community and a grateful Nation proclaims its thanks and best wishes to Patria and staff for continued growth and prosperity.

Viva Patria.

THE SOVIET UNION AND EXIM BANK

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh Press on May 26 carried an editorial expressing its views on a recent Export-Import Bank loan of \$180 million to Russia to help finance a fertilizer complex there.

The bank, I might add, is the same institution which recently ignored a resolution signed by 200 Members of this House to cease and desist from such transactions unless specifically deemed by the President to be in the national interest.

As the Press editorial points out, one must stretch his imagination to justify American loans to a nation which can readily pay out billions in cash to other nations for products and materials it desires.

Mr. Speaker, the article is self-explanatory and I am inserting it into the Record for the attention of my colleagues who can reach their own conclusion as to the reasons for such "foolish and unnecessary foreign-aid blunders":

FOREIGN AID TO RUSSIA

In a foolish and unnecessary foreign-aid blunder, the Nixon administration has granted a \$180 million loan to the Soviet Union to help finance a huge fertilizer complex there.

The loan was made by the Export-Import Bank on instructions from President Nixon.

It carried the bargain interest rate of 6 per cent. Six per cent at a time when the most credit-worthy American corporations must pay about twice as much to borrow money!

In an effort to justify its dubious deal, the Ex-Im Bank points out that the credit will help U.S. companies export \$400 million in goods for the fertilizer project and eventually will bring "needed fertilizer to the U.S."

All that may be true but it misses a basic point:

By granting credit to the Soviet Union at half the rate charged domestically and to many friendly countries, the U.S. taxpayer is subsidizing and giving foreign aid to the Kremlin's industrial base.

There is nothing wrong with expanding trade with Moscow in nonstrategic items. But financing that trade with long-term loans at sweetheart rates is indefensible.

It may be news to the White House, but

it isn't to U.S. intelligence agencies, that the Soviet Union can well afford to pay cash or to arrange for normal commercial credits for what it wants to buy in this country.

Russia is a major exporter of oil and oil products to hard-currency areas.

It will get a windfall profit of \$1.5 billion to \$2 billion in 1974 from the fourfold boost in crude prices imposed by the Arab oil cartel.

With commodity prices setting records, Moscow will earn extra billions through its extensive timber, gold and diamond exports.

Since mid-1973, it has sold \$2 billion to \$4 billion in weapons to Egypt and Syria, these sales financed by Saudi Arabia and paid for in hard currency.

This means that while the Soviet Union would like bargain credits from the United States if we are stupid enough to grant them, it can and will pay cash to countries with backbone in their trade policies.

Russia tried to pull an "Ex-Im" type deal on West Germany for an iron and steel combine in Kursk. But when Bonn remained firm, Moscow agreed in March to pay \$1 billion in cash for the project.

Similarly, it is paying \$48 million in cash to a British firm for a new plastics plant.

Only this month the Soviet Union gave Argentina \$600 million in credits for a vast electric power project.

Can anyone explain why Russia should get a \$180 million loan from the United States when Russia can afford to lend Argentina \$600 million?

Obviously something is very wrong.

Either the White House doesn't know how to do business with Russia (remember the wheat deal?) or Mr. Nixon is so eager to make his visit to Moscow next month a success that he is giving away the store.

Whatever the reason, the Ex-Im giveaway should be blocked by Congress.

Why subsidize a foreign power that is basically inimical to America's future, freedoms and friends?

"ABORTING AN AMENDMENT," AN EDITORIAL IN THE NEW YORK TIMES

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times contains a short, clear, and important editorial on the right to abortion.

The editorial points out that the acceptance of any of the constitutional amendments now pending would be "an unjustifiable and unworkable intrusion upon family life." The editorial makes the same point I made in my testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, chaired by Senator BIRCH BAYH, that the adoption of any of these amendments would return us to the period of a few years ago before the individual States started reforming their abortion laws. It has been estimated that before the States began reforming their laws, only about 10,000, of the estimated million abortions, performed were done legally. Most of these 10,000 abortions were for white, middle class, or rich women who had the money and access to physicians willing to make the necessary arrangements. But it is certainly proper to ask what about the others, the

990,000 young girls and women, married and unmarried, who could not obtain legal abortions? Each one has had to go through the individual trauma of facing an unwanted pregnancy, frantically seeking in secrecy for a bootleg abortionist, paying exorbitant fees, or in many cases having to rely on a quack, a neighbor, a midwife or a home remedy, usually unsuccessful and often dangerous.

Each year before the Supreme Court decision was handed down, physicians had to treat about 350,000 women suffering from complications arising from illegal abortions. Each year, it has been estimated, some 400 to 1,000 women died as a result of illegal, out-of-hospital abortions.

But, Mr. Speaker, perhaps more invidious and more threatening to the concept of equal protection under the laws is the spurious, and in my opinion, unconstitutional, riders offered to various social welfare legislation. I have opposed these amendments when they have come to the floor and I will continue to do so. I only hope that my colleagues who have not yet done so will have the courage to do what they know in their hearts to be correct and join me in opposing these amendments if they come up again.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of the New York Times editorial:

ABORTING AN AMENDMENT

More than a year after the United States Supreme Court declared that abortion should be considered a private matter between a woman and her physician, a strong campaign is on to make it a public matter between a woman and the Federal Government.

This would be the effect of four "human life" amendments to the Constitution, now being pushed in Congress. All are designed to restrict the right of a woman or her physician to terminate pregnancy voluntarily. One amendment would prohibit abortion even if a woman's life is in danger; another would go beyond abortion and prevent the use of birth control devices or drugs.

The anti-abortion forces already have achieved victories by attaching riders to other measures. Thus Medicaid payments for abortion are denied to the poor under the Social Security Act; the foreign aid law includes a provision restricting funds for abortion, and the bill creating a legal services corporation would bar legal aid to the indigent in cases that might result from abortion.

New York's three-year-old legalized abortion law has caused a decline in deaths from abortions, in maternal and infant deaths, and in the number of women hospitalized by futile abortions. A constitutional amendment would be an unjustifiable and unworkable intrusion upon family life. The nation would simply return to a double standard under which the wealthy would continue to obtain abortions and the poor would be victimized.

AN ANNIVERSARY TO LAMENT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker. Members of Congress are continuing to address themselves to possible solutions to the energy crisis but this Congress as a whole has not processed an overall en-

ergy bill that would realistically move our Nation to self-sufficiency.

I believe it is quite appropriate that the history of past Congresses have also been unable to serve a long-term public need. This point is very well taken in an editorial of June 7 in the Chicago Tribune:

AN ANNIVERSARY TO LAMENT

Today is a good day to examine how innocence and misguided zeal led this country into an energy crisis with respect to natural gas, because it is the 36th anniversary of the innocence and the 20th anniversary of the misguided zeal. The Natural Gas Act of 1938 and a Supreme Court decision of June 7, 1954, have combined to hold natural gas prices artificially low, presumably for the benefit of consumers, and have thus encouraged the country to depend heavily on a fuel which is so limited in supply that we may run out within the lifetime of half the population.

The Natural Gas Act was sought by state utility commissions, back in the New Deal days, as a means of controlling the price of gas piped into their jurisdictions from out-of-state. Natural gas was then a little used fuel, much of which was burned off by oil producers as waste. It had no great constituency either of producers or of consumers. The bill was sponsored by Democrats and actively backed by Rep. Charles A. Halleck, the Republican majority leader of the House. It was so uncontroversial that when Sen. Robert J. Bulkley of Ohio asked to bring it up for the Senate vote on June 7, 1938, after it had been approved by the House, the following exchange took place between him and the acting president, Sen. Joseph C. O'Mahoney:

Sen. O'Mahoney: The bill is not of controversial nature, is it?

Sen. Bulkley: No.

Sen. O'Mahoney: And its passage may be expected in a reasonably short time?

Sen. Bulkley: I think it should be passed within a few minutes.

It was promptly and easily passed and received almost no public attention. It gave the federal government the power to regulate the price of natural gas sold to the pipeline companies for transportation across state lines. It specifically excluded regulation involving "the production or gathering of natural gas."

By the late 1940s, natural gas had become so popular a fuel that liberal politicians began to make an issue of low prices. The Federal Power Commission had not been militant enough to suit them. When Wisconsin sought to regulate prices in apparent violation of the 1938 act, the Phillips Petroleum Co. carried the case to the Supreme Court and lost.

Justice Sherman Minton, a liberal Truman appointee, wrote the majority decision holding that the primary purpose of the 1938 act was the "protection of consumers" and that Congress therefore intended the act to cover independent producers, despite the specific exclusion in the act.

Ironically, the FCC had never wanted this power and indeed warned of the confusion it could create. Even liberal Justice William O. Douglas dissented from the 5 to 3 decision on the ground that "regulation of the business of producing and gathering natural gas involves consideration of which we know little, and with which we are not competent to deal."

Repeated efforts to remove this "well-head" regulations of gas prices thru Congressional action have aroused liberals from Wayne Morse of Oregon to Mayor Robert Wagner of New York to demagogic oratory, and have failed. The one such bill that got thru Congress was vetoed by President Eisenhower, tho he endorsed its purpose, because of "arrogant" tactics by oil and gas company lobbyists.

And so it is that natural gas, with its arbitrarily low prices and other attractions, has become our leading source of energy for industrial, commercial, and residential use. Meanwhile the low prices caused exploratory drilling to drop by more than 50 per cent between 1956 and 1970.

Had the producers been able to set prices on the basis of free competition [there are more than 2,000 of them], prices would have risen steadily as costs rose; the demand for natural gas would have been less; there would have been an earlier incentive to develop uranium and new ways of using coal; and we would not have been caught as short as we are today. The story of natural gas is worth remembering, because it teaches us that misguided efforts to appeal to consumers by holding down prices can do far more damage to the country than good—and the implications of this go far beyond natural gas.

TYRANNY STILL EXISTS IN CHILE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am taking a few moments today to remind my colleagues that brutality and torture are still being applied by the junta in Chile. By emphasizing this state of affairs, I leave no room for the excuse of ignorance when various nations and peoples of the world question this Congress' lack of commitment in the international fight for human rights in Chile.

There are a few Members that have become involved in this unending struggle to help the Chilean citizens, and I commend their efforts. I only wish the number was larger.

Everett Martin, staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal, has drawn attention to the Chilean junta's extensive use of repressive measures. I am submitting his article to be printed in the RECORD so that all of my respected colleagues might acquaint themselves with its contents.

CONTINUING REPRESSION REPELS MANY IN CHILE WHO BACKED THE COUP, BUT ON THE BRIGHTER SIDE, MOST FACTORIES FUNCTION, SHORTAGES HAVE EASED—ARE THE PARTIES NECESSARY?

(By Everett G. Martin)

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—There is little doubt that most Chileans welcomed the armed forces' overthrow of the Marxist government of President Salvador Allende last September. But now, after more than half a year of stern rule by a four-man military junta—and with no end in sight—many aren't sure they like what's going on.

They are especially worried by the junta's continued use of repressive tactics to head off any threat, whether real or imagined, against law and order. Almost anyone can be denounced anonymously and disappear without his relatives having any idea where he has been taken. There have been cases of torture. Estimates of the number of political prisoners being held without charges range as high as 6,000.

Besides the arrests, some 38,000 workers are reported to have been fired from their jobs in government and industry, on the ground that they were active supporters of Dr. Allende. A low-ranking labor leader, who

opposed the Marxists, argues that the time has come to forgive these people.

"Those who were fired can't find jobs," he says. "They are being demolished. It was, after all, legitimate to support the former government, but now they are being persecuted and hunted for it. It isn't fair. They acted in good faith."

A NUMBER OF FLUSES

Still, Chileans like many aspects of the regime. They welcome the public calm enforced by the strict military discipline after three years of escalating violence under the Marxists. They also welcome these developments.

Government services are functioning again; most factories are operating normally; severe shortages of basic necessities have ended; the black market has dried up; public-housing construction is going ahead again, schoolchildren are getting free breakfasts and lunches as part of a drive to improve nutrition for the poor.

Chileans don't like the inflation—prices went up 57% in the first quarter—but it is recognized that the inflation was inherited from Dr. Allende, and people don't expect the junta to end it overnight. At least it's being slowed down.

Opinions are mixed about the junta's having put all political parties, even those opposed to the Marxists, in indefinite limbo, a measure designed to end Chile's traditionally heated political wrangling over every issue. Wives of copper miners cheered army Gen. Augusto Pinochet, junta president, when he told them to "erase from your minds the idea of elections."

THE MAIN CONCERN

But it is the repression that most disturbs Chileans at all levels. Where genuine Marxist extremists are concerned, the junta probably does have a security problem. During the Allende regime, a quantity of weapons was apparently smuggled into the country to arm leftist extremists. Almost weekly, intelligence agents report uncovering another small cache of them. Moreover, pro-Allende Chileans who fled the country after the coup are openly soliciting funds to finance a guerrilla campaign in Chile.

Recently a series of forest fires—started, according to the authorities, with gasoline—threatened the port city of Valparaiso. A small bomb was exploded on the docks there, and there have been numerous other suspicious fires in the city.

One youthful extremist, who is still in hiding, told a relative he secretly visited that his organization was planning political kidnappings like those committed by Argentine terrorists. Such talk may be futile blustering, but the junta does worry about national security. Any kind of terrorist outbreak would, for one thing, hurt the junta's efforts to attract foreign investors to spur Chile's economic growth. In a recent speech, Gen. Pinochet declared:

"If the submerged elements try to rise against our people, we will not hesitate to react with drastic means. Until we have caught them all, I will not lift the military measures."

AN ARRAY OF ZEALOTS

A bewildering array of six different intelligence groups is busy chasing down suspected terrorists with frightening zeal. There is an intelligence service in each of the three branches of the armed forces, one in the police, a joint organization and, finally, a new superagency.

One man, a political commentator during the Allende years, was seized by army intelligence, was interrogated for days and then was sent home with written instructions to consider himself under house arrest and responsible to the army. Soon afterward, members of the air force broke in on him. Ignoring his army documents, they held him

for several days trying to torture information out of him. When they released him, by then a broken man, he took asylum in a foreign embassy.

Most cases of brutality and torture seem to lead back to the air force, although no one knows if the perpetrators are acting as members of air force intelligence or as members of the new superagency. There have been cases of army commanders intervening to get detainees out of the hands of air force agents—an indication that the armed forces themselves may be divided over the use of such extreme methods.

The number of political prisoners being held without charges fluctuates, of course, as some are released and others picked up. A group of Santiago lawyers who protested the situation in a private letter to the junta were soundly denounced as being "unpatriotic," but such protests may have had an impact: Since then, a group of air-force officers charged with having been pro-Allende and anti-air-force before the coup have been represented by outspoken defense lawyers during their trial, and the trial was open to invited foreign observers; likewise, imprisoned former officials of the Allende government have been scheduled for early public trials, also with defense lawyers representing them and with invited foreign observers on hand.

Although most detainees are eventually released, one college professor expresses a widespread sentiment when he says, "We don't like this feeling of being unprotected against arrests. Lots of mistakes are being made."

While the rate of arrests has slowed down measurably since the first weeks after the coup, the junta has developed a new concern that, to many Chileans, borders on paranoia. The military leaders now appear to be zeroing in on a new class of so-called enemies that seems to include anyone who is critical of them.

The rector of a university in Valparaiso was sacked recently for being "anti-junta." The head of the Catholic University television station and several members of his staff, all of whom were leaders in the fight against the Marxists, were also fired, and it is presumed that they, too, had "anti-junta" tendencies. Meanwhile, Gen. Pinochet has issued a dark warning that many civil servants are also going to go.

"These people pretend to be cooperating," he said, "but according to information that we have, in reality they are not cooperating. They always say yes to you, but when the moment comes to act they move slowly, they mislay documents, they change a word or a comma. They may comply with an order, but privately they talk against it."

It isn't entirely a coincidence that most of "these people" happen to be Christian Democrats. Relations between the military and the Christian Democrats have never been good. When the Christian Democrats were in power during the administration of President Eduardo Frei, just before the Allende government, they ignored the military men or treated them with disdain until one army unit staged a revolt in its barracks to demand higher pay. As one party member explains it, "The Christian Democrats regard the military as a bunch of fools, and the military regards the politicians as a * * *

Except for its left wing, however, the party supported the coup as the only way to stop the Marxists. Observers point out, though, that many of the party leaders expected the military to turn the government over to them after a short caretaker period.

THEY MEAN TO STAY

Now the military has made it clear that it intends to stay and make sweeping changes. "Some politicians," Gen. Pinochet said in a major speech last month, "initially took a favorable attitude toward the government,

but they thought when the armed forces took action to liberate Chile that the conduct of the state would be returned to them in a short time. Today they react antagonistically because they realize, that they were wrong, and I ask myself, 'Are they patriots or mercenaries?'

The politicians, he implies, are responsible for demagoguery. "It is necessary to eliminate demagoguery, the principal sickness of Chile," he says. "From it has come the sectarianism which divides and the inefficiency which impedes progress and justice. This sickness is not only from the past three years. It is much older than that."

Gen. Pinochet's barely disguised attacks on the Christian Democrats go down well with many conservative Chileans who blame the liberal Frei government for opening the door for the Marxists with its land-reform program and other measures.

Christian Democrats, whose adherents make up a substantial portion of the middle class, rankle at having no voice in governmental affairs and at the pointed criticism they are taking. They retort with some sharp barbs of their own. "The junta should recognize," says one party member, "that the political parties fought the Marxists for three years while the military were the right hand of Allende. They were in opposition one day. They shouldn't look down on people who were fighting for three years."

THE SILVER BRIDGE

One of the most outspoken critics of the Christian Democrats is the government's chief press spokesman, Alvaro Puga. To a request for an explanation of the junta's opinion of the party, he replies: "Before Allende the Christian Democrats paved the road for the Marxists because they began to talk—in the style of Henry Kissinger—of a dialogue with the Marxists. They talked of communism instead of communism, but people without perception believed that they were both equal within democracy."

He adds, "During Allende, they were a moderating element between the Marxists who wanted dictatorship and the rightists who wanted to overthrow the Marxists. They were the silver bridge—beautiful but weak—between the Marxists and the democrats."

The 44-year-old Mr. Puga came to prominence during the Allende regime, delivering biting criticism of the Marxists over the radio and in a newspaper column written under the pen name "Alexis." No one can quite explain how he rose to such an influential position in the junta, but he is one of a group of puritanical young Roman Catholic ultraconservatives who seem to play a significant role in outlining the public philosophy of the junta. This group is known for its dislike of the Christian Democrats.

Mr. Puga's statements cause dismay in other branches of the government. A foreign-ministry official, for example, winced when he heard of Mr. Puga's reference to Mr. Kissinger. "How can he say such things?" the official said. "We are rather pleased with Mr. Kissinger."

Mr. Puga outlines a form of government for Chile where the only elections would be in neighborhood organizations and professional and labor groups. These grass-roots organizations would transmit their needs to the local mayor, who would tell the governor, who would get in touch with the junta. There doesn't seem to be any room in the system for national political parties, and Mr. Puga says:

"We want to make a mechanism where it is not necessary to have political parties to have a position on a question."

It was Mr. Puga who ordered the Christian

Democrats' radio network closed for six days because of broadcasts commenting unfavorably on the state of human rights in Chile. Soon thereafter, the archbishops of Chile issued a call for reconciliation. It said:

"For love of our fatherland, we must contribute to re-establishing a harmonious atmosphere in which all Chileans can live and be brothers . . . the basic condition for living together peacefully is the establishment of a state of law in which the constitution and the law will be a guarantee for everyone."

This Nation was born out of a successful battle against a tyrannical ruler, King George of England:

There is no week nor day nor hour when tyranny may not enter upon this country, if the people lose their supreme confidence in themselves—and lose their roughness and spirit of defiance—Tyranny may always enter—there is no charm, no bar against it—the only bar against it is a large resolute breed of men.—Walt Whitman

It is now the Chileans that are facing a rule that is more repressive and brutal than any we have personally experienced. They need our help.

DISINTERMENT OF BODY OF JOHN "JEREMIAH" JOHNSON

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1974

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of my colleagues are aware of the recent publicity and fanfare surrounding the Veterans' Administration's action in granting permission for the removal of the body of John "Jeremiah" Johnson, a Union soldier in the Civil War, from a national cemetery where he had been interred for more than 70 years to a private cemetery in Wyoming. The agency's unprecedented action prompted strong criticism from National Veterans Organizations and others who feel such action is warranted only when unusual circumstances are involved.

Many of us are concerned about the action taken by the Veterans' Administration and I take this time to inform the House that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is looking into the matter to determine whether there has been any violation by the agency in approving the disinterment of the body of John "Jeremiah" Johnson, and to reevaluate present regulations and criteria governing such action.

I call to the attention of my colleagues a communication our committee recently received from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., June 14, 1974.

HON. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DORN: The Veterans of Foreign Wars has noted with much sadness and

regret the approval by the Veterans Administration of the removal of the body of a deceased veteran from a National Cemetery to a private cemetery.

The V.F.W. holds that when a veteran is buried in a National Cemetery his body should not be disturbed except for good and substantial reasons. A petition to disinter a veteran's body by a descendant of a veteran should not necessarily be the determining factor, especially in those cases where a veteran has already been laid to rest.

Before the VA decides to remove and reinter a deceased veteran, every consideration should be given to all those promptings and emotions that men and women hold sacred in the disposition of the dead.

Any petition to remove a veteran from a National Cemetery, to be successful, must show good cause, urgent necessity, and unusual circumstances. There must be a showing of a rare emergency to move a veteran's body from the hallowed ground of a National Cemetery to a private cemetery.

Pursuant to these principles, the V.F.W. expressed disgust regarding the recent removal of a veteran of the Civil War, who had been interred in a National Cemetery for over 70 years. The removal of this veteran does not meet any of the requirements which have been developed over the years regarding the disinterment of bodies from National Cemeteries. The whole affair has left a stench in the nostrils of the veterans of the nation.

Here's what the V.F.W. stated regarding the approval of the VA to remove the body of John (Jeremiah) Johnson, a Union soldier in the Civil War, whose body was disinterred in 1974 and reburied in a cemetery in Wyoming.

Too, this is the same Johnson now being hailed as Jeremiah Johnson in a movie being shown throughout the nation. The V.F.W. statement regarding this when it was about to take place is as follows:

"Veterans and their families everywhere deplore the recent unprecedented action taken by the graverobbers at the Veterans Administration which permitted the removal of the body of John (Jeremiah) Johnson from his grave without permission. It has come to the attention of the V.F.W. that the VA removed the body of Civil War Veteran Johnson from his place of rest in the Los Angeles VA Cemetery and are planning to rebury him in Cody, Wyoming. It appears that attention has been drawn to this veteran by the release of a recent motion picture and the V.F.W. can only draw the inference that the removal was to publicize the picture or to encourage tourist travel. The reasoning of VA involvement escapes us, but with precedent such as this, no veteran remains safe in his grave. It is now possible for the VA to move, without permission, privates, generals or ex-Presidents simply because no relatives are living?"

Mr. Chairman, the VA was given the responsibility of operating the National Cemetery System by the Congress just a short time ago. There has been no action taken by the VA which could be described as distinguishing itself in its new responsibility regarding cemeteries.

This Jeremiah Johnson incident merits an investigation by your Committee to make sure that the law of the land has not been violated by the VA and that similar unprecedented and distasteful actions will not be approved by the Veterans Administration without prior notice of the Congress and the Public.

With best wishes and kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.