

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GRIT WEEKLY NEWSPAPER COMMENDED BY SENATOR RANDOLPH—KEEP PRESSURE ON ENERGY SEARCH

## HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a recent national edition of the 91-year-old Grit weekly newspaper, published at and circulated very widely from Williamsport, Pa., has published an editorial: "Keep Pressure on Energy Search." It is an admonition to which I subscribe.

Mr. President, it is a brief editorial—cogent, timely, and powerful in the message it imparts.

The President of the United States has been in the Middle East where he has received welcomes in the Arabic countries. We must remember the events of last fall and winter when the United States was the principal target of the vicious oil embargo fixed on most of the free world. We must so strengthen our energy supply status that our country will not in the future be so distressed as we were by the impact of that embargo. The Grit editorial makes a strong case for domestic self-sufficiency in energy.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have the editorial "Keep Pressure on Energy Search" printed in the RECORD.

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

## KEEP PRESSURE ON ENERGY SEARCH

Although the nightmare of last winter's energy shortage is past, there is no sure knowledge that it won't return. Americans who think otherwise are out of touch with reality.

So long as the United States is dependent on Arab oil, it is subject to sudden shortages beyond its control. Both the individual citizen and his elected representatives must work harder to hasten the day when that possibility no longer threatens us.

Motorists, for example, can continue to conserve gasoline and oil. Families can continue to conserve electricity. Drive less than last year and drive within reduced speed limits. Keep the air-conditioner turned off when not needed and not set lower than necessary when it must be on. Less and slower driving means fewer highway deaths. Conservation generally keeps more money in your pocket.

As citizens do their part, the President and the congress also must move forward effectively. It is time to put personal executive-legislative disputes aside and more energetically encourage the search for new energy sources and development of existing ones.

President Nixon's goal of a United States self-sufficient in energy by 1980 is a worthy one. We urge private enterprise at every level to back it with enterprising action. Only by effective initiative by the private sector can the challenge be met without massive federal involvement. Here is an opportunity for free enterprise to show its productive genius.

## OVERLOOKING OUR NO. 1 NEIGHBOR

## HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to Adolph W. Schmidt, former U.S. Ambassador to Canada, for a very timely and important warning of the need of keeping our relations with our neighbor to the north in "good repair."

Mr. Schmidt retired as Ambassador at his own request on last February 28, after serving since 1969. He is a resident of my part of Pennsylvania, having been brought up in McKeesport, Pa., and later moving to Pittsburgh where he is a community leader.

Mr. Schmidt's career in Canada was a successful one. He did his homework and the result was a full and friendly acceptance of him by Canadians all across that broad land. No one, in my estimation, is better informed on United States-Canadian relationships or, indeed, of the need of having them improved.

On his return to Pittsburgh, Mr. Schmidt wrote a searching article for the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. It contains much pertinent information on our ties with Canada and also his judgment on what is lacking now between our countries and what must be done to fill the breach.

First of all, Canada, according to the former Ambassador, is by far our best trading partner. He writes:

Few U.S. citizens realize that U.S. trade with Canada at a level of \$35 billion a year is greater than U.S. trade with the entire European Community (including Great Britain), or that this trade is almost as great as our total trade with Asia and Africa combined (and Asia includes Japan).

I agree with Mr. Schmidt that few U.S. citizens have been aware of these trade facts, or, in truth, that many of us in Congress have them firmly in mind. And the fault, I believe, is in a Washington absorption with Asia and Europe and a seeming willingness to take Canada for granted.

The last three decades have seen our national administration involved up to their eyeballs in the troubles of Europe and Asia. Little time diplomatically has been spent on matters here on this continent. The newspapers and airwaves have been filled daily with reports from overseas. Meanwhile, Canada has received minimal attention. And it is this situation which troubles Mr. Schmidt. I quote him further:

In general, Canadians know much more about the United States than Americans know about Canada. Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver and border communities are bombarded with U.S. television. Canadians read our major newspapers and magazines avidly. Contrariwise, there is little news of Canada in our newspapers and magazines. Because of our preoccupation with many other areas of the world, most of which are liabilities,

Canadians continue to be neighbors taken for granted.

And, yet, as Mr. Schmidt points out, our future is wrapped up so completely with Canada that such neglect could be disastrous. Canada supplies us with gas and oil. She is a land filled with minerals. With our own raw materials facing exhaustion, Canadian sources become more and more important to us. Surely, our mutual interests, trade and otherwise, demand a closeness and an understanding of each other which do not exist now.

It is time, in other words, that we bring the focus of our attention back to this continent in the right conclusion that, regardless of circumstances elsewhere, our destiny lies here. Canada must be kept not only a good neighbor, but a fully cooperating one. She must be disabused of any notion that we fail to appreciate her value to us. We have to ask, too, that she accept us as a neighbor who considers her No. 1 on our block.

Mr. Schmidt sums it up this way:

From our side, it would behoove us to keep our relations in good repair by paying a lot more attention to our neighbor to the North, by improving our image in the world with a return to some of the virtues that built greatness in America, and by treating with tact, justice, and respect one of our best friends and assets in the world.

This is a large order, certainly. But I agree wholeheartedly with former Ambassador Schmidt that it must be filled. We have been world-minded to the point of forgetting our primary interests on this continent and in this hemisphere. We need a change of concern, and I am grateful to Mr. Schmidt for having promoted this idea while representing us in Canada and now for bringing it to public notice here at home. He and other U.S. friends of Canada have a big job to do and I, as a Congressman, pledge them my support.

## ACTIONS TO COPE WITH OUR DRINKING DRIVING PROBLEM

## HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my fellow Members of this body a very informative discussion of the problem of drinking drivers and highway accidents written by Iowa State Senator William Plymat. It contains some valuable suggestions for steps that might be taken to deal with the continuing carnage on our streets and highways caused by misuse of alcohol. In addition to information from national and foreign sources, Senator Plymat presents some extremely valuable data from the experiences of his home State of Iowa which certainly are pertinent to the rest of our country.

The article follows:

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 20, 1974

ACTIONS TO COPE WITH OUR DRINKING DRIVING PROBLEM  
(By Iowa State Senator William N. Plymat, Sr.<sup>1</sup>)

In my state in a recent three-year period (1970-1972 inclusive), 826 people lost their lives in alcohol-related fatal traffic accidents. In December 1972 a local newspaper reported that 807 Iowans lost their lives in the entire period of the Vietnam war, with 16 prisoners of war and 23 missing in action.

It seems that while the public was rightfully concerned about our war death toll, it has been, and continues to be, relatively unconcerned about the high death toll from alcohol-related fatal traffic accidents. This contrast indicates the size and importance of our alcohol traffic problem. It is often claimed that 50% of our total death toll in American traffic accidents involves alcohol. In my state, the official statistics, which always under-report the true picture, tell us that in 1971 alcohol-related fatal accidents accounted for about 34% of total fatal accidents and around 35% of total fatalities.

The official report for 1972 included the following statement: "Out of 719 fatal motor vehicle traffic accidents in Iowa in 1972, 210 or 29.2 percent were alcohol related, resulting in the death of 252 persons. This is about one of every 3.4 fatal accidents in the State of Iowa which are alcohol related." The report for the year 1973 shows a similar situation as indicated by a table shown with this article. In 1974 the same general situation continues as shown by another table. Total accidents and fatalities are down due to the energy crisis, reduced speed, reduced travel, because of higher gasoline prices, and other factors. But the alcohol percentage, as you will note from a study of the tables, remains about the same.

The foregoing, which I am sure is very similar to conditions in other states, indicates that we are not justified in dropping our interest in the alcohol traffic problem because of a reduction of total accidents and fatalities on our highways.

## ACTIONS IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Constructive actions to cope with alcohol traffic problems are taking place in Europe. Now in Germany, any driver caught with more than 0.08 percent alcohol in his bloodstream is automatically subject to fines up to \$1,250 and suspension of his or her driver's license for up to three months. In the Netherlands, the Queen will sign a bill to impose a 0.05 percent limit as soon as the police are technically ready to enforce the alcohol test. The government had proposed a 0.08 percent limit, but Parliament toughened the legislation. France adopted the 0.08 percent test in 1970; Britain in 1967. Austria, Switzerland, Luxembourg, and Denmark also have this limit. Sweden and Norway are even tougher with a 0.05 percent test. The Communist countries tend to be still stricter. For instance, Poland has a 0.02 percent limit; Czechoslovakia, 0.03 percent; and the Soviet Union and East Germany, zero percent—no alcohol allowed for drivers.

## U.S. ACTIONS

Efforts are being made in the United States to direct alcoholics involved in traffic arrests and accidents into rehabilitation facilities. These actions are constructive. Yet the emphasis appears to be on the alcoholic, sometimes referred to as the "problem drinker." In some places, those arrested for drinking driving offenses are being sent by judges to

special "schools" in place of jail and sometimes in addition to fines and sometimes in place of fines. It is perhaps too early to determine whether these "school" efforts will constitute a sizable deterrent to repeat occurrences of drinking driving offenses and accidents. We will need a year or two at least to determine whether these schools will stop repeated offenses and accidents in any substantial way. In many places these school efforts have only recently begun.

## ALCOHOLICS AND SOCIAL DRINKERS AS OFFENDERS

While many who claim to be experts contend that the drinking driving problem involves mostly alcoholics, others, such as Judge Raymond K. Berg, who served as chief traffic judge in Chicago, point out that a detailed study in that city indicated 80% of the offenders were social drinkers. In addition, Judge Berg claims that an intensified enforcement drive with threats of jail sentences and loss of driving privileges resulted in a marked reduction in alcohol accidents in that city while the rest of Illinois without such a program was showing increases.

The Federal Department of Transportation has mounted special intensive action programs in a sizable number of United States cities. Undoubtedly, much of this effort is constructive, especially in getting alcoholics into rehabilitation programs. Stepped-up arrest programs have resulted in some citizen resistance to the programs and undoubtedly has disturbed many an operator of taverns and cocktail lounges.

But the basic problem in enforcement still resides in the inability to convict the guilty due to the state of the law in most jurisdictions. If motorists could come to believe that if arrested while under the influence they would face conviction as a high probability we would have effective deterrence in operation. As long as most can believe that they can beat the charge in most instances unless real drunk at the time we will not have the needed deterrence. Many years ago, the offense in speed in my state was driving at an "unreasonable speed." Enforcement was extremely difficult under such a vague standard because a defendant would assert that his speed was reasonable under existing traffic, weather, and other conditions even if he was driving at a relatively high rate of speed. We did not manage to bring the speeding problem under reasonable control until we set a speed limit in miles per hour. When we did this, enforcement officials were able to use radar and speedometers to clock speed of offenders, and about all a violator could do in most cases was to plead guilty. We have obtained reasonable deterrence with speed.

## LAW CHANGES THAT ARE NEEDED

What we desperately need is to set a "speed limit" on drinking when one drives. Today our law in most places involves a vague standard of law violation—in essence, we are saying one should not drive with an "unreasonable amount" of alcohol. We define this in terms of *presumptions* of alcohol readings in excess of 0.10% in most places, but these can be rebutted by testimony by a driver that he had only "two beers" and was in good control of himself. Under such standards, convictions are often rare, and we do not have real deterrence.

We need to set a positive limit in terms of blood-alcohol readings. The needed action was contained in a bill which I introduced in the Iowa State Senate in 1973 with ten cosponsors. A companion bill was introduced in the Iowa House. The main provisions of the bill would: (Senate File 318)

(1) Give peace officers authority to request a person believed to be operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of an al-

coholic beverage to take a breath test (or other chemical test) without placing the person under arrest;

(2) Make it illegal *per se* to operate a motor vehicle with a BAC (blood alcohol concentration) of .10% or more;

(3) Establish a lesser offense (driving while impaired) for operating a motor vehicle with a BAC in the range of .05% to .09%;

(4) Make mandatory a two-day jail sentence for drivers convicted of first offense DWUI (driving while under the influence) or with a BAC of .10% or more.

This proposal met with the approval of Marvin H. Wagner, Legislative and Judicial Coordinator of the Office of Alcohol Countermeasures, Traffic Safety Programs of the U.S. Department of Transportation, who said: (in a letter to the author)

"It (the bill) contains most of the new legislative concepts that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is recommending in the alcohol and highway safety area . . . let me congratulate you on a fine bill and one which this Administration would strongly support and endorse."

The Iowa Department of Public Safety made some minor suggestions to improve the bill, and then Michael M. Sellers, the Commissioner of Public Safety in Iowa in 1973, said:

"It is quite apparent that passage of your bill with our recommended changes could have a significant impact on Iowa's alcohol-related fatality toll, and for that reason the Department of Public Safety is in a position to strongly support and endorse your proposal."

In 1974, the new Commissioner of Public Safety, Charles W. Larson, also endorsed the bill, saying: (in a letter to the author)

"This Department believes that this proposed legislation will be a valuable tool in our efforts to curb highway deaths caused by drunken drivers."

Mr. Larson then called attention to an article in the November 1970 issue of Highway User which summarized the European laws concerning operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol. Mr. Larson then said:

"I concur with the author of the article when he states that, 'The Europeans regard the U.S. as a "Johnny-come-lately" in drunk driving legislation and believe our fantastically high percentage of alcohol-related motor vehicle accidents is the price we are paying for our indifference.'"

## THE INACTION OF THE IOWA LEGISLATURE

In the 1973 session, the Iowa Senate Judiciary Committee took no action on the bill. Then a joint Senate-House interim study committee was appointed to study, during the summer of 1973, the problem of traffic fatalities in Iowa and to recommend legislation. And I was appointed vice chairman of that committee. This committee endorsed this bill by a vote of 9 to 0. We were encouraged to believe that the total support for this effective legislation would cause the Senate and House Judiciary Committee to study and report the bill out for action with recommendation to pass. But unfortunately, this did not come to pass in the 1974 session, which is one normally considered the "short session." We are hopeful that this legislation will finally come before the Iowa Legislature in the 1975 session.

This inaction of the Iowa Legislature is another indication of the general unwillingness of legislators to face up to passing bills which will really cope with the alcohol traffic problem. There are many claimed explanations of this. Some feel that it relates to the fact that many legislators are fearful of passing legislation which may meet with

<sup>1</sup> Chairman of the Board, Preferred Risk Mutual Insurance Company, West Des Moines, Iowa.

strong objection from many members of the social drinking public who do in many cases drive after drinking. And perhaps in some hopefully rare instances legislators may be in that group themselves.

## TACTICS MAY BE IMPORTANT

It may well be that this writer made a tactical error in presenting what might be considered the "whole package" in a bill. Perhaps the wiser course might be to introduce a short, simple bill simply setting up a per se standard of 0.10% BAC for the general offense of driving under the influence and then if and when the bill reaches the floor offer the rest of the additional provisions by a series of amendments which could be adopted piecemeal. This may well be this legislator's tactic for 1975, and in turn it may be the tactic which other legislators might wish to follow.

## ANOTHER POSSIBLE BUT UNLIKELY ATTACK ON THE PROBLEM

A rather famous advertising expert once said it was unwise to ask a man "if," but rather one should ask "which." When confronted with such a choice, many a person will simply choose one of two options. Perhaps following this advice we might well suggest that legislators vote to close bars and cocktail lounges (and in general stop the sale of alcohol) at 10 p.m. rather than the now usual closing hours, which may often be till 2 a.m. or even later. You will note with this article a chart which shows when the alcohol-related fatal accidents occurred in Iowa during the three-year period of 1970-1972 in-

clusive. During those years there was no sale of alcohol on Sunday in Iowa. You will observe the very low totals of alcohol-related fatal accidents in the period of 9 p.m. to midnight Sunday night and midnight to 3 a.m. Monday morning and the very high totals on Friday and Saturday nights from 9 p.m. to 3 a.m. the following mornings. It appears that 29% of our alcohol-related traffic deaths in Iowa occur on Friday and Saturday nights and the early hours of the following days. And over half occurred during those same hours during the entire week. If we could make the "sacrifice" of closing the bars at 9 p.m. or 10 p.m., we might well shut off a large number of fatal traffic accidents.

Faced with such a choice in legislative proposals, it may well be that some might choose the "hours of sale" approach to the problem with a minimum of change in the drinking driving laws (perhaps only the 0.10% per se provision), and others might want to go the route of leaving the hours of sale as they are now but focusing on the problem by complete and comprehensive legislative action as provided by the Iowa bill, S.F. 318, as described above.

In any event, how can concerned citizens continue to tolerate the heavy and needless toll of injury, death, and property damage now occurring on our streets and highways due to our alcohol traffic problem? Daily we read of the death and injury of innocent people killed by drinking drivers, and we are reminded of the old saying that in taking effective action the life we may save might well be our own or that of a loved one.

## IOWA—1973 AND 1974

Month	Alcohol-related fatal accidents						Alcohol-related fatalities					
	1973			1974			1973			1974		
	Number alcohol-related fatal accidents	Total fatal accidents	Percent of fatal accidents	Number alcohol-related fatal accidents	Total fatal accidents	Percent of fatal accidents	Number alcohol-related fatalities	Total fatalities	Percent of total fatalities	Number alcohol-related fatalities	Total fatalities	Percent of total fatalities
January	10	43	23.2	10	37	27.0	11	50	22.0	12	40	30.0
February	14	40	35.0	14	40	35.0	16	48	33.3	14	46	30.4
March	21	49	42.8	12	35	34.8	25	60	41.7	15	41	36.6
April	15	55	27.3	13	42	31.0	17	67	25.4	15	48	31.2
May	23	66	34.8	11	31	35.5	29	79	36.7	19	40	47.5
Total	83	253	32.8	60	185	32.4	98	304	32.2	75	215	34.9

## IOWA ALCOHOL-RELATED FATAL ACCIDENTS BY TIME OF DAY BY DAY OF WEEK—A COMPOSITE FOR THE YEARS 1970, 1971, AND 1972

Time of day	Total		Day of week—						
	Number	Percent	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
12 to 2:59 a.m.	184	27.7	58	2	12	13	21	23	55
3:59 a.m.	73	11.0	16	2	8	7	8	10	22
8:59 a.m.	19	2.9	3	1	3	1	2	4	5
9 to 11:59 a.m.	12	1.8	3	1	0	2	1	2	3
12 to 2:59 p.m.	37	5.6	6	2	6	2	3	4	14
3 to 5:59 p.m.	65	9.8	5	6	4	13	7	8	22
6 to 8:59 p.m.	104	15.6	9	18	8	11	11	19	28
9 to 11:59 p.m.	167	25.1	9	19	15	19	22	45	38
Not stated	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total	665	100	110	51	56	69	76	115	188
Percent distribution			16.5	7.7	8.4	10.4	11.4	17.3	28.3

## SOME OBSERVATIONS

(1) 9 P.M. to 3 A.M. of each day of the week total 351 out of 665 fatal alcohol related accidents or 52.8%.

(2) 9 P.M. Friday night to 3 A.M. Saturday morning, plus 9 P.M. Saturday night to 3 A.M. Sunday morning, account for 196 out of 665 fatal alcohol related accidents or 29.5%.

(3) Sunday night from 9 P.M. to midnight accounts for only 9 fatal alcohol related accidents, and every other 9 P.M. to midnight

period of the week has at least double that amount, rising during the week to a peak of 45 on Friday nights.

(4) Monday morning from midnight to 3 A.M. in this three year period had only 2 fatal alcohol related accidents, the lowest of the week for that period of time in marked contrast to every other such period during the week, with Saturday and Sunday mornings from midnight to 3 A.M. with totals of 55 and 58 respectively of such alcohol related accidents.

## BEEF PRICES, PRODUCTION COSTS, AND PROFITS

## HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, while cattle prices have dropped 23 percent in the

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 20, 1974

past 6 months and hog prices have fallen even more drastically, 45 percent, this is other bad news our meat producers face. Hurting even more, are the prices the producers must pay for all their inputs.

Using the same years on which parity is figured as a base of 100, feed today is 366, feeder livestock 564, trucks and tractors 734, farm machinery 712, building materials 707, seed 548, interest 974, taxes 1,461, and wage rates 1,467.

While staggering under these overburdening costs of production, the producer still feeds our people at the lowest percentage of income of any country in the world.

And while he is doing that, the meatpackers, the grocery chains, and other middlemen are reaping record profits.

Published reports by the meat companies show that the Missouri Meat Packers had a net income increase per share of 253.7 percent, United Brands, 139.4 percent; Hormel & Co., 107.7 percent; Spencer Foods, 104.3 percent; and Swift & Co., 63.5 percent. These are increases in the past year.

I am tired of having the producer blamed for our high over-the-counter food prices. I am tired of seeing retaliatory measures, such as dropping meat import quotas, aimed against him and millions of dollars of losses, while not a word is said about the high profit barons whose excessive markups are the real villains of high food prices.

## GRADUATION—THE END AND THE BEGINNING

## HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I acknowledge the accomplishments of Miss Victoria Peet upon her graduation from Graham-Eckes High School in Palm Beach, Fla. I congratulate the Peet family on this happy occasion and commend them for their efforts and successes. As a tribute to Victoria and to her family, I believe we can all gain from reading the inspirational message included in Vicki's valedictorian speech, delivered on June 1, 1974, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

VALEDICTORY SPEECH  
(By Victoria Peet)

Dr. Flynn, Mr. Benjamin, Faculty, Students, and Guests, Good Evening.

Graduation from high school is both a sad and joyous time in one's life. It marks the end of childhood education, and the beginning of a future as an adult. Graduation brings with it tears as one recalls happy times spent in high school and excitement as one looks ahead to what the future may bring. Perhaps, as one thinks about the future, he may feel doubtful that he will be ready to accept new responsibilities and a new way of life. These feelings seize each of us at one time or another, and, as it is said, are a part of growing up. They may be helpful or hazardous, depending on what one feels within himself. If he believes that he can overcome any obstacle that may stand in the way of obtaining his dream, these

feelings will help him to realize that the road to success is not always easy. However, if he feels incapable of handling obstacles, he will be defeated in his quest for his dream.

When reaching for your dreams, believe in yourself and your ability. That way, no one can discourage you from obtaining your goals. Have trust in yourself and be your own best friend, for then you can always be certain that what you are doing is right for you. Listen to the opinions of others, but formulate your own ideas. Cherish your friends for they are often a source of strength and encouragement. Always be prepared to learn, for through learning we grow. And, most important, be yourself. Each of us has something to offer, so keep your individuality and appreciate that of others.

## STATEMENT OF ALEX BARNO, M.D., BEFORE THE SENATE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

## HON. BOB BERGLAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Speaker, in an expression of our own personal values we often speak only from emotion. Nothing has become more emotional than questions concerning the rights of the unborn and in our debates we have frequently forgotten or ignored the voice of those who speak from knowledge as well as emotion.

My attention has recently been called to the remarks of Dr. Alex Barro before the Senate subcommittee studying possible constitutional amendments to reverse the Supreme Court decision on abortion. Dr. Barro speaks not only from the heart but from the perspective he has gained during 28 years as a practicing obstetrician and gynecologist, a distinguished professor of obstetrics and gynecology and an active member of several professional organizations dealing with his specialty.

He speaks in favor of human life.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share Dr. Barro's statement with my colleagues for their study and consideration and insert it in the RECORD.

The article follows:

## STATEMENT OF DR. ALEX BARNO

Mr. Chairman and Members: My name is Alex Barro, M.D. I have been a physician for 30 years and an Obstetrician and Gynecologist from Minneapolis, Minnesota, for the past 28 years. I am a Clinical Professor in Obstetrics and Gynecology at the University of Minnesota School of Medicine, a past President of the Minnesota Obstetrical and Gynecological Society, a member of the Central Association of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Chairman of the Minnesota Maternal Mortality Committee of the State Medical Association, Chairman of the Committee on Obstetrics, Gynecology and Maternal Health of the State Medical Association, and a member of the Minnesota Cervical Cancer Mortality Committee. I am a non-Catholic physician.

I am here today in favor of the Human Life Amendment. These are my comments, and they do not represent in any official capacity any of the aforementioned organizations.

My presentation will be in two parts—some data from the Minnesota Mortality Study, which I believe will be of interest to you, and some general remarks.

Santayana stated that "those who do not

remember the past are condemned to repeat it." The pro-abortionists flooded the American public with scare tactics before the Supreme Court decision of January 20, 1973, claiming that 5,000 to 10,000 women were dying annually in the United States as a result of induced abortions. Statistics from the Minnesota Maternal Mortality Study suggest that these figures were grossly exaggerated. This is a Clinical Research Study sponsored by the Minnesota State Medical Association, the Minnesota State Department of Health and the Minnesota Obstetrical and Gynecological Society. It has been continuous since 1950—I have been involved with the study since its beginning. Every maternal death in the State of Minnesota is studied in detail by an OB-Gyn specialist field worker—going to the hospital, doctor's office, etc., and obtaining firsthand all the information. Final decisions are then made at periodic meetings of the Committee as a whole, consisting of 23 physicians. I have presented to you data (Tables I through IX) from this Study for a 24 year period, 1950 through 1973, regarding rates, a breakdown of the causes of death, the out-of-wedlock pregnancy situation, the induced abortions, and the suicides in pregnancy. During this 24 year period under study, 840 maternal deaths occurred in Minnesota among 1,763,702 live births. Only 31 of these deaths were induced abortion deaths or 1.3 per year—28 illegal, or 1.2 per year, two therapeutic (for medical reasons) and one legal in 1973 (Table IX). Automobile accidents (48) are killing more pregnant patients in Minnesota than induced abortions (31), or suicides (22), yet this does not create such a furor as do the other two. The pattern in our state is the same as it has been—even after the latter part of the 1960's when some states began liberalizing their abortion laws and Minnesota residents could go out of state for abortions. If the figures of 5,000 to 10,000 per year were true, Minnesota should have contributed 100 to 200 illegal abortion deaths per year, yet we had only 1.2 per year. That figure of 5,000 to 10,000 I think was picked out of a Houdini hat. Legalizing abortion doesn't have much to do with the decrease in Maternal Mortality rates. The rates were decreasing before liberalization of the abortion laws. While there seems to have been a decrease in the number of legal abortion deaths in some states such as New York, the number of legal abortion deaths has replaced those gains. There are many factors to account for this—decreases in our birth rate, better training of physicians, better hospital organization of obstetrical care, better anesthesia, availability of blood, antibiotics, better nurses, etc., etc. In our State, the Study itself was a factor—quality control, peer review, disseminating the knowledge regarding the problems and their correction—education.

As our modalities of care have improved, the medical indications for therapeutic abortion have dwindled to almost nothing. Before the Supreme Court decision of January 20, 1973, the pro-abortionists kept parroting that if we didn't abort these women, they would kill themselves. About 75-85% of the abortions were done on the basis of psychiatric indication, the principal criterion being the likelihood of suicide. Again, however, data from the Minnesota Study indicates that this fear was unfounded.

There were only 22 suicides, one per 80,168 live births, or less than one per year. Sixteen of these occurred post-partum and only six with the child in utero. Pregnant patients commit suicide about six times less frequently than non-pregnant women of the same age group. No one has ever shown that aborting a woman cures psychiatric disease. The first nine tables of data I have presented to you are an updating of a scientific paper of mine which was published in the American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology in 1967 (reprint also included for your perusal).

Some pertinent data is presented to you in Tables X, XI and XII. Had we relied on Death Certificate information alone, we would have missed 32% of the total maternal deaths and 18% of the obstetrical deaths (where pregnancy played a causative role) since pregnancy or the postpartum state was not mentioned on the death certificate. These additional deaths were discovered through Committee efforts—setting up the study in a prospective fashion. The mechanics of this is included in the Appendix. Analyzing the maternal death certificates with regard to the cause of death—we found that 19% were incorrect—there was no correlation between the cause of death listed and that determined by the Committee. So Senators, with 19% incorrect to begin with as to the cause of death, and 18% of the obstetrical deaths missed by relying on death certificate information alone, one wonders about the reliability of some of the biometric information we are being fed today. Some of this data is inaccurate because they are making calculations regarding data which is inaccurate to begin with.

Now for the second part of my presentation. The abortion issue is the most divisive issue that has ever faced Medicine. It has produced a dichotomy, a schism, a polarization of a great and honorable profession on the local, state, national and international level, especially within the discipline of Obstetrics and Gynecology—abortionists in one camp and pro-life physicians in another. Our role as physicians is to protect and preserve life. The physician is the guardian of life. We are doing heart transplants, kidney transplants, kidney dialysis, etc., etc., in order to save lives. Only in the discipline of Obstetrics and Gynecology are we asked to destroy a life. This I have done three times in 28 years, and I will do it again when the life of the mother is jeopardized, but this is indicated very, very rarely in modern day medicine. The unborn child is a life, and its rights to be born should be protected. This wanton destruction of human beings by the thousands is a debasement, a prostitution of the art and science of medicine. Dr. Sigmund Freud (the eminent psychiatrist) said, "We may suppose that the final aim of the destructive instinct is to reduce living things to an inorganic state. For this reason, we call it the death instinct." If I had to coin one word to try to express everything regarding this indecent concept, it would be this—it is a phantasmagoria.

You have been bombarded with figures that abortion on demand has decreased the infant death rate. What a paradox—the more that are destroyed, the less there will be available for the live birth status for the statistics for perinatal mortality. This is a schizophrenia. These destroyed babies should rightly be included in the statistics as iatrogenic deaths—doctor produced.

You also have been bombarded with the concept that doctor produced abortions are much safer regarding the possibility of maternal death than the "back alley abortionists." In a recent article from the *Bulletin New York Academy Medicine* 49: 804, 1973, entitled "Impact of the Liberalized Abortion Law in New York City on Deaths Associated with Pregnancy: A Two-year Experience" by Pakter, O'Hare, Helpern, and Nelson, they reported 29 maternal deaths—16 associated with legal and 13 with illegal abortions. It seems that the doctors killed more women than the so-called "back alley abortionists." 16 to 13. The professional expertise of the "back alley abortionists" seems to have been underestimated. Making abortion available to the individual does not eliminate illegal abortions. This has been shown to be true in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary.

It would seem to me, Senators, that the answer to this abortion controversy is pregnancy prevention instead of pregnancy des-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

truction. There is an old saying, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." Life is a precious commodity as those of us who have it, realize. Birth control is a reality in today's world—the "pill," the intrauterine device, the diaphragm, the contraception jellies, etc., with vasectomy in the male and tubal ligation in the female, as is desired. In closing I would like to quote Camus. This is from a publication by Greg A. Gehred, M.D., Rochester, New York. Camus said in "Letters to a German Friend": "I continue to believe that the world has no ultimate meaning. But I know that something in it has meaning, and that is man, because he is the only creature to insist on having one. This world has at least the truth of man, and our task is to provide its justification against fate itself."

"And it has no justification but man; hence he must be saved if we want to save the idea we have of life. With your scornful smile, you will ask me What do you mean by saving man? And with all my being, I shout to you that I mean not mutilating him."

If life has any intrinsic value, Senators, then abortion is just such mutilation. Thank you.

### APPENDIX

Before the study was begun, it was outlined in our state medical journal, "Minnesota Medicine." Each doctor was notified by letter. Each hospital administrator and chief of staff of every hospital in the state was also notified by letter. The cross-matching technique has been utilized. The death certificates of all women ages 15 through 45 are cross checked against any births or stillbirths . . . additional cases are discovered since pregnancy or the postpartum state was not mentioned on the death certificate. Additional cases were discovered through notification by physicians, nurses, social workers, medical students, hospital record room librarians and newspapers. In addition the State Department of Health issued a ruling to all hospitals that a maternal death should be reported within three days of occurrence.

## FEELING OUTRAGED ABOUT HIGH PRICES DOWN ON THE FARM

### HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the corporate power in the United States' food economy is only now coming to light and it appears there is good reason for further scrutiny.

Writing in the June 16, 1974, *Washington Post*, Jim Hightower, director of the agribusiness accountability project, points toward the extensive influence major food chains have over the food structure. The article follows:

#### FEELING OUTRAGED ABOUT HIGH PRICES DOWN ON THE FARM

(By Jim Hightower)

"Farmers never had it so good," declared President Nixon at a press conference in March. But have they? Certainly, farm people do not share the President's cheery outlook on the farm economy. In fact, farmers were shocked and outraged, and one national farm group considered the remark so callous as to warrant impeachment.

With the highest food and farm prices in memory, what caused farmers to bridle at the President's comment? Two things in particular.

First, farmers did not benefit most from the exorbitant food prices of 1973—the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) reports

that food middlemen continued to take nearly three-fifths of the consumer's food dollar in 1973.

Second, the President was trying to make political hay out of a temporary farm price boom that already is fizzling out—1974 does not look all that great to farmers.

Consider the first question: who profited? There can be no doubt that 1973 was a good year for farm income, especially for grain and livestock farmers. As it turns out, administration publicists were a bit overzealous in their initial claims for farm income and they had to revise their early figures downward by \$2 billion. And there is considerable doubt that all of the \$24 billion farmers supposedly earned actually ended up on the farm, since a good many corporate processors and marketers of such commodities as eggs and poultry get counted as "farmers." These quibbles aside, however, 1973 was not a bad year to have been a farmer.

But it was not the kind of year that warrants being singled out in a Presidential press conference. Even with the record income levels of 1973, farmers received only 46 cents of the consumer's food dollar. The rest went to the corporate middlemen that process, market and retail food. Nor does every farmer in America draw 46 cents every time a consumer lays down a dollar; most farmers never see that kind of ratio.

For an example, the chicken for which you pay \$1.50 pays the chicken farmer 6 cents. USDA statistics show that a can of peaches cost consumers 41 cents last year, but the peach farmer got only 7 cents of it. You spent 28 cents for a loaf of white bread, but only 4 cents trickled back to the wheat farmer. A head of lettuce cost 43 cents at the supermarket, but paid only 4 cents to the farmer.

### PROCESSORS' PROFITS UP

At a time of skyrocketing food prices and consumer disgruntlement, the President pointed to farmers, without bothering to mention that food corporations were enjoying even better times. Far from flattered, farmers felt picked on. Cattle ranchers are said to have done especially well in 1973, but none did anywhere near as well as such corporate cowboys as Iowa Beef Processors, with a 66 per cent profit increase last year, or American Beef Packers, with a 288 per cent profit increase. Food processors grumbled all last year about government price controls, but their 1973 profit figures suggest that they grumbled all the way to the bank. For example, the big canners of fruits and vegetables did much better than the farmers who grow them with such firms as Del Monte taking a 35 per cent profit increase in 1973, Campbell Soup 23 per cent and Castle & Cook (Dole) up 52 per cent.

The May 4 issue of *Business Week* offered another interesting insight into how the chips actually fell last year. In a listing of salary increases for corporate executives, the food industry was found to be very generous. Food firms and government officials are quick to point to rising labor costs as an inflationary villain and a drain on corporate profit margins, but they do not draw attention to inflationary jumps in executive salaries. In 1973, food industry workers had wage increases of 6 per cent. Up in the executive suites of food corporations, however, there was much less restraint.

Food manufacturing firms ranked ninth out of 32 industries surveyed by *Business Week*, boosting the pay of their top executives by an average of 17.7 per cent. For example, while consumers were being advised by government and industry to switch from beef to beans, Kraftco increased the salary of its board chairman from \$264,000 to \$321,000. Consumers ultimately get to pay for Kraftco's internal largesse. Grocery chain executives ranked fourth in *Business Week's* listing, taking home a 24.3 per cent pay increase. Safeway, which complained all last year that its profit margins were paper thin,

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 20, 1974

scraped up an extra \$16,000 to round off its chairman's salary at \$200,000 a year. Nothing that these corporate executives now claim to be feeling the "pinch" of inflation. Business Week reports that their pay levels can be expected "to take another big jump with the expiration of controls."

## FARM PRICES DOWN

Grocery shoppers undoubtedly are puzzled over the phenomenon of the "disappearing price drop" in our food economy. Since September, 1973, the news media have been reporting each month that the farm value of food has been falling. But that price drop on the farm has not made its way into the supermarkets. Farm prices fizzled 16 per cent from August to December of last year but supermarket prices remained sizzling hot. Even as President Nixon was making his remark about the good fortunes of the American farmers, the price they were being paid was falling for the sixth straight month, while the price charged to consumers actually was rising.

Not only did food firms pass all of the farmers' 1973 increase right through to the beleaguered consumer, but they also attached a sizable markup of their own. The Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago reported on March 8 that food middlemen increased their take from consumers by 6.5 per cent in 1973. That is an increase exceeded only once (in 1970) in the last 20 years. And the Department of Agriculture reports that these firms will increase their share in 1974 at a rate that "may be more than double the 1973 increase." What that means is that consumers will pay much more for food this year and much less of what they pay will go to farmers.

In 1973, the farmer was averaging 46 cents of the food dollar. By May, 1974, that already had fallen to 42 cents, the same level it was prior to the boom of 1973. And the farmer's share is expected to fall even more during this year. The retail price of food is hardly keeping pace. A Department of Agriculture report shows that the price of bread rose from January to April by two cents, while the farm value of bread ingredients fell by two cents. That is four extra pennies picked up by middlemen every time a loaf of bread is bought.

Not only are middlemen failing to pass along cheaper farm prices, but some appear also to be holding back on supplies of farm goods. For example, Reps. Frank Denholm (D-S.D.), Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (D-Mass.) and Lester Wolff (D-N.Y.) have suggested that meat packers and processors are widening their profit margins today by manipulating available supplies of meat.

The congressmen took a look at the meat industry's cold storage inventories in May and found an astounding amount of meat being packed away in corporate warehouses. Department of Agriculture figures showed that cold storage of beef by the packers and processors is 33 per cent above last year, pork stocks are 43 per cent greater and poultry storage is up by 87 per cent. Denholm charged that this storage "clearly pirates the prices of consumers and producers alike." By storing meat, the corporations can artificially decrease supplies in supermarkets, thus keeping consumer prices high. Simultaneously, the record inventories decrease industry demand, thus dampening prices paid to meat raisers.

During April, farm prices overall fell another 4 per cent, with the price of cattle falling from 39 to 37 cents a pound, hogs down from 31 to 26 cents a pound, wheat down from \$3.98 a bushel to \$3.52, cotton down from 58 to 49 cents a pound and eggs down from 50 to 42 cents a dozen.

## STEIN'S STATEMENT

A remark in May by Herbert Stein, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, is depressing to farmers and consumers alike. He said, "The declines in farm product prices are likely to be reflected in

much smaller increases in retail food prices than occurred in the first quarter of 1974" (emphasis supplied). Only the Grocery Manufacturers of America and the National Association of Food Chains can appreciate the logic of that.

In fact, that is the kind of logic that food middlemen can carry to the bank. The Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago said in its May 31 agricultural letter that "the available evidence suggests that higher profits have contributed to the widening farm-to-retail price spreads." That conclusion is supported by Business Week magazine figures showing that in the first three months of this year the largest food retailers had profits that were 59 per cent higher than a year ago, even though their sales were up just 14 per cent.

The Department of Agriculture clouds the issue of high middleman profits by reporting figures that encompass all food firms, the small with the giant. There are 32,000 food manufacturing firms in America, but just a handful of those sell nearly all the food and control the industry. In May testimony before the Joint Economic Committee, the Federal Trade Commission's Dr. Russell Parker noted that "the 50 largest [food manufacturers] controlled 50 per cent of assets of 1964, they accounted for 61 per cent of profits and nearly 90 per cent of television advertising." According to Dr. Parker and other authorities, this level of industry concentration is increasing steadily. These are the brand-name giants, powerfully situated between millions of farmers and millions of consumers, and they are fast becoming the decisive force in the American food economy.

The average profit increase for all 32,000 food firms in 1973 would not be remarkable, but the dominant firms had "a year to remember," as Business Week put it. A special USDA task force on food marketing costs reported this month that the profits of food middlemen in 1973 "probably" will exceed the 1972 total of \$3.4 billion. But the task force need have no doubt about the largest firms. Analyzing the 66 largest food processors, Business Week reported in March that their profits averaged 17 per cent higher than in 1972. The profits of those 66 industry leaders were more than \$1.8 billion, which is more than half the industry's total for the previous year.

To a significant degree, this level of profit is the result of monopoly power in the food industry.

Dr. William Shepherd, a leading authority on market concentration, reports that the food industry falls well within the category of "tight oligopoly," with the average four-firm concentration within the industry being 55 per cent. In many food lines, shared monopolies exert much greater control. For example, 91 per cent of all breakfast cereal is sold by four firms (Kellogg, General Mills, General Foods and Quaker). Three firms (Dole, Del Monte and United Brands) sell 85 per cent of all bananas in this country. Gerber alone sells 60 per cent of all baby food and Campbell's sells 90 per cent of all soup.

The same high levels of concentration exist in food retailing, with more than half the cities in the country being dominated by four or fewer chains. In the Washington, D.C. area, for example, Safeway, Giant, Grand Union and A & P control 72 per cent of the grocery market. Nationally, one-third of all the convenience grocery stores are owned by Southland Corp., parent of the 7-11 chain.

## PRODUCTION COSTS

There is another harsh economic reality that is squeezing farmers and causing them to think anew about the advice of old-time populist leader, Mary E. Lease: "Raise less corn and more hell." That reality is the rise in farm production costs.

Not much of what the farmer gets stays in his pockets, for he has a mess of bills to pay. As farmers move into the summer months,

they are massively pessimistic. The cost of their production supplies has increased about as rapidly as the plummeting of farm prices. In March alone, farm prices fell 4.4 per cent, while the cost of farm inputs increased 2.2 per cent. The Department of Agriculture predicts that farmers' expenses in 1974 will be "more than \$9 billion above last year."

A corn farmer in Iowa told the Des Moines Register of fertilizer prices this year 40 per cent higher than last, of diesel fuel prices doubling since last year and of corn seed that has gone from \$25 a bushel to \$37 a bushel. The cost of new machinery has gone out of sight, and repair of old machinery is about as costly—as this corn farmer put it, "You don't need too big a truck to haul away \$500 in parts." He is having to shell out this kind of money now, while the price he can expect for his corn already has tumbled this year from \$3.25 a bushel to \$2.27.

At work here is the other jaw of the corporate vice that is squeezing family farmers and contributing to higher food prices. There may be a profit made on the farm in 1974, but there will be much more profit made off the farmer. Here's a sample of profit increases farm suppliers already have had in the first quarter of this year.

{in percent}

	1st quarter 1974 profit increase	1st quarter 1974 sales increase
International Harvester.....	113	16
Stauffer Chemical.....	55	31
Occidental Petroleum.....	716	98
Firestone Tire & Rubber.....	19	17
Pfizer.....	33	26

Source: Business Week, May 11, 1974, "Survey of Corporate Performance: First Quarter 1974," pp. 70-90.

To put these profits into perspective, the average profit increase in all industries in this first quarter was 16 per cent. And again, these profits can be traced to the existence of monopoly power within the industries. For example, Dr. Shepherd reports that the four leading farm machinery firms hold 70 per cent of the relevant market. The Federal Trade Commission staff found in 1972 that farmers were overcharged \$251 million because of the existence of monopoly power in the farm machinery industry. The four-firm concentration ratio in the chemical industry is 71 per cent; in petroleum refining, 65 per cent; and in tires, 71 per cent.

The general public, the Congress and the press have paid little attention to the rise of corporate power in the food economy. It is time to notice, for not only has that power become significant, it already has become the single, most dominant factor affecting the food supply.

It is impossible in the long run to lower food prices, to raise farm income and to assure a steady supply of nutritious food without dealing directly with the shifting structure of the food economy. Both as suppliers of inputs to farmers and as buyers of raw commodities from them, corporations have become the determining force in the farmer's business. As manufacturers, advertisers and retailers of food, corporations have become the decisive force in the quality, choice and price of food available to the shopper.

As a minimal first step toward keeping corporate food power in check, the country's antitrust apparatus ought to be focused on food. The Federal Trade Commission shows some hopeful signs that it might be listening to consumer and farmer complaints on food issues. The chairman of the commission, Lewis A. Engman, has announced creation of a special task force of lawyers within FTC's enforcement branch to develop and implement a program of antitrust action directed at the food industry. Whether Chairman Engman's highly-touted "National Food

"Plan" will be more than window dressing is questioned by several consumer and farmer organizations, but at this point they are grateful for any official response tossed their way.

Also encouraging are signs that at least a few congressmen are waking up to the corporate presence and beginning to probe for some answers. Within the last six months, the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, the Senate Commerce Committee and the Joint Economic Committee have conducted public hearings on the role of corporate middlemen in the food economy. In addition, the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and the Senate's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations have shown an interest in corporate activities that affect farmers and consumers.

These are halting, first steps, but they are important. Old perceptions of food power, based on the idea of independent farmers responding to sovereign consumers, no longer are valid. Increasingly, corporations are the decisive force at both ends of the food chain. That fundamental shift in power is too important a matter to be left to USDA and corporate executives.

The most lasting and significant impact of 1973's skyrocketing food prices may well be the wide public attention that the jolt of those prices attracted to food economics. The food issue will abate somewhat in intensity, but it will not go away, and neither will public attention. The Food industry can expect much more scrutiny in the months ahead.

#### PEANUT GIVEAWAY PROGRAM

#### HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, in April 1973, the General Accounting Office completed a study of the peanut program and concluded that that program was wasteful and ineffective. This Friday when the agriculture appropriation comes to the floor I intend to offer an amendment to end this giveaway program. The peanut has got to be one of the most wasteful of all government programs and I feel very strongly that the House must put an end to it. I insert at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues a copy of some of the highlights of the GAO study on peanuts:

[Report to the Congress]

NEED INTENSIFIES TO AMEND LEGISLATION TO REDUCE GOVERNMENT LOSSES ON THE PEANUT PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

(Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture)

COMPTROLLER GENERAL

OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

This is our report stating that the need intensifies to amend legislation to reduce Government losses on the peanut price-support program administered by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, for the Departments Commodity Credit Corporation.

We made our review pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67).

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Copies of this report are being sent to the Director, Office of Management and Budget, and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

ELMER B. STATTERS.

[Comptroller General's Report to the Congress]

DIGEST

#### WHY THE REVIEW WAS MADE

About 5 years ago the General Accounting Office (GAO) reported to the Congress that the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC), Department of Agriculture, had lost about \$270 million on the peanut price-support program during the 12 years 1955 through 1966 and that losses over the next 5 years 1967 through 1971 would be at least \$248 million.

GAO recommended then that the Department develop for the Congress' consideration a program to control peanut production more effectively and that it study other means to remove excess acreage from production and/or equalize supply and demand.

The program has not been changed, and, as predicted, CCC has incurred greater losses. GAO, therefore, has reassessed the program to determine what should be done to effectively control production and reduce losses.

#### FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, requires the Secretary of Agriculture to control peanut production on the basis of demand. However, the act specifies also that he authorize annually not less than 1,610,000 acres for growing peanuts.

The sponsors of the act expressed hope that the 1,610,000 acres—the minimum national acreage allotment—would be sufficient on all occasions to supply the edible trade without any substantial surplus.

Since 1955, however, fewer than 1,610,000 acres have been needed annually to satisfy commercial demand because advances in farm technology have increased yields per acre by an average of 70 pounds a year. An average of 1,015,000 acres annually would have produced the necessary supply during 1967 through 1971.

Under the program CCC has to buy the surplus peanuts and store them until they are sold. The prices at which CCC sells them are significantly less than the costs of buying them.

From 1967 through 1971 CCC recovered through sales 53 percent of its costs of buying surplus peanuts and lost \$279 million on the program, a 66-percent increase over the loss of \$168 million from 1962 through 1966. The loss for 1972 is estimated at \$105.5 million. Unless the program is changed, CCC's losses will continue to mount.

Projections developed in March 1972 by the Department's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, which administers the program for CCC, show that, if the present program is continued, losses from 1973 through 1977 will total \$537 million, a 92-percent increase over the losses for the 5 years ended in 1971.

Anticipated losses could be substantially reduced if the minimum acreage provision of the act were rescinded, so as to allow the Secretary flexibility to adjust the allotment to keep production more in line with commercial demand. The Department and the Congress would decide the rate of reduction and the level to which the allotment would be adjusted.

GAO does not propose any particular rate or level. However, this report contains an example, developed on the basis of information supplied by the Service, which shows the effects on CCC losses and grower income of one acreage reduction program that might be used.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS OR SUGGESTIONS

This report contains no recommendations or suggestions to the Department.

#### MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CONGRESS

To give the Secretary of Agriculture more flexibility to adjust production so that it is consistent with commercial demand, GAO recommends that the Congress amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to remove the minimum acreage provision.

#### AGENCY ACTIONS AND UNRESOLVED ISSUES

The Department agreed with GAO's findings. (See app. II.) It recognized that CCC's annual losses had grown rapidly in recent years and probably would increase unless changed by legislation.

Although agreeing that the legislative change which GAO recommends would help bring peanut production more in line with demand, the Department said that it was not completely satisfied that the change was the most desirable solution when considering the longrun interests of peanut growers, the peanut industry, and the public. The Department said it was studying GAO's recommendation and possible alternatives.

The National Peanut Growers Group and the National Peanut Council outlined several actions that the industry had taken or planned to take to try to build new and expand present markets domestically and abroad. The group requested that the industry be given an opportunity to test its promotion program before the Government modifies the price-support program.

Alternatives exist for bringing production and demand more in line, and the Department's study and the industry's promotional efforts are desirable. However, because CCC losses are expected to exceed \$100 million annually, more immediate action is needed.

Removal of the minimum acreage provision would not preclude any actions the Secretary may wish to take as a result of the Department's study. Also it would not affect the industry's ability to meet any increasing demand that may result from its promotion program since the Secretary would be able to adjust the allotment up as well as down.

#### BURDENED WITH INCOME TAXES

#### HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, everyone seems to be burdened with income taxes. However, there are certain areas of the country which pay higher taxes than others. For the benefit of my colleagues, I insert the following article:

[From the Washington Star-News, June 17, 1974]

TAX STUDY SHOWS WIDE DISPARITIES BETWEEN AREAS

NEW YORK.—A survey of 125 metropolitan areas in the U.S. showed that New York City area residents paid an average federal income tax of \$1,388, at the same time that Columbus, Ga., residents paid \$620.

Four other metropolitan areas contributed more than \$1,300 per resident, based on fiscal 1972 statistics, according to the survey by the Tax Foundations.

They were: San Francisco-Oakland, \$1,364 per resident; Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J., \$1,322; Newark, N.J., \$1,320 and Chicago, \$1,310.

Relatively low per-capita tax burdens also were found in Charleston, S.C., \$621; El Paso, Tex., \$626; Augusta, Ga., \$661.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 20, 1974

The average tax per resident in all 125 urban areas was 1,085, compared with \$795 for non-urban areas.

The metropolitan areas accounted for 61 percent of the nation's population and 68 percent of personal income in 1972, according to the foundation, a nonprofit research organization based in New York.

The new metropolitan estimates are based on an extension of a formula the foundation says it has used for nearly two decades to show how states share the federal tax burden.

The cost of federal grants by state, also shown in the study, ranged from Indiana's \$1.55 for each dollar of aid, to Alaska's 38 cents for each aid dollar.

Determination of where the burden of federal taxation actually falls is a first step in answering many questions raised by the growth of federal taxes and spending, the Foundation said.

## ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE REVEALS SOME INTERESTING VIEWS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I mailed copies of my annual questionnaire to each of the nearly 154,000 homes in my congressional district, asking my constituents' views on some of the many issues and problems facing our Nation.

Several dozen volunteers worked many hours in my district office to tabulate the returns. Although the questionnaires are still arriving daily, the flow has dwindled and I am pleased at this time to report the percentage results of approximately the first 10,000 replies.

## ENERGY CRISIS

The questionnaires were mailed during the height of the energy crisis, and several of the questions dealt with this crucial matter. It is interesting to note that 77 percent of those responding expressed belief that the fuel shortage was artificial.

Of these, 70 percent believed the shortage was deliberately created by the oil industry, while 21 percent declared that it was contrived by the Nixon administration to divert public attention from the Watergate scandals. Among those who believed that the shortage was valid, the blame was equally split between the oil industry, the Federal Government, and the public.

By an overwhelming margin of 70 percent, my constituents preferred rationing over higher prices or increased taxes as a means of dealing with any future shortages.

Although I am not convinced that the crisis was entirely contrived, I do think the big oil corporations should have seen it coming and made their plans accordingly. Certainly, they have profited from the situation, both in terms of financial dividends and the elimination of competing independent firms. The price of gasoline and fuel oil has skyrocketed, and there seems little likelihood that it will return to precrisis levels.

Likewise, although I doubt that the

Nixon administration actually planned the shortage, I do think the President's actions—and inaction—contributed to the crisis, and the end result was to take public attention, temporarily, away from the growing cancer of Watergate.

To whatever extent the shortages were valid, I think the blame must be shared by the oil industry and, to a lesser extent, the Federal agencies with oversight responsibilities in this area. I do not think it is fair to blame the general public, who had no warning that a crisis was imminent.

I heartily agree with my constituents that rationing offers the only fair way to deal with future shortages. Increased prices or taxes puts the burden primarily on the low- and middle-income wage earners, and would tend to make driving a rich man's privilege.

## THE PRESIDENCY

The questions dealing with President Nixon reflected the continual erosion of public confidence in his ability to govern the Nation effectively. Eighty percent of the respondents felt he had not been honest or candid about the scandals surrounding his administration. This certainly mirrors my own skepticism about the President's role in the entire Watergate mess.

Sixty-one percent of my constituents felt that he should resign, and 66 percent said he should be impeached if he does not resign. Only 34 percent believed he should remain in office. These figures come close to a recent Harris poll, which showed that most Americans, by 52 to 35 percent, think Nixon should be impeached and removed from office.

I have a deep faith in our Federal Constitution, and I would prefer that the President not resign. This would circumvent the constitutional process of impeachment, and would leave the basic issue of guilt or innocence forever undecided. If a majority of the House votes to impeach President Nixon, he would have a full and impartial hearing by the Senate, under the direction of the Chief Justice. Only if two-thirds of the Senate voted to convict him, would the President be removed from office.

## POLLUTION STANDARDS

On the question of pollution standards, only one-third of those replying thought these standards should be reduced while the energy crisis lasts. Nearly half believed that the standards should remain at present levels, while 19 percent preferred even higher standards. I agree with the majority of my constituents that we must not permit the energy crisis—real or artificial—to wipe out what gains we have made in the field of pollution control.

## INFLATION

More than 50 percent stated that the impact of inflation on their families had been "very serious," while 40 percent reported it had been "fairly serious." Only 6 percent replied that the impact of inflation had not been serious.

These 6 percent must be unusual families, indeed. I consider runaway inflation to be the most serious problem facing our Nation today, and I cannot imagine any family, below millionaire status, not being affected. Most seriously hit, of course,

are those on fixed incomes, primarily retirees. Every family of average income, however, has seen its standard of living curtailed by the ever-mounting cost of living.

## TROOPS IN EUROPE

Again reflecting a nationwide trend, most of my constituents—57 percent—favored a reduction in our troop levels in Europe. Only 19 percent voted to maintain the present levels, while 24 percent favored eliminating them entirely.

I, too, think the time has come to sharply reduce our troop commitments in Europe, and begin planning for their eventual elimination. The retention of these servicemen, and many of their dependents, in Europe, nearly 30 years after the end of World War II, is a luxury our strained economy cannot afford.

## BUDGET CUTS

Asked to list three areas in which they would cut the Federal budget, a near-unanimous 97 percent listed foreign aid in the top three. Defense-military spending was second, with 62 percent. Welfare programs, Government waste, space research and Federal subsidies also received a substantial number of votes.

Here, too, it is difficult to quarrel with my constituents. Government spending must be reduced, and with so many domestic problems, foreign aid is the most obvious place to cut. I have long believed our military budget is over-inflated and should be sharply reduced. The national hodge-podge of welfare programs is nothing short of disgraceful, and reform is long overdue. Space research is already being curtailed, and we are slowly winning our long fight to cut down on Federal subsidies, particularly to the rich and powerful who do not really need them.

## BUDGET INCREASES

On areas in which they would increase the Federal budget, my constituents ranked education and health care at the top, with 45 percent each, closely followed by pollution control with 42 percent. Senior citizen programs drew 33 percent, while 24 percent voted for crime control. An identical 24 percent said they would not increase the Federal budget for any purpose.

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I have been fighting for many years to increase the Federal Government's contribution to local school districts. As a cosponsor of the Kennedy-Griffiths Health Security Act, I am a firm believer in a comprehensive Federal health insurance program.

With my constituents, I would put education and health at the top of my list. The wealthiest nation in the world can no longer continue to shortchange its citizens in these two vital areas.

## MAJOR PROBLEMS

Asked what they consider the three most important problems facing the Nation, 30 percent cited inflation, 23 percent listed crime and drugs, and 18 percent voted for the energy crisis, 17 percent declared that the presidency was among our three major problems, and another 15 percent listed Government corruption. Thirteen percent marked unemployment.

Here, again, I feel that my constitu-

ents have shown keen insight into our Nation's problems. I, too, would list inflation first, and crime second, although I would include the presidency and Government corruption in a single category.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this annual questionnaire survey is one of the most

important and valuable projects that my office carries out each year. I know that many other members conduct similar surveys, and I know they share my belief that this is an excellent means of keeping in touch with the sentiments and anxieties

of those whom we represent here in Congress.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am herewith printing the questions as they appeared on my questionnaire, together with the percentage responses thus far tabulated:

[In percent]

	Yes	No
1. The energy crisis has become the Nation's primary concern in recent months, there are many who believe the shortage has been artificially created and is not necessary.	77	23
(a) Do you believe the shortage is artificial?		
2. Assuming the shortage is valid, and recognizing that there can be many contributing factors for such a complex problem, what do you think are the primary reasons?	31	
(a) Poor planning by the oil industry	36	
(b) Poor planning by the Federal Government	21	
(c) Wasteful consumption by the public	12	
(d) Other		
3. Assuming the shortage is artificial, why and by whom do you think it was created?	56	
(a) By the oil industry, to drive prices upward	14	
(b) By the oil industry to combat antipollution regulations	21	
(c) By the administration to divert public attention from Watergate and other scandals	9	
(d) Other		
4. If the shortage worsens, and drastic steps appear necessary, which of the following methods would you prefer to help solve the problem?	70	
(a) Rationing	14	
(b) Higher prices	6	
(c) Increased taxes	10	
(d) A combination of these		
5. The energy crisis, and continued inflation, following on the heels of the Watergate scandals and the Agnew resignation, have severely shaken public confidence in President Nixon. Do you think he has been honest and candid about—	22	78
(a) His role in the Watergate case	24	76
(b) His income-tax payments in recent years	20	80
(c) His relationship to the oil corporations	19	81
(d) His campaign contributions in 1972		
6. Many persons believe Nixon has become such a controversial President he has lost his ability to effectively govern our Nation. What is your opinion?	61	39
(a) Should he resign?	66	34
(b) If he does not resign, should he be impeached?	34	
(c) Should he remain in office?	34	66
7. Because of the energy crisis, there is growing pressure to lower the antipollution standards developed in recent years, particularly in such areas as auto-emission control, strip mining, and the use of coal and high-sulfur petroleum. Do you think pollution standards should be—	47	
(a) Retained at present levels	34	
(b) Reduced while the energy crisis lasts	19	
(c) Increased to even higher levels		
8. Inflation in 1973 climbed to an annual rate of 8.8 percent, the highest for nearly 20 years. In general, do you think the impact of inflation on your family has been—	54	
(a) Very serious	40	
(b) Fairly serious	6	
(c) Not serious		
9. The United States now has 320,000 troops and 140,000 dependents in Europe, nearly 30 years after the end of World War II. Congress this year will consider plans to reduce these figures. Do you think our troops in Europe should be—	25	
(a) Decreased sharply	32	
(b) Decreased moderately	19	
(c) Retained at present level	24	
(d) Eliminated entirely		
10. Both the Congress and the Administration agree that Federal spending should be reduced, but disagree drastically on which programs should be cut and which should be expanded. President Nixon, in fact, has refused to spend funds appropriated by Congress for such items as education, health care, and water pollution measures, while seeking higher allocations for the military and for foreign aid.		

a. In what three areas do you think the Federal budget should be cut?

[In percent]

Foreign aid	97
Military/defense	62
Welfare programs	38
Government waste/cost	29
Space program	15
Federal subsidies	13

b. In what three areas should the Federal budget be increased?

[In percent]

Education	45
Health care	45
Pollution control	42
Senior citizen programs	33
Crime control	24
None	24

11. To conclude this questionnaire, please tell me what you consider the three most important problems facing our nation.

[In percent]

Inflation	30
Crime and drugs	23
Energy crisis	18
The presidency	17
Government corruption	15
Unemployment	13

#### OPERATION YOUTH AT XAVIER UNIVERSITY

#### HON. THOMAS A. LUKEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, recently Xavier University, which is located in my district, hosted the 25th annual meeting of "Operation Youth," a program designed to give our young people a better understanding of the American way of life. Much of the success of the program is the result of the efforts of Mr. William Smith, director of "Operation Youth."

This year 53 high school juniors from Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana, representing 35 high schools, participated in the event. These young people spent an entire week at Xavier listening to talks from leaders in government, business, and education, and participating in workshops. The theme of this year's program was "How To Apply Freedom."

Each year the participants of "Operation Youth" elect officers. I would like to extend my congratulations to this year's officers and recognize them by inserting their names in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

They are as follows: Bryan Adrick, mayor; Suzi Leonard, vice mayor; Bob

Collett, city manager; Gary Rogers, clerk of courts; Jeannie Cooper, Jim Waters, Mike Burr, Becky Durfey, Mitch Grueninger, Chris Mihalik, Terry Mittlehauser, counsel members.

#### LAW AND ORDER—PART II

#### HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues the contents of the Justice Department mailing which has been a focus of my attention and was the subject of my remarks yesterday upon introduction of the bill H.R. 15447. Although the cover under which this mailing was made cannot well be reproduced in the RECORD, the mailing was made in penalty mail envelopes, in the upper left hand corner stating: "U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., Official Business, Penalty for Private Use, \$300."

The material follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1973.

DEAR Sir: One of President Nixon's most important speeches of recent times was his

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 10th address to the nation on crime and drug abuse in which he called for common sense in law enforcement.

Mr. Nixon's remarks served to remind us very clearly that leadership in the war on crime comes right from the top of the United States Government. And it also indicated once again that law-abiding Americans have a man with the courage to represent their interests.

In the 1960's crime control often founded on the rocks of permissiveness and on the attitude that society was more to blame for crime than was the criminal. President Nixon has made it clear that the law must hold the individual responsible for his own actions, and that only with this approach can we maintain a society that is both free and secure.

This has been the philosophy which has undergirded the President's crime fighting initiatives since he first came to office. In his recent address, he made unequivocally clear his intention to use every responsible tool to curb crime in America. This means still more effective law enforcement at the Federal level and it means even more assistance for State and local law enforcement agencies.

Enclosed is a copy of the President's March 10th address which I am pleased to command to you.

Sincerely,

RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST,  
Attorney General.

## ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT ON LAW ENFORCEMENT AND DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION

Nothing is so precious to Americans as the freedoms provided in our Constitution. In order that these freedoms may be enjoyed to their fullest, there must be another freedom—from the fear of crime.

The senseless shooting of Senator John Stennis in January gave tragic emphasis to the fact that there is still a high risk of crime on our Nation's streets. These acts of violence are the natural residue of an atmosphere in America that for years encouraged potential lawbreakers.

Americans in the last decade were often told that the criminal was not responsible for his crimes against society; but that society was responsible.

I totally disagree with this permissive philosophy. Society is guilty of crime only when we fail to bring the criminal to justice. When we fail to make the criminal pay for his crime, we encourage him to think that crime will pay.

Such an attitude will never be reflected in the laws supported by this Administration, nor in the manner in which we enforce those laws. The jurisdiction of the Federal Government over crime is limited, but where we can act, we will act to make sure that we have the laws, the enforcement agencies, the courts, the judges, the penalties, the correctional institutions and the rehabilitation programs we need to do the job.

Next week I will propose a revision of the entire Federal Criminal Code, modernizing it and strengthening it, to close the loopholes and tailor our laws to present day needs. When I say "modernize", incidentally, I do not mean to be soft on crime; I mean exactly the opposite.

Our new code will give us tougher penalties and stronger weapons in the war against dangerous drugs and organized crime. It will rationalize the present patchwork quilt of punishments for crime. It will substantially raise current limits on monetary fines and it will restrict the present absurd use of the insanity defense.

I am further proposing that the death penalty be restored for certain Federal crimes. At my direction, the Attorney General has drafted a statute consistent with the Supreme Court's recent decision on the death penalty. This statute will provide capital punishment for cases of murder over which the

Federal Government has jurisdiction, and for treason and other war-related crimes.

Contrary to the views of some social theorists, I am convinced that the death penalty can be an effective deterrent against specific crimes. The death penalty is not a deterrent so long as there is doubt whether it can be applied. The law I will propose would remove this doubt.

The potential criminal will know that if his intended victims die, he may also die. The hijacker, the kidnapper, the man who throws a fire bomb, the convict who attacks a prison guard, the person who assaults an officer of the law, all will know that they may pay with their own lives for any lives that they take.

This statute will be a part of my proposed reform of the Federal Criminal Code. However, because there is an immediate need for this sanction, I have directed the Attorney General to submit a death penalty statute as a separate proposal so that the Congress can act rapidly on this single provision.

Drug abuse is still Public Enemy No. 1 in America. Let me tell you about some of the tragic letters I have received at the White House from victims of drugs.

One tells about a five-year-old boy hospitalized in Missouri. Someone gave him LSD.

One is from a boy 18 years old who has spent 11 months in a mental hospital trying to get rid of his drug addiction. He started with marijuana. He is asking me for help because his 14-year-old brother has begun to use drugs.

Another is from a mother in California. Her son committed suicide. He could not end his drug habit, so he ended his life.

One of the things that comes through so forcefully in these letters is the sense of despair of people who feel they have no place to turn for help, and so they write to the White House. I intend to help them.

We have already made encouraging progress in the war against drug abuse. Now we must consolidate that progress and strike even harder.

One area in which I am convinced of the need for more immediate action is that of putting heroin pushers in prison and keeping them there. A recent study by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs revealed that more than 70 percent of those accused of being narcotics violators are freed on bail for a period of three months to one year between the time of arrest and the time of trial. They are thus given the opportunity to go out and create more misery, generate more violence, commit more crimes while they are waiting to be tried for these same activities.

The same study showed that over 25 percent of the federally convicted narcotics violators were not even sentenced to jail. When permissive judges are more considerate of the pusher than they are of his victims, there is little incentive for heroin pushers to obey the law, and great incentive for them to violate it. This is an outrage. It is a danger to every law-abiding citizen, and I am confident that the vast majority of Americans will support immediate passage of the heroin trafficking legislation I will propose to the Congress next week.

This legislation will require Federal judges to consider the danger to the community before freeing on bail a suspect for heroin trafficking. That is something they cannot legally do now. It will require a minimum sentence of five years in prison for anyone convicted of selling heroin. It will require a minimum sentence of 10 years to life imprisonment for major traffickers in drugs. And for offenders with a prior conviction for a drug felony, those who persist in living off the suffering of others, it will require life imprisonment without parole.

This is tough legislation, but we must settle for nothing less. The time has come for soft-headed judges and probation officers to show as much concern for the rights of

innocent victims of crime as they do for the rights of convicted criminals.

In recent days, there have been proposals to legalize the possession and use of marijuana. I oppose the legalization of the sale, possession or use of marijuana. The line against the use of dangerous drugs is now drawn on this side of marijuana. If we move the line to the other side and accept the use of this drug, how can we draw the line against other illegal drugs? Or will we slide into an acceptance of their use, as well?

My Administration has carefully weighed this matter. We have examined the statutes. We have taken the lead in making sanctions against the use of marijuana more uniform, more reasonable. Previously, these sanctions were often unrealistically harsh. Today, 35 States have adopted our model statute on drugs, including marijuana. I hope others will.

But there must continue to be criminal sanctions against the possession, sale or use of marijuana.

Law enforcement alone will not eliminate drug abuse. We must also have a strong program to treat and assist the addict. Two-thirds of my proposed anti-narcotics budget goes for treatment, rehabilitation, prevention and research. We are approaching the point where no addict will be able to say that he commits crimes because there is no treatment available for him.

By providing drug offenders with every possible opportunity to get out of the drug culture, we need feel no compunction about applying the most stringent sanctions against those who commit crimes in order to feed their habits.

The crimes which affect most people most often are not those under Federal jurisdiction, but those in which State and local governments have jurisdiction. But while the Federal Government does not have full jurisdiction in the field of criminal law enforcement, it does have a broad, constitutional responsibility to insure domestic tranquility. That is why I am doing everything I can to help strengthen the capacity of State and local governments to fight crime.

Since I took office, Federal assistance for State and local law enforcement authorities has grown from over \$100 million to over \$1 billion. We are training over 40,000 law enforcement officers in the control and prevention of drug abuse.

This year more than 1,200 State and local police officers will graduate from the new FBI Academy, and I plan to increase assistance next year to local law enforcement to over \$1,200,000.

Crime costs Americans twice. It costs first in lives lost, in injuries, in property loss, in increased insurance rates, in being fearful for your own safety as you go about your work.

And second, crime costs in the taxes that go to maintain police forces, courts, jails, others means of enforcement.

It is a breach of faith with those who are paying the cost of crime, human as well as financial, to be lenient with the criminal. There are those who say that law and order are just code words for repression and bigotry. That is dangerous nonsense. Law and order are code words for goodness and decency in America.

Crime is color blind. Let those who doubt this talk to the poor, the minorities, the inner-city dwellers, who are the most frequent victims of crime. There is nothing disgraceful, nothing to be ashamed of, about Americans wanting to live in a law-abiding country.

I intend to do everything in my power to see that the American people get all the law and order they are paying for. Our progress in this effort has been encouraging. The latest FBI figures show that for the first nine months of 1972, the growth rate of serious crime in America was reduced to one percent. That is the lowest rate of increase since 1960.

June 20, 1974

In 83 of our major cities, serious crime has actually been reduced, and in the District of Columbia it has been cut in half since 1969. Convictions for organized crime have more than doubled in the last four years. The rate of new heroin addiction has dramatically decreased.

These are the positive results of refusing to compromise with the forces of crime, refusing to accept the notion that lawlessness is inevitable in America. We have the freedom to choose the kind of nation we want, and we do not choose to live with crime.

The Federal Government can help provide resources. It can help provide leadership. It can act with its own jurisdiction. But in the end, one of the best resources we have, one of the greatest safeguards to public peace, is the active concern of the law-abiding American citizen. The war against crime is not just the job of the FBI and the State and local police; it is your job, everybody's job. It is the very essence of good citizenship to act when and where we see crime being committed.

Citizens in some high crime areas have gathered together to work with the police to protect lives and property, to prevent crime. They have recognized the simple fact that we are going to have a crime problem as long as we are willing to put up with it, and most Americans are not willing to put up with it any longer.

When I saw and heard the remarks of our returning prisoners of war, so strong and confident and proud, I realized that we were seeing men of tough moral fiber, men who reflected, despite their long absence from America, what America is all about.

Just as they are returning home to America, I believe that today we see America returning to the basic truths that have made us and kept us a strong and a free people. I am encouraged by that vision. It points the way toward a better, safer future for all Americans. It points the way toward an America in which men and women and children can truly live free from fear in the full enjoyment of their most basic rights.

To accept anything less than a nation free from crime is to be satisfied with something less than America can be and ought to be for all our people.

#### TEMPLE VALLEY BETH SHALOM'S ATTEMPTS TO ASSIST SOVIET JEWS

#### HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, while all of us in the Congress are heartened by the recent emigration of Valery and Galina Panov to Israel, we must not permit our concern for other less eminent Soviet Jews to erode. Jews seeking to emigrate are encountering severe difficulties and are harassed and discriminated against for actions which we ourselves incorporate as an inherent part of our traditional liberties—the right to openly practice their religious and cultural heritage, and the freedom to emigrate.

I would like to call attention to the actions of the Sisterhood of Temple Valley Beth Shalom in Encino, Calif. In its continuing attempts to publicize the plight of Soviet Jewry, the sisterhood, on April 18, 1974, placed another of its telephone calls to the family of Boris Rubinstein, its "adopted" Soviet family. Present for the call were Sylvia Bernstein, president of the Sisterhood of Valley Beth Shalom; Phyllis Channing, social action chair-

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

man of the sisterhood; Geza Grun, the ritual director of Valley Beth Shalom; Rita Lipshtutz, recording secretary of the sisterhood; and Len Smith, executive director of the temple.

The transcript of the telephone conversation follows:

##### TRANSCRIPT

CHANNING. Hello Boris.

RUBINSTEIN. Hello.

CHANNING. This is Phyllis. Phyllis Channing from Valley Beth Shalom.

RUBINSTEIN. Hello.

CHANNING. Yes. Do you remember me, Boris?

RUBINSTEIN. Excuse me, but give your name.

CHANNING. Phyllis Channing.

RUBINSTEIN. Ah, thank you.

CHANNING. Yes, from Valley Beth Shalom Temple in Encino.

RUBINSTEIN. Yes.

CHANNING. I don't know if you remember, but we spoke to you about two or three months ago.

RUBINSTEIN. I remember. Please speak a little slower.

CHANNING. Yes. How are you?

RUBINSTEIN. Thank you, fine.

CHANNING. Good. It is nice to hear your voice again.

RUBINSTEIN. Thank you.

CHANNING. Did you receive any of my mail?

RUBINSTEIN. Mail what?

CHANNING. Have you received any of our mail?

RUBINSTEIN. No.

CHANNING. Some letters?

RUBINSTEIN. From Valley Beth Shalom? Hello.

CHANNING. Yes. Valley Beth Shalom.

RUBINSTEIN. What do you mean? Letters?

CHANNING. Yes.

RUBINSTEIN. Huh?

CHANNING. Yes, New Year's cards.

RUBINSTEIN. No, no, no. Nothing!

CHANNING. Oh.

RUBINSTEIN. Absolutely nothing!

CHANNING. Oh, I'm sorry about that. We . . .

RUBINSTEIN. But I have not got any cards, any greeting cards from Passover.

CHANNING. Well, we will keep sending you cards anyway.

RUBINSTEIN. (He laughs). Oh, I am sure that you have sent to me something, but I have not got anything.

CHANNING. How is your situation now?

RUBINSTEIN. Pretty badly. You must understand it. Because nothing, nothing. The situation is very quiet. Nobody got their permission and now they have refused families. Only Dreyfus—right—got anywhere. Do you understand me? Hello?

CHANNING. Yes, well I want you, don't give up hope on this because we have heard of many families ah, we have just heard of one from Moscow that got their visa to go to Israel.

RUBINSTEIN. No, no, no. I mean that families and persons who were refused before and in previous times after some time, some not for a long time of waiting, were granted permission to go away now. The situation is completely changed. And nobody of this persons or family got permission to go away. Do you understand me?

CHANNING. Oh, I see. Of the families.

RUBINSTEIN. And now a number of these families who were refused in the families ah number of this family now about 50 in Lenin-grad.

CHANNING. 50? Have you been to the Ovir Office?

RUBINSTEIN. I don't understand you.

CHANNING. Have you, I see. Tell me, would you like to speak to somebody here who speaks Russian and I would like him to say just a few words to you and then I will talk to you again. Just one moment Boris.

RUBINSTEIN. I will wait.

CHANNING. This is Mr. Grun.

Conversation in Russian.

CHANNING. Hello, Boris.

RUBINSTEIN. Hello.

CHANNING. Yes, you know I wanted to tell you that last time we spoke to you our conversation was recorded in the Congressional Record.

RUBINSTEIN. I see.

CHANNING. Now that is a public daily record of all the happenings in the United States Congress.

RUBINSTEIN. I see.

CHANNING. Even today we have a Congressman represented here and hopefully we will have the same thing. This brings your problem and your plight to the attention of the American people and they are all trying to help you.

RUBINSTEIN. Yes, yes.

CHANNING. So please don't give up hope. Everything will work out.

RUBINSTEIN. I try.

CHANNING. Just beautifully. We have somebody here from Congressman Tom Rees's office.

RUBINSTEIN. Yes.

CHANNING. And last time Barry Goldwater, Jr. from the Congress submitted the conversation to the Congressional Record. So please, things are getting done and just keep up the faith. OK?

RUBINSTEIN. OK.

CHANNING. We have regards for you from Evelyn & Gilbert Dreyfus and from Betty and Ira Winer.

RUBINSTEIN. Thank you very much.

CHANNING. And, in addition, do you think you could be at this telephone number in two weeks at the same time and somebody will be calling you.

RUBINSTEIN. Quite well.

CHANNING. OK. Now don't forget.

RUBINSTEIN. Two weeks later, same time.

CHANNING. Yes, same time.

RUBINSTEIN. Who will call to me, you or Betty Winer?

CHANNING. I don't know. Maybe Betty. We will see. Somebody will.

RUBINSTEIN. Quite well.

CHANNING. It has been wonderful talking to you. You sound good.

RUBINSTEIN. Thank you very much. I am very glad to hear your voice.

CHANNING. Same here and I hope we will see you in Israel very, very soon.

RUBINSTEIN. I hope but I must tell you that it is very hard work to live such a life.

CHANNING. I see. How is your family?

RUBINSTEIN. The whole family are still waiting. Do you understand me?

CHANNING. Yes, please send them our regards.

RUBINSTEIN. Thank you.

CHANNING. OK. Goodbye Boris.

RUBINSTEIN. Goodbye. Shalom.

CHANNING. Shalom.

#### MANY A SLIP "TWIXT CUP AND LIP" ON DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST

#### HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Congress is often accused of being a "rubber stamp" for the Department of Defense in dealing with its requests for money. While this charge may be true in particular instances, the action taken by the Congress on the recent supplemental budget request by the Pentagon shows that there is sometimes a slip "twixt cup and lip" when it comes to the Pentagon getting hold of public money.

Below is a chart which shows the progress of this latest request through the legislative process. The chart includes only those items subject to authorization:

## COMPARATIVE COMMITTEE ACTION ON FISCAL YEAR 1974 DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST

	Defense request	House Armed services	Senate Armed services	House appropriation	Senate appropriation	Authorization conference	Appropriation conference
I. Procurement:							
Army aircraft	22.0	22.0	15.0	16.0	16.0	15.0	16.0
Navy, Marine aircraft	219.2	219.2	101.1	153.7	113.0	210.2	95.0
Air Force aircraft	445.0	445.0	154.8	294.0	244.4	187.8	107.7
Army missiles	84.4	76.6	66.3	76.6	76.6	76.6	76.6
Navy missiles	28.6	28.6	17.0	0.0	0.0	17.0	0
Marine Corps missiles	22.3	22.3	22.3	22.3	22.3	22.3	22.3
Air Force missiles	39.0	39.0	22.9	39.0	27.0	39.0	11.4
Navy ship repair	24.8	24.8	0.0	0.0	24.8	24.8	24.8
Army weapons	121.8	121.8	59.1	71.1	58.6	71.6	71.1
Total	1,007.1	999.3	1,458.5	658.0	582.7	655.3	424.9
II. R. & D.:							
Raises	108.9	108.9	108.9	54.4	108.9	108.9	81.7
R. & D.	108.9	.975	0	5.8	0	.975	5.8
III. Milcon	29.0	29.0	0	29.0	0	3,866	0
IV. MASF	2,474.0	3,474.0	3,4266.0	3,474.0	3,4266.0	0	0
Total	1,727.9	1,612.175	978.8	1,221.2	947.8	769.041	512.4

<sup>1</sup> \$155.8 to be transferred from \$2.2 billion for Israel.

<sup>2</sup> Increased spending authority requiring Congressional approval—no appropriation needed.

<sup>3</sup> Deleted by floor action.

<sup>4</sup> Approved bookkeeping switch freeing \$266 million.

As the above figures show, some committees are more aggressive in their oversight function than are others; nevertheless, the total effect of the legislative process was to reduce the amount of the request from \$1,727.9 million to \$512.4 million for a 70.3-percent decrease.

The action taken by the various committees on this proposal is commendable; obviously, there was a lot of fat in the request that simply did not require the urgent type of action that a supplemental appropriation receives. It is distressing to find that the Pentagon would send up an "urgent" request that was found to be less than 30 percent urgent, for this cannot help but reflect back on the credibility of future Defense Department budget submissions. There appears to be no obvious threat to the safety of the Republic from our deletion of \$28.6 million for missiles for the Navy, or from our reduction of \$124 million in the Air Force aircraft budget.

It is also worthy of note that the Department has made no formal budget amendment proposal to include the \$108 million in R. & D. money we deleted from the supplemental in the 1975 budget. Again, we are faced with the question: If these items were so urgent that they required a supplemental appropriation, why are they now of so little importance that they do not warrant inclusion into the fiscal year 1975 budget?

The portion of the supplemental that attracted the most public and congressional attention was the request to raise the ceiling on military aid to Vietnam from \$1.126 billion to \$1.6 billion, an increase of \$474 million. What made this request seem so capricious was that it came less than 2 months after Congress had voted to lower the aid ceiling by precisely the amount of the supplemental request. This proposal appeared to be such an outrageous flaunting of the intent of the fiscal year 1974 ceiling that an enraged Congress summarily refused it, despite several administration attempts to compromise at lower figures. The final blow to this ill-fated request was a Senate vote to deny the use of what was called "legerdemain" in Pentagon

bookkeeping to salvage \$266 million for Vietnam.

The Pentagon works from a position of strength when they make a budget request. It knows that Congress wants a military force that is strong and able to meet real threats to the country. It knows that Congress and the President entrust this vital mission to our Military Establishment, and that we want to give our military men what they need to do their job. It is important, however, that the Pentagon not waste this reservoir of good will with capricious or ill-considered requests. The example set by the supplemental request is a poor one—it places the Department of Defense in the light of requesting huge sums of money on an urgent basis for poorly justified programs. The fiscal year 1975 budget did not suffer the fate of the supplemental; it will not suffer anything approaching a 70-percent cut. But the nagging question must now be in every Congressman's mind. Suppose that request contains as much fat as the supplemental did? Are we wasting 70 percent of \$22 billion, and should we be cutting at that rate?

When the Pentagon makes a poorly conceived budget request, nothing but harm can come of it. If the request is granted, the country is weakened by unnecessary spending for defense. If the request is exposed as frivolous, it damages the credibility of the organization charged with that defense. Either way, America loses.

I hope that valuable lessons were learned from the defense supplemental. I hope that the Congress has learned that we can say no to unnecessary defense spending without exposing the country to needless danger, and I hope that the Pentagon has learned that its proposals must be well-conceived, soberly assessed, and fully justified before we are asked to provide a defense budget that is rapidly exceeding our ability to pay.

A military budget that annually bankrupts the Treasury does not contribute one iota to our defense. We in the Congress must continue to exercise the kind

of restraint shown in our treatment of the supplemental request, lest we find ourselves appropriating money for the defense of a bankrupt nation. We must heed this lesson soon, or soon it will be too late.

## A SAFER WORKDAY STARTS IN GUAM

## HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues know that the island of Guam is "where America's day begins." Our position just across the international dateline allows tomorrow's sun to shine first on the American soil of Guam. But Guam also sees the "light" first in other ways, too, as a recent article in the Department of Labor's Job Safety and Health magazine, published by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, shows.

Excellently written by Ms. Virginia Reinhart, the article states that on February 14, 1972:

Guam became the first jurisdiction to pass enabling legislation for occupational safety and health.

Ms. Reinhart continues on to enumerate the many changes which occupational safety legislation has brought to working conditions on the island. Previously, she notes, scaffolding for construction projects were made from bamboo—a common and dangerous practice in much of the East. Today, thanks to the farsighted action of the Guam Legislature and the Department of Labor, construction workers climb scaffolding made of steel, no longer endangering their lives and confident that the supports under them will not collapse.

In recent years, Guam has undergone a tremendous building boom. The new safety regulations have contributed to keeping the accident rate on such projects way down, a fact of which both

Guam and the staff of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration can be justly proud.

Ms. Reinhart's article makes interesting reading for all those who are interested in occupational safety. I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues and congratulate Ms. Reinhart for her outstanding efforts and a job well done. In this connection, I also extend my appreciation to the editorial staff of the magazine, *Job Safety and Health*, and in particular to an old friend and seasoned journalist, Malcolm Barr, Chief of the Media Relations for OSHA, for including an article about Guam in their publication.

At this time, I include the article in the RECORD:

**A SAFER WORKDAY STARTS IN GUAM**  
(By Virginia Reinhart)

Located 6,500 miles west of San Francisco, on the other side of the International date line, the American island of Guam is the first piece of American soil to see the sun rise every day. So it is appropriate that the Guamanians also were first to "see the light" on the need for job safety and health legislation. On February 14, 1972, Guam became the first jurisdiction to pass enabling legislation for occupational safety and health.

The purpose of such legislation is to enable a state or territory to put its own job safety and health plan into effect—once the plan is approved by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). So, the immediate effect of Guam's enabling legislation was to set in motion the long process by which a state or territory assumes responsibility for job safety and health by writing its own plan. The long-range effect is to assure that once the plan has been approved, there will be funds to implement it and staff to carry it out.

If it seems surprising that the first enabling legislation was passed by a territory that has little industrialization, Guamanians, nevertheless, have their own reasons for supporting job safety and health.

Guam is an island paradise, with clean, sandy beaches, a warm climate, and great natural beauty—and the Guamanians want to keep it that way. Guam has been spared some of the ugliness of modern times—there is little unemployment, for example—and its government is determined to prevent some of the other kinds of ugliness. Job-related deaths, injuries, and diseases are ugly, indeed, and the Guamanians are staunch supporters of any means to cut down on these ills. They look upon OSHA as an ally in the effort to keep their paradise just that.

Because of its size, location, and current economic boom, Guam has unique problems in industrial safety. To understand how these developed, it is helpful to know something of Guam's history.

Guam is a small island, 32 miles long, and 8 miles at its widest point. Discovered by Magellan in 1521, it was a colony of Spain until 1898, when the United States gained control of the island at the end of the Spanish-American War. Because of its strategic position in the Pacific, the United States Navy has had a base there ever since. During World War II, the Japanese occupied the island and forced 22,000 islanders into concentration camps. The people of Guam thought of themselves as Americans, and the Japanese occupation strengthened that feeling. In 1944, after heavy bombing and fierce fighting, the United States regained Guam. The job of rebuilding the island began.

In 1950 the United States government granted self-government to the island and full U.S. citizenship to the Guamanians, ex-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cept that they can not vote in national elections and their representative to Congress in Washington is a non-voting delegate.

When the war damage had been repaired, disaster struck the island again. In 1962 Typhoon Karen hit the island with such force that 90 percent of the buildings were damaged or destroyed. The Governor declared it a disaster area, and the job of reconstruction began again.

Guam lacked the manpower to do the job. And though the Guamanian did not want large numbers of foreign workers to come to the island and take away jobs, they knew they would need help to rebuild. So the U.S. government granted non-immigrant visas to 1,500 construction workers from the Philippines, Korea, and Formosa.

By the time the typhoon damage was repaired, a happier reason was found for hiring foreign construction workers. Tourists—the Japanese, in particular—had discovered the wonderful climate and great beauty of Guam. In 1965 there were 500 tourists. By 1972 that number had jumped to 118,000, and the government predicts a quarter of a million tourists will visit the island in 1975. But if tourists are to come, there must be places for them to stay. Today Guam has seven luxury hotels, seven more under construction, and another seven on the drawing boards. The labor shortage is more acute than ever, and now there are more than 8,000 foreign construction workers building hotels, homes, banks, and stores all over the island.

With the growth in the workforce, more attention has been focused on working conditions, and job safety and health is high on the list of concerns. William A. Flores, the island's administrator for occupational safety and health, has been given the primary responsibility for writing the Guam plan. The U.S. Department of Labor also has assigned attorney Gennaro Ingenito to assist in preparing the plan for federal approval.

Ingenito, who had done much of the legal wording of the Guam plan, adapted the applicable standards of the Occupational Safety and Health Act. But the plan will be written around Guam's special needs; it will not be a "mirror image" of the federal act, nor will it be modeled after another state plan.

Some of the standards that the Guam plan will probably incorporate reflect problems that are unique to Guam. For example, scaffolding erected for use in construction always needs special care to make it a safe place to work. But in Guam some Korean contractors were erecting scaffolding made of bamboo, and men were working many feet above the ground on narrow, rickety platforms. The practice, of course, has been stopped.

Fatalities also have occurred because of old wiring. As buildings have been remodeled, workers who were unfamiliar with the way electric wiring had been done were liable to severe burns and other injuries. Other accidents resulted from workers' lack of training. Many of the foreign workers are skilled in more than one trade and can move from one construction task to another. But not all carpenters are also plumbers, and vice versa; so the new plan will include provisions to prevent a man from working at a trade for which he has not been properly trained.

The Guam plan also must set standards that cover the housing of foreign workers. Many of the contractors bring in temporary workers from other countries to work on construction projects. The housing provided for these workers must now meet standards set by the U.S. Department of Labor. Guam's plan will have to set standards "at least as effective" as the federal standards.

Many of the foreign workers do not read or write English, so Greg Almonte, an inspector, was assigned to translate the OSHA poster. There are now posters in Tagalog, Visayan, and Pampangan. Though there are more than

700 Filipino dialects, these three serve most of the workers. "We need to translate the poster into Korean and Chinese, too," Flores says.

Flores and Ingenito are giving their attention to the immediate problems, but are also determined that the Guam plan will anticipate the needs of the future. Aside from construction, there has been little heavy industry on the island, but a watch assembly factory, an oil refinery, and a brewery have recently been built. Flores and Ingenito want their standards to cover workers in these new industries as well as the construction workers who make up the bulk of today's labor force.

In writing the Guam safety and health plan, Flores and Ingenito hope to incorporate one major feature that will make it quite different from the federal act. The Guam plan, as they conceive it, would have the local island court judges hear contested safety and health cases rather than an Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission.

"We believe that handling contested cases through our local court system will be cheaper and more efficient and will fulfill all the due process requirements," states Ingenito. "However, we believe that a full educational and information program will result in voluntary compliance by most of the employers on the island, and that actual court cases will be kept to a minimum."

The expense of hiring a judge to review the challenges to the citations seems to Ingenito and Flores to be wasteful. Their position is based on the assumption that there would be only a few cases each year to review. As evidence, Flores cites the goodwill and cooperation that exist between OSHA and the various business associations on the island. "We have wonderful cooperation, particularly from the island's contractors," he says. "They don't want accidents any more than we do."

Recently the Guam Contractors Association held a two-day meeting on OSHA. They sent foremen and workers to the meeting to hear Paul Haygood, the area director from Honolulu, who directed the sessions.

By sending consultants like Ingenito and Haygood and by providing training for inspectors, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration has helped Guam work toward safe and healthful working conditions on the island. But most of the impetus has come from the people and the government of Guam.

## DUKE ELLINGTON

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, when Duke Ellington recently passed away, many words were written about his outstanding contribution to American music. In addition to his numerous musical accomplishments, Duke was loved and highly respected by many of those who had the opportunity to know him over the years. Nat Hentoff, a noted music critic who knew Duke personally, wrote a moving tribute to him in the June 13 edition of the *Village Voice*. Mr. Hentoff's essay follows:

DUKE ELLINGTON, 1899-1974

(By Nat Hentoff)

During more than 30 years of knowing Duke, I hardly ever saw anger in him. That is, overt, visible anger. Once it did come through when we were talking about putting labels on music.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"Riding in the car with Harry the other night," Duke said, "I heard a cat on the radio talking about what he called 'modern jazz.' So he played a record to illustrate his point. And you know, there were devices in that music I heard cats using in the 1920s. Those large words like 'modern' don't mean anything. Everybody who has had anything to say in this music—all the way back—has been an individualist. I mean musicians like Sidney Bechet, Louis Armstrong, Coleman Hawkins. Then what happens is that hundreds of other musicians begin to be shaped by that one man. They fall in behind him and you've got what people call a category. But I don't listen in terms like 'modern' jazz. I listen for those individualists. Like Charlie Parker was."

When Duke wanted to praise someone—which he did, I thought, non-discriminately out of chronic kindness—he would often say that the musician or singer being talked about was "beyond category." In all of American music—Ives, Jelly Roll Morton, even Coltrane and George Crumb—there has been no one but Duke to whom that term, "beyond category," can be applied with total accuracy. Of course, he had roots, but what he created over half a century was a microcosm, a musical universe all his own. His own and that of those musicians who were in his orchestra. No other hand could play Duke's charts and sound at all like his orchestra did. Not even Charlie Barnet who idolized him so.

One reason for the utter singularity of that universe was, of course, that Duke wrote for specific musicians. "I know," he once told me, "what each man does best, what his strengths are, what his capacities are, and I write to that." That's why when someone who had been with Duke for a long time left to go out on his own, he always sounded somehow incomplete in the outer world. Some recognized that and came back, having learned that Duke could find qualities in a musician he didn't know he had.

The microcosm could not be copied for another reason. It was part of an extraordinary cohesive continuum. Like Bach, Duke worked in a multitude of forms, transmuting them, interrelating them all to a huge body of work with its own logic of evolution, expansion, continual regeneration. No piece by Duke was ever finished. When I was a kid, going to hear him night after night at dances in Boston, then later being allowed by him to come to rehearsals, I kept hearing songs going through all sorts of changes. Sidemen would make suggestions, some of which Duke would accept. And he would have a new idea and put it in. Then, years might go by before the piece was played, and suddenly—if Tom Whaley, the librarian of Ellingtonia, could find it—it would reappear, changed yet again. By then there were new players in the band who in turn would generate new ideas in Duke. And yet the new and the old were part of that wholly distinctive continuum, that microcosm which this one man, and only he, controlled.

No wonder Duke would get exacerbated by people trying to put labels on music, especially his music. There was the music of Ellington, and there was other music. And because his musicians were so integral a part of how he wanted to express himself, Duke was intensely loyal to them. A good many years ago, he roared—an extreme rarity—at a young man who was then head of Down Beat's Chicago office. In Duke's band at the time was an addict and that night he had nodded off during the whole first set.

"It looks awful, Duke," the young critic said, "that guy zonked out in public. Why don't you get rid of him?"

"Do you realize?" Duke said furiously, "that that man fought for you in the South Pacific where he contracted a rare form of

malaria which puts him in this condition from time to time?"

The blood of the musician in question would have instantly stunned any mosquito to death, but Duke was not about to have a citizen of his own principality criticized by an outsider.

Duke could not fire a man. "What he does," Billy Strayhorn once told me, "is wait until it becomes obvious to the man himself that he'd be happier somewhere else. And sooner or later, the man leaves." Duke did fire one man though—Charles Mingus. The story is in Mingus's "Beneath the Underdog" (pp. 324-325). You ought to read it. Mingus has caught Duke exactly. And as Mingus says, the way Duke fired him made Mingus feel honored. It's both a very funny passage and quite revealing of Duke.

Musicians outside the band were never criticized by Duke. "I'm not good at appraisals," he would say. But if he liked someone, he would try to help, in his oblique way. Years back, Marian McPartland had a long run at the Hickory House where Duke usually hung out when he was in New York. (The room's publicity man was Joe Morgen who, for more years than anyone can remember, has been wholly devoted to Duke and acted as Duke's publicity man—without pay, as Woody Herman told me the other night.)

Anyway, Marian came down after a set, and Duke said, with a large smile, "You play so many notes." It took several months for that to sink in. "I was green as grass," Marian remembers. "Then I realized he was telling me to edit myself. And of course, he was right."

There was that Duke, and there was the man who was highly aware and proud of his Blackness. He wrote "Black Beauty" in 1928, in tribute to Florence Mills. And through the years, there were the show, "Jump for Joy"; the long works, ("Black, Brown and Beige," "Deep South Suite," "My People"), and many more explorations and celebrations of the Black heritage.

We were talking once about Black consciousness, and Duke mentioned that in the 1920s, when Paul Whiteman was allegedly bringing "dignity" to jazz, Duke went to Fletcher Henderson and said, "Why don't we drop the word 'jazz'?" We ought to call what we're doing 'Negro music.' Then there won't be any confusion." Henderson preferred not to.

Duke also pointed out how, long before the civil rights movement, he never allowed himself or his men to be treated with disrespect. There was a 1934-36 tour of the Deep South. "We did it," said Duke, "without the benefit of Federal judges, and we commanded respect. We didn't travel by bus. Instead we had two Pullman cars, and a 70-foot baggage car. We parked them in each station and lived in them. We had our own water, food, electricity, and sanitary facilities. The natives would come by and say, 'What's that?' 'Well,' we'd say, 'that's the way the President travels.'"

When he was with other Presidents, Duke was never awed, being of higher rank. Toward the end of Lyndon Johnson's Presidency, there was a plane ride so that Lady Bird could say good-bye to America. The plane was full of security personnel; and Duke, at one point, leaned over to a political figure he knew and whispered, "Would you like some grass?"

There's so much more to write about Duke, but to end for the time being, I have to say how underestimated he was as a pianist. Duke, as part of his stage talk, used to deprecate his piano playing. But I remember when I was a kid, I would always get to an Ellington dance early because I knew that invariably, some members of the band would be late. So, while those present were setting up, Duke would play the piano for himself.

June 20, 1974

Talk about an independent left hand! And the improvisations were ingeniously orchestral. He was also, of course, a nonpareil accompanist—for the band as a whole and for soloists. "There's never been a composer as good as Duke," Dizzy Gillespie once said.

And there's never been a more graceful master of the put-on. The last time I saw Duke, I was standing, listening to the band. For some reason, Duke was not on the stand. I felt my shoulder being tapped, and then I heard the voice.

"You don't know who I am," Edward Kennedy Ellington said, "but I know who you are."

Everybody, just about, knew who Duke was. He touched so many lives in ways that he could never have known about. At the funeral, a Black man, no celebrity, a guy who lives in Harlem, said, "I'm just here to bear witness. A man passed through, and he was a giant."

Good-bye, Duke. I never did get to tell you how much I learned from you, how much I wanted to be like you. But there has never been anyone like you, Duke. Well, you knew that. Hundreds, thousands of years from now, people will still be knowing that.

#### 1974 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

#### HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I mailed my 1974 legislative questionnaire to the residents of New Jersey's Ninth Congressional District, the district which I have had the privilege of representing in Congress for 10 years.

In an effort to gain greater insight into the views of my constituents, I sent questionnaires to 167,000 families in my district. The response I received was extremely gratifying and indicates that the people of the Ninth District are deeply concerned about the many problems now confronting our Nation.

The results of the 19,480 responses I received to my questionnaire have now been tabulated. A copy of the results will be sent to every household in the Ninth District so that my constituents may compare their individual answers with the consensus of opinion, based on this questionnaire, which prevails in the district. I regret that I was unable to send this information to my constituents sooner, but the new franking law prevents the sending of franked postal patron mailings 30 days before an election day, which was June 4.

In submitting answers to my questionnaire, many constituents attached detailed letters explaining positions they took on issues and problems. Others included concise and similarly cogent remarks on their questionnaires. Since receiving these responses, I have had the opportunity to read each questionnaire sent to me and I found that the residents of my district are acutely aware of the many problems which need resolution at all levels of government.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to insert into the Record the tabulation of the 20 questions asked of my constituents. However, before doing so, I want

to take a few moments to reflect on some of the responses received.

One of the gravest concerns now confronting Congress is the issue of impeachment. Though these figures have shifted since the tabulation of the questionnaire, in response to the question "Do you think there is sufficient basis for impeachment proceedings to be brought against the President?", 48.6 percent said yes, 40.1 percent said no, and 11.3 percent were undecided. However many of my constituents, both for and against impeachment, urged the House Judiciary Committee to complete its impeachment inquiry as soon as possible.

While the issue of impeachment is extremely important, certainly it is not the only issue facing Congress today. The residents of northeastern New Jersey, for example, were affected more severely by the gasoline shortage this past winter than any other group of people in the United States. Hence, the energy crisis is an issue that has been of utmost importance to my constituents, and as a result, 7 of the 20 questions I asked dealt in some way with our national energy situation.

Basically, the people of my district reflect a desire for the Federal Government to exercise greater control over the big oil monopolies, and believe Congress should take stronger measures to prevent any future shortage from recurring. For example, in answer to the question, "Would you favor a proposal to create a Department of Energy which would oversee and regulate, in the form of a public utility, exploration, research, and distribution of all our energy resources?", 78.3 percent said yes, 17.3 percent said no, and 4.4 percent were undecided.

In addition, by a margin of more than two to one, the people of the Ninth District also overwhelmingly indicated that they would gladly use mass transportation if a decent system were available to them. One of my priorities in Congress

has been to work for a realistic and accessible system of mass transportation. The lack of mass transportation facilities is a problem of critical dimension in our urban and suburban areas.

Mr. Speaker, another important area with which Congress must now deal is the area of national health insurance. A significant percentage of my constituents urged the Federal Government to design and implement such a program. In answer to the question "Should the Federal Government consider a national health insurance program to cover all Americans?", 75.7 percent said yes, 23.9 percent said no, and 0.4 percent were undecided.

There was disagreement on the way in which this type of program should be funded. About 46 percent said that it should be 100 percent federally funded; 36.5 percent felt that the cost should be shared between Government and private enterprise; and 17.2 percent opted for a totally privately funded program, but with Federal regulation.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents also displayed a keen awareness of the harsh economic realities which now confront us. Many letters focused on the problem of runaway inflation and describe in detail the difficulty of "trying to make ends meet" while living in an area of the country which has one of the Nation's most expensive standards of living. We must do everything in our power to combat inflation, and to bring prices back in line and more consistent with the wages people earn.

The people of the Ninth District also expressed a great deal of dissatisfaction with the President's policy of impoundment as a means to stop funding for programs passed by Congress. In response to the question "Do you think that Congress should act to limit Presidential use of impoundment?", 70.1 percent said yes, 28.1 percent said no, and 1.8 percent were undecided.

Mr. Speaker, though my district voiced overwhelming opposition to the President's policies of impoundment, I think it is also important to remember that huge Federal spending is one of the key causes for inflation. Just last week, as you know, the Senate gave recognition to this fact by voting to cut the President's budget by \$10 billion.

Furthermore, the decision of the House to pass the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act conference report was a wise one and reflects a positive step forward in budget control. Not only would this measure establish a procedure for providing congressional control over the impoundment of funds by the President, but it would make other changes in the present authorizing and appropriations process, which would help curb inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I also asked my constituents whether they favor a proposal which would make pensions received by policemen and firemen exempt from the Federal income tax. In answer to this question, 45.5 percent said yes, 53.6 percent said no, and 0.9 percent were undecided. However, many of those who expressed opposition did so because they felt that all pensions under \$5,000 should be tax exempt. With this concept I fully agree, and enactment of a bill to this effect is one of my legislative priorities.

I also received many comments on the other legislative subjects such as campaign financing, no-fault insurance, crime, the Supreme Court decision on abortion, and the needs of our senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, above all, the response I received to my 1974 questionnaire once again underscored the fact that it is an honor to represent the people of the Ninth District. I take this opportunity to share the tabulation of my questionnaire with my colleagues in Congress:

## 1974 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE—CONGRESSMAN HENRY HELSTOSKI, 9TH DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY

[Results in percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Would you favor a proposal to create a Department of Energy which would oversee and regulate, in the form of a public utility, exploration, research, and distribution of all our energy resources?	78.3	17.3	4.4
2. If fuel shortages do become more severe, would you favor a federally imposed system of national gasoline rationing?	64.7	32.7	2.6
3. Presently, the major oil companies exercise virtual control over all 3 phases of the petroleum process—production, refining, and distribution. Would you favor a proposal which would prohibit the oil companies from continuing to exercise this 3-phased control?	71.5	23.5	5.0
4. Year-round daylight saving time was implemented as a way to conserve energy. Based on your own saving of kilowatt-hours of energy do you favor continuing this time system?	52.9	42.9	4.2
5. In view of the current energy crisis, if mass transportation were readily available would you use it to commute to and from work?	69.2	30.0	0.8
6. Do you think environmental laws concerning auto emission standards should be eased temporarily as one means of solving the energy problem?	54.3	38.6	7.1
7. Would you favor oil drilling in the Atlantic Ocean off the New Jersey coast if adequate safeguards against spills were imposed by law?	71.8	24.7	3.5
8. Legislation is presently pending which would repeal the mandatory seatbelt starter interlock system found in 1974 automobiles. Would you favor such a proposal?	57.3	39.2	3.5
9. Would you favor establishing a Consumer Protection Agency within the Federal Government?	77.8	19.5	2.7
10. Legislation is presently pending which would create a national no-fault insurance program. Do you think such a system would be an improvement over our present system of insuring motorists?	73.8	15.8	10.4
11. Do you think there is sufficient basis for impeachment proceedings to be brought against the President?	48.6	40.1	11.3
12. Do you believe that Federal elections should be financed entirely by funds from the Federal treasury on an equitable basis for all candidates?	59.1	36.7	4.2
13. The President has tended to use impoundment as a means to stop funding for programs passed by Congress with which he disagrees. Do you think that Congress should act to limit Presidential use of impoundment?	70.1	28.1	1.8
14. Legislation is presently pending which would make pensions received by policemen and firemen exempt from the Federal income tax. Would you favor such a proposal?	45.5	53.6	.9
15. Health care costs have increased substantially in recent years to the point where paying for adequate health care is often difficult for many people. Should the Federal Government consider a national health insurance program to cover all Americans?	75.7	23.9	.4
If such program is approved by Congress, how should it be funded? (Select 1):			
(a) 100 percent Federal funding.	46.3		
(b) 50 percent Federal, 50 percent private funding—or some other sharing formula.	36.5		
(c) 100 percent private funding, but with Federal regulation.	17.2		
16. Do you favor the Supreme Court decision which states women and their doctors can decide about abortions within the 1st 3 months of pregnancy and further allows the States to regulate abortions after 3 months?	55.6	38.0	6.4
17. Government and private studies indicate there is high unemployment among Vietnam war veterans. Would you support a stepped-up joint drive by government and private enterprise to find suitable jobs for these veterans?	78.7	15.3	6.0
18. The Federal Government currently provides a variety of programs for our senior citizens. Do you think these programs have enabled senior citizens to meet their needs sufficiently?	16.6	70.0	13.4
19. Do you think newsmen should be allowed to refuse to testify in a court of law if such refusal is necessary to protect their news sources and information?	48.2	45.8	6.0
20. During the past few years a number of Federal programs have been instituted to help control crime. Do you think we are beginning to win the war against crime?	15.9	73.7	10.4

## WATERGATE ANNIVERSARY—SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENTS

## HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the second anniversary of the Watergate burglary was last Monday—June 17—and the Tennessean of Nashville in an editorial points out that the Teapot Dome Scandal—including trials, investigations, and prison terms—extended over a period of 11 years—from 1921 to 1932.

Certainly we all hope the Watergate matter will be resolved within a shorter period of time.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this matter, I place the editorial from the Tennessean in the RECORD herewith, together with a summary of Watergate developments to date from the Washington press.

The editorial and summary follow:

## WATERGATE ANNIVERSARY

Today is the second anniversary of the break-in at Democratic National Headquarters in Washington's Watergate apartment complex.

Many are weary of Watergate and would like to be rid of it. But a government crisis of the magnitude of Watergate takes on a life of its own and is not ended by the waving of a wand or someone's plea to "forget Watergate" and get on with the country's business.

No one knows how long Watergate will go on, but Editorial Research Reports has come up with some data which may not be reassuring to those who want an early end to the business.

Going back to the Teapot Dome scandal of the Harding administration, ERP found this episode began in May, 1921, when President Harding was induced to sign an unconstitutional executive order transferring certain oil reserves from the Navy Department to the Interior Department. Three years later a federal grand jury indicted Interior Secretary Albert B. Fall and two oil men on charges of bribery and conspiracy to defraud the government.

It was not until 1924 that Fall, the central figure in the case, was convicted of bribery. His release from prison in May 1932 marked the formal end of Teapot Dome.

There is no assurance that Watergate will go on 11 years. But the case seems to be more complicated than Teapot Dome and to have more ramifications leading off to side issues. Watergate could go on much longer than Teapot Dome, but in any case, it is likely to be quite a while before the nation hears the end of it.

## WATERGATE PROSECUTION STATUS

## WATERGATE COVER-UP

Frederick C. LaRue: Pleaded guilty on June 27, 1973, to conspiracy to obstruct justice. Sentencing deferred.

Jeb Stuart Magruder: Pleaded guilty in August, 1973, to conspiracy to obstruct justice and defraud the United States. Sentenced May 21, 1974, to 10 months to four years. Began term June 4, 1974.

John W. Dean III: Pleaded guilty on October 19, 1973, to conspiracy to obstruct justice and defraud the United States. Sentencing deferred.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Charles W. Colson: Indicted March 1, 1974, on one count of conspiracy to obstruct justice and one count of obstruction of justice. Pleaded innocent March 9, 1974. Charge dropped after guilty plea in Ellsberg case.

H. R. Haldeman: Indicted March 1, 1974, on one count of conspiracy to obstruct justice, three counts of perjury and one count of obstruction of justice. Pleaded innocent March 9, 1974. Trial set for Sept. 9.

John D. Ehrlichman: Indicted March 1, 1974, on one count of conspiracy to obstruct justice, one count of making a false statement to FBI agents, two counts of making a false statement to a grand jury and one count of obstruction of justice. Pleaded innocent March 9, 1974. Trial set for Sept. 9.

Gordon C. Strachan: Indicted March 1, 1974, on one count of conspiracy to obstruct justice, one count of obstruction of justice and one count of making false statements to a grand jury. Pleaded innocent March 9, 1974. Trial set for Sept. 9.

Kenneth W. Parkinson: Indicted March 1, 1974, on one count of conspiracy to obstruct justice and one count of obstruction of justice. Pleaded innocent March 9, 1974. Trial set for Sept. 9.

Robert C. Mardian: Indicted March 1, 1974, on one count of conspiracy to obstruct justice. Pleaded innocent March 9, 1974. Trial set for Sept. 9.

John N. Mitchell: Indicted March 1, 1974, on one count of conspiracy to obstruct justice, two counts of making false statement to grand jury, one count of perjury, one count of making false statements to FBI agents, and one count of obstruction of justice. Pleaded innocent March 9, 1974. Trial set for Sept. 9.

Herbert L. Porter: Pleaded guilty on Jan. 28, 1974, to one count of making false statements to FBI agents. Sentenced on April 11, 1974, to serve 30 days of a 5- to 15-month sentence. Released May 20.

## "ITT" CASE

Ed Reinecke: Indicted April 3, 1974, on three counts of perjury before the Senate Judiciary Committee investigating the possible connection between an ITT pledge to the 1972 GOP campaign and antitrust settlement. Pleaded innocent April 10, 1974. Trial set for July 15, 1974.

Richard G. Kleindienst: Pleaded guilty May 16, 1974 to one count of refusing to testify, a misdemeanor. Sentenced June 7, 1974, to one month unsupervised probation. Suspended sentences of one month in jail and a \$100 fine.

## MILK CASE

Jake Jacobsen: Indicted on Feb. 21, 1974, on one count of making a false statement to the grand jury investigating possible violations in connection with the Secretary of Agriculture's milk price support decision of March 25, 1971. Pleaded innocent March 15, 1974. Indictment dismissed on technical grounds, May 3, 1974.

## ELLSBERG CASE

Egil Krogh Jr.: Pleaded guilty Nov. 30, 1973, to one count of violating the rights of Dr. Lewis Fielding, Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist, in the Sept. 3-4, 1971 break-in at Fielding's office. Sentenced Jan. 24, 1974, to serve 6 months of a 2-6 month term. California charges dropped.

John Ehrlichman: Indicted March 7, 1974, on one count of conspiracy to violate Fielding's rights, one count of making false statements to the FBI and three counts of making false statements to a grand jury. Pleaded innocent March 9, 1974. Trial scheduled June 17, 1974. Must also stand trial on one perjury charge in California.

Charles W. Colson: Indicted March 7, 1974, on one count of conspiracy to violate Field-

June 20, 1974

ing's rights. Pleaded innocent March 9, 1974. Pleaded guilty June 3, 1974, to another charge, obstruction of justice, and all other charges were dropped. Sentencing scheduled for June 21, 1974.

G. Gordon Liddy: Indicted March 7, 1974, on one count of conspiracy to violate Fielding's rights. Pleaded innocent March 14, 1974. Also indicted on two counts of refusing to testify before a House committee. Pleaded innocent March 14, 1974; convicted May 10, 1974. Two concurrent six month sentences; suspended. California charges dropped. Trial set for June 17.

Bernard L. Barker: Indicted March 7, 1974, on one count of conspiracy to violate Fielding's rights. Pleaded innocent March 14, 1974. Trial set for June 17.

Eugenio Martinez: Indicted March 7, 1974, on one count of conspiracy to violate Fielding's rights. Pleaded innocent March 14, 1974. Trial set for June 17.

Felipe DeDiego: Indicted March 7, 1974, on one count of conspiracy to violate Fielding's rights. Pleaded innocent March 14, 1974. Charges dismissed May 24, 1974 by U.S. District Judge Gerhard Gesell.

## VESCO CASE

John N. Mitchell: Pleaded innocent to one conspiracy to obstruct justice, two counts endeavoring to obstruct justice, and six counts of grand perjury. Trial N.Y. Federal court began Feb. 19, 1974. Acquitted on April 28, 1974.

Maurice H. Stans: Pleaded innocent May 21, 1973, to one count of conspiracy to obstruct justice, and six counts of perjury before a grand jury. Acquitted April 28, 1974.

Robert Vesco: Indicted on May 10, 1973, on one count conspiracy to obstruct justice, and three counts of endeavoring to obstruct justice. Vesco is a fugitive in Costa Rica.

Harry L. Sears: Pleaded innocent May 21, 1973 to one count conspiracy to obstruct justice and three counts endeavoring to obstruct justice. Sears was granted total immunity to testify at the trial.

## DIRTY TRICKS

Dwight L. Chapin: Indicted Nov. 29, 1973, on four counts of making false statements before a grand jury. Pleaded innocent Dec. 7, 1973. Convicted April 5, 1974, on two counts. Sentenced May 15, 1974 to 10-30 months in prison. Free pending appeal.

Donald H. Segretti: Pleaded guilty Oct. 1, 1973 to three counts of distributing illegal campaign literature. Sentenced Nov. 5, 1973 to 6 months in prison. Served from Nov. 12, 1973-March 25, 1974, with time off for good behavior.

George A. Hearing: Pleaded guilty May 11, 1973 to two counts of fabricating and distributing illegal campaign literature. Sentenced June 15, 1973 to one year in prison. Released March 22, 1974.

## WATERGATE BURGLARY TRIAL

G. Gordon Liddy: Convicted of six counts of burglary, wiretapping and conspiracy. Sentenced March 23, 1973 to 6 years, 8 months to 20 years; fined \$40,000. Now in D.C. jail.

E. Howard Hunt: Pleaded guilty Jan. 11, 1973 to six counts; sentenced Nov. 9, 1973 to 2½ to 8 years; fined \$10,000. Released Jan. 2, 1974, pending appeal, after serving 10 months, 5 days.

James W. McCord, Jr.: Convicted of eight counts, sentenced Nov. 9, 1973 to 1 to 5 years. Free on \$5000 bond pending appeal.

Bernard L. Barker: Sentenced Nov. 9, 1973 to 2½ to 6 years, on his plea of guilty Jan. 15 to seven counts. Released Jan. 1, 1974, pending appeal, after serving 1 year, 19 days.

Virgilio Gonzalez: Pleaded guilty Jan. 15 to seven counts. Sentenced Nov. 9, 1973 to 1 to 4 years. Released on parole, March 7, 1974.

Eugene Martinez: Pleaded guilty Jan. 15 to

seven counts. Sentenced Nov. 9, 1973 to 1 to 4 years. Released on parole, March 7, 1974.

Frank A. Sturgis: Pleaded guilty Jan. 15, sentenced Nov. 9 to 1 to 4 years. Freed by court order Jan. 18, 1974, pending appeal.

#### ILLEGAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Herbert W. Kalmbach: Pleaded guilty on Feb. 25, 1974, to one felony count charging violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and to one misdemeanor count of promising an ambassadorship as a reward for a \$100,000 campaign contribution. Received 6-18 month sentence, fined \$10,000 on June 18, 1974.

American Airlines: Pleaded guilty on Oct. 17, 1973; fined \$5,000.

Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co.: Pleaded guilty on Oct. 17, 1973; fined \$3,000. Harry Heitzer, chairman of the board, fined \$500.

Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co.: Pleaded guilty Oct. 17, 1973; fined \$5,000. Russell De-Young, chairman of the board, fined \$1,000.

First Interoceanic Corp.: Pleaded innocent to four-count violation Oct. 19, 1973. Trial set for July 8, 1974. Dwayne Andress, chairman of the board, also pleaded not guilty.

Braniff Airways: Pleaded guilty on Nov. 12, 1973; fined \$5000. Harding L. Lawrence, chairman of the board, fined \$1000.

Gulf Oil Corp.: Pleaded guilty Nov. 13, 1973; fined \$5000. Claude C. Wild Jr., former vice president, fined \$1000.

Ashland Petroleum Gabon Inc.: Pleaded guilty Nov. 13, 1974; fined \$5000. Orin E. Atkins, chairman of the board, fined \$1000.

Phillips Petroleum Co.: Pleaded guilty on Dec. 4, 1973; fined \$5000. William W. Keeler, Chairman of the Board fined \$1000.

Carnation Co.: Pleaded guilty Dec. 19, 1973; fined \$5000. H. Everett Olson, chairman of the board, fined \$1000.

Diamond International Corp.: Pleaded guilty on March 7, 1974; fined \$5000. Ray Dubrown, vice president, fined \$1000.

American Shipbuilding Co.: Indicted April 5, 1974, on one count conspiracy, one count illegal campaign contributions.

George M. Steinbrenner III, chairman of the board, indicted on one count conspiracy, five counts illegal campaign contributions, two counts aiding an individual to make false statements to the FBI, four counts of obstruction of justice, and two counts of obstruction of a criminal investigation. Pleaded innocent, April 19, 1974.

John H. Melcher, Jr., executive vice president and general counsel, pleaded guilty April 11, 1974, to a charge of being an accessory after the fact in contempt of its legal acts.

Northrop Corp.: Pleaded guilty on May 1, 1974; fined \$5,000. Thomas V. Jones, chairman of the board, fined \$5,000. James Allen, vice president, fined \$1,000.

Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers: Pleaded guilty on May 6, 1974; fined \$5,000. Richard L. Allison, president, one month unsupervised probation and suspended \$1,000 fine.

#### LITHUANIA

#### HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, June 15, was the commemoration of the forcible annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union in 1940. Lithuanian-Americans joined with Lithuanians

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

throughout the free world in this commemoration.

The people of Lithuania are not being treated properly. They are denied the right of national self-determination and they suffer continual religious and political persecution.

The Lithuanian people are requesting a few policy changes made by the Soviet Union. These changes include lowering tariffs on gifts, increasing the 5-day tourist visa, eliminating travel restrictions, and permitting the immigration of Lithuanians to other countries.

The Lithuanians deserve their basic human rights. The United States will have the opportunity to ease the plight of Lithuania and other captive nations should the Soviet Union receive most favored nation status.

I would like to share in the joy of this commemoration, and send my heartiest greetings to the Lithuanians on this occasion.

#### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FACES FUNDING CUTS

#### HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering the first comprehensive housing legislation to come before the House in 6 years, and I want to commend my colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee for their efforts toward the goal of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family.

At the same time, however, I would like to indicate my concern about the "hold harmless" formula agreed to by the committee. Title I of this bill establishes a new program of community development block grants starting in 1975, to replace existing HUD categorical programs, such as urban renewal, model cities, open spaces, and water and sewer facilities. Direct funding is provided on a formula basis to certain urban counties, central cities, and all cities over 50,000.

Communities that have been funded for community development at a rate higher than their formula allocation are protected, in part, against a cut in Federal aid during the first 3 years of the new program, through a "hold harmless" provision. During the second 3 years, however, their funding level is phased down to their formula allocation.

The implications of this move are disastrous for many American cities, including Portland, in my own State of Maine. This city stands to lose a large sum of Federal money if this provision is allowed to stand. Portland now averages \$4-6 million in Federal funding for community development and housing programs. Under the committee's formula, their grant level will decrease to only \$900,000 by fiscal year 1980.

When so many cities are battling to maintain a healthy urban environment

for their residents, I find this reduction in Federal aid difficult to justify.

REV. DR. WILLIAM QUICK LEAVES DURHAM, N.C., FOR DETROIT, MICH.

#### HON. IKE F. ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, Rev. Dr. William K. "Bill" Quick delivered his last sermon at Trinity United Methodist Church, the oldest church of any denomination in Durham, N.C. He has accepted the pastorate of Metropolitan Methodist, the largest church of his denomination in Detroit, Mich.

Mr. Floyd Eamon, chairman of Trinity's administrative board, has kindly sent me copies of an editorial from The Durham Sun and of a news story from The Durham Morning Herald, and I am pleased to insert these in the RECORD and thereby commend Dr. Quick to my colleagues from Detroit.

As Mr. Eamon said in his letter to me, North Carolina is losing one of its finest citizens, but as the headline of the editorial says, our best wishes go with Dr. Quick as he leaves to answer his calling in Detroit.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Sun, May 7, 1974]

#### WITH HIM GO DURHAM'S BEST WISHES

Selection of the Rev. William K. Quick to become pastor of the largest Methodist church in Detroit, Mich., is more than just a loss to Durham's Trinity Church, where he has been assigned. It is a loss to the entire religious community, to the city, and to church programs throughout the state in which he has been active.

"Bill" Quick is a good citizen. He is known and his influence has been felt by many people who are members of denominations other than his own. He is a dedicated and persevering worker, no matter what his task may be. But perhaps most of all, he is a friendly, helpful and understanding person who knows how to meet people and build their confidence in him.

A small-town boy, he has risen rapidly in esteem in Methodism; and it is not surprising that he has been called to a larger and more challenging assignment. During his 20 years in the North Carolina Conference of the Methodist Church, he has received not only a national but also an international reputation, being a member of the World Methodist Council and a delegate on two occasions to the World Methodist Conference.

Mr. Quick is a quiet and unobtrusive man. But that does not mean he is not doing things—important things—as his record as a minister has shown. A Michigan bishop of his denomination in commenting on Mr. Quick's impending transfer to a 2,200-member church in Detroit said he is "one of the most talented preachers" he ever has known, a man with unexcelled administrative and pastoral skills.

It is nice to know that the folks in Michigan hold this pastor in the same high regard as do the people in this area. There will be many in Durham, of all denominations, who

will agree with the Michigan bishop when he says "Bill" Quick is "a highly talented man with a unique combination of gifts and graces."

[From the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald, May 6, 1974]

#### MINISTER GOING TO DETROIT

The Rev. William K. "Bill" Quick, minister of Trinity United Methodist Church, will leave Durham next month to become minister of his denomination's largest church in Detroit, Mich., Metropolitan Methodist.

His transfer was announced Sunday at Trinity's morning service. Quick will deliver his last sermon at Trinity June 2. He has been in Durham for five years.

His successor at the 1,300-member church is expected to be announced at the annual meeting of the North Carolina Methodist Conference which starts June 3 in Fayetteville.

Metropolitan Church has 2,200 names on a membership roll recently purged. Quick will succeed the Rev. Robert H. Bodine, who died of leukemia in December.

Bishop Dwight E. Loder of Michigan described Quick as "a highly talented man with a unique combination of gifts and graces that equip him in a particular way for ministry at Metropolitan."

He said Quick is "one of the most talented preachers of the church with administrative and pastoral skills that are not excelled by any minister I have known in my years in the ministry."

During his 20 years in the North Carolina Conference, which covers the eastern half of the state, Quick gained an international reputation.

He is a member of the World Methodist Council and was a delegate to the World Methodist Conference in 1966 in London and 1971 in Denver, Colo. In 1970-71 he was national chairman of the Francis Asbury Bicentennial Celebration.

For 12 years Quick had been the North Carolina Conference's director of public relations and Methodist information. He is a member of the communications committees on the General Conference and Southeastern Jurisdiction levels.

He is also active in the archives and history commissions of the North Carolina Conference, Southeastern Jurisdiction and General Conference.

He is chairman of the program committee of the Joint committee on Higher Education and Campus Ministry of the North Carolina and Western North Carolina conferences. He is secretary of the North Carolina Conference's Division of Higher Education.

Quick is active in several other conference committees, is the conference historian and is a trustee of Methodist College in Fayetteville.

In Durham Quick was the chairman and one of the founders of the Center City Church Council, the ecumenical ministry in downtown Durham. He has been a member of the City-County Governmental Reorganizational Committee and the Community Services Planning Committee. He is active in the Durham Rotary Club.

Quick, 41, is a small-town boy who has been constantly on the move since he graduated from high school at Gibson, near the South Carolina border, in 1950.

He attended Pfeiffer College for two years, then transferred to Randolph-Macon College in Ashland, Va., where he earned a B. A. degree. Randolph-Macon awarded him an honorary doctorate in 1972. He earned an M. A. degree from the Duke University Divinity School in 1958.

Throughout his school career he polished his public speaking ability. In high school he was a member of the debating team and won several public speaking contests, including

the Boy's State Oratorical Contest, and he placed second in the state 4-H speaking contest.

At Randolph-Macon he was a member of a nationally ranked debating team and at the Duke Divinity School he won the Frank S. Hickman Preaching Award.

Quick was minister of the Camp Glenn, N.C., Methodist church in 1954-55 and then moved to Durham County for the first time. He was minister of Mt. Bethel Methodist Church at Bahama from 1955 to 1959 while studying at Duke.

He then served as minister of the Zebulon Methodist Church from 1959 to 1963 and the St. James Methodist Church in Greenville from 1963 to 1969 when he came to Trinity Church.

Robert M. Blackburn of Raleigh, presiding bishop of the North Carolina Methodist Conference, said Trinity has "experienced phenomenal renewal" under Quick.

In 1971 Trinity won the conference's "Church of the Year" award.

Blackburn called Quick's transfer "a great loss to the United Methodist Church in North Carolina."

Quick is married to the former Barbara E. Campbell of Bluefield, W. Va. They have four children, Stephen, 18; Kathryn, 16; David, 10, and Paul, 5.

#### CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NEEDED NOW TO ESTABLISH A 200-MILE U.S. COASTAL FISHERIES PROTECTIVE ZONE FOR OUR PEOPLE'S VITAL PROTEIN FOOD SUPPLIES

##### HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, the protection, preservation, and conservation of our Nation's fisheries resources is of vital concern to all of us. It is my firm belief that we can no longer afford the luxury of further debate on traditional vested rights of the water resources off our coast until some international authority is established to allocate the living and mineral resources of the sea while the essential supply of the ocean's protein continue to dwindle and portend another crisis of catastrophic food shortages throughout the world. It is, therefore, most important that we move with dispatch in approving a congressional mandate to extend our Nation's fishing jurisdiction to the 200-mile limit off our coast.

On Saturday, June 22 at 10 a.m. in the Lecture Hall of Ocean County College, Tom's River, N.J., the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will be conducting a field hearing on pending legislation to extend the exclusive fisheries zone 200 miles off of our coast. The following statement that I have submitted for consideration at this hearing will provide further details of my position in this most crucial matter.

##### STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN ROBERT A. ROE

I, Robert A. Roe, Member of Congress representing the Eighth Congressional District of the State of New Jersey, am pleased to have this opportunity to present testimony at today's field hearing in Toms River, New

Jersey to the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment of our House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in support of legislation which I have sponsored and vigorously endorsed since coming to Congress in 1969 to extend the exclusive fisheries zone 200 miles off of our United States coast. As many of you in attendance know, I have long been an advocate of the essential need for total environmental resource conservation and the management of our coastal fisheries resources during my tenure as Commissioner of the New Jersey State Department of Conservation and Economic Development having the fundamental responsibility to conserve and protect the natural resources of our State and to promote the effective use and development of these resources for the overall health, welfare and best interest of all of our citizens.

We are talking today about our nation's fisheries resources which all of our people have a stake in—as a sustenance of life—protein food for the survival of mankind.

History and bitter experience have clearly established that we cannot afford to exploit our natural resources in any form. The major environmental problems facing our Nation today are a direct result of destructive use and plunder of our natural resources in disregard of the lasting effect on present and future generations.

Your Committee Chairman, Congresswoman Leonor Sullivan has provided me with a copy of the Department of State's coordinated Executive Branch response to our legislative proposal for the extension of the United States contiguous fisheries zone from its present width of 9 miles beyond our 3-mile territorial sea to a width of 197 miles from the territorial sea or the length of the continental shelf, whichever is greater, with foreign fishing permitted in the zone to the extent determined by the Secretary of State in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior.

All facts considered, there is agreement among all of us that serious problems do exist, that overfishing in our coastal waters has already caused a depletion of the fish stocks involved and that steps can be and should be taken to halt the destruction of our fisheries resources by foreign fishing fleets which have no regard for sound conservation measures and continue to harvest fish beyond the maximum yield and capability of the fisheries resources in our coastal waters.

The disagreement with the administration lies in their overly cautious reticence in suggesting that the solution which we are all agreed upon should await the multilateral agreement of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea to be held in Caracas, Venezuela beginning this week and extending to August 29, 1974.

It is important to note that the 1958 Geneva conference has still to resolve the question of a 12-nautical mile territorial sea. In the Department of State communiqué they acknowledge that for the past three years they have been actively participating in *preparatory* negotiations for the Law of the Sea Conference and have forcefully put forth our nation's fisheries position in that forum. It is also generally agreed that if the Law of the Sea Conference does place the 200-mile contiguous fishing zone on their agenda, it may take a decade to implement and attain an effective program, if at all. To this date all nations have not voted for a Law of the Sea Conference and some do not feel bound by the 1958 Geneva conference.

There is no question that given the opportunity the Department of State has a comprehensive fisheries proposal which offers, as they stated in their letter, a "rational system of managing the United States fishing industry as well as the diverse in-

terest of the international community," namely—

"Our proposal is based on an approach that reflects our overall view that coastal State control over coastal species and host State control over anadromous fish should be subject to international standards and compulsory dispute settlement so as to protect the interests of all States and the international community in general. The jurisdiction exercised by the coastal State over coastal species would follow each stock as far offshore as the stock ranges. Each coastal State would have a preferential right to that portion of the allowable catch it could harvest. The remaining portion would be open to harvest by fishermen of other nations, subject to nondiscriminatory coastal State conservation measures and reasonable management fees to defray their share of the cost of such regulation. The extent to which the coastal State preference would reduce traditional distant water fishing would be determined through negotiation at the Law of the Sea Conference.

"Under our proposal, anadromous species would be handled in the same manner as that of coastal species with the host State origin exercising jurisdiction. On the other hand, highly migratory stocks, such as tuna, would be managed by international organizations in which all fishing and interested coastal States could participate."

The question before us today, however, is can we afford to delay any longer in putting such a proposal into action. There is no present treaty or understanding among nations that the States may not take unilateral action to conserve natural resources. I firmly believe that the establishment of an inviolate coastal fisheries environmental protective zone is essential and vital to the interests of not only our country but the peoples of all nations who look to America to help them—as we have for these many years—in their time of need. It is time we took the initiative in this international fisheries resources dilemma and show the way for all. We can no longer afford the desecration of our international waters any more than we can afford the desecration of the world's environment—for the sake of people—and for our survival. We must seek to achieve the full communion of our human and natural resources to combat the worldwide environmental problems that knows no boundaries. Fisheries resources is a God-given sustenance belonging to all of the people but there is a balance we have to achieve in our coastal waters on behalf of our own people as well as all human beings throughout the world. Let's make the investment now for the benefit of mankind.

Call it a moratorium, if you like, on our coastal fishing zone to the 200-mile limit until the Law of the Sea Conference can achieve so-called multilateral agreement and an international ocean authority can be established to implement the necessary conservation environmental renewal of the fisheries resources of international waters. If other nations choose to follow us with a similar zone, can it be so wrong?

If we have the tools to accomplish this fisheries resources preservation program, let's not wait for an international law to be enforced and we find ourselves placing a protective umbrella over a barren seabed. History does indeed serve as a bitter lesson—It took the sinking of the *Titanic* to awaken the national and international conscience into establishing a high seas collision law and provide an international safety code for ocean-going vessels.

In view of all of the facts available, the Congress of the United States should take forthright action immediately and establish a 200-mile protective fisheries resource zone off the United States coast and do it now without any further delay.

#### THE BEWILDERING DAIRY SITUATION

##### HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, a very excellent article appeared in the June issue of *Land O'Lakes Mirror* on "The Bewildering Dairy Situation."

The whole broad range of Government action, from setting parity levels at the minimum to the administration's refusal to impose the countervailing duty law has greatly irritated American dairy farmers and has thrust them into an unfair competitive situation.

In February I introduced legislation forcing the Secretary of the Treasury to impose the countervailing duty statute on dairy imports subsidized by foreign governments. I have also urged Secretary Butz to boost the parity level to 90 percent.

Government policy affecting dairy producers has shattered the confidence of farmers. Minnesota milk cow population is already at its lowest point in history. If these policies continue, dairy production will continue to fall and we will end up relying on more imports. We have already seen what happened when the United States relied heavily on Mideast petroleum producers.

The following is a condensation of an address by *Land O'Lakes* executive vice president Harvey Ebert before the American Dry Milk Institute's annual meeting in April. I commend the excellent article for the information of my colleagues:

#### THE BEWILDERING DAIRY SITUATION

In past years we experienced changes in milk utilization—an orderly conversion from butter and nonfat dry milk production to cheese and whey and an increase in consumption of fluid whole milk, especially low fat products. The law of supply and demand was working well.

Then, during the spring of 1973, when milk production began to decrease, the price support for milk was set at the minimum level and "tilted" so that milk going into cheese would yield 50 cents per hundred-weight more than milk going into butter and nonfat dry milk. In my opinion the tilt was an effort to artificially push the pendulum in the direction of cheese.

Coupled with this were the controls and various stages of economic freezes imposed by the Cost of Living Council. The orderly balance of supply and demand began to disappear.

Next came the imports. The government dumped over-quota quantities of highly subsidized foreign butter, cheese and nonfat dry milk on the domestic market. I cannot help but believe that this was done in a further effort to swing the pendulum in favor of cheese and to depress prices generally. We, along with others, made numerous protests against over-quota imports—which we believe to be illegal—but to no avail.

We also requested that countervailing duties be placed on the subsidized imports—as required by law—so that the price of domestic products would be more competitive. It is my understanding that butter from Common Market countries sells anywhere from 37 to 60 cents a pound, processed cheese 28 cents a pound and nonfat dry milk

9 cents a pound. That's competition. Countervailing duties would correct the situation, but as yet the government has not responded to our request for enforcement.

While all this was going on, the U.S. found itself in a negative position in the balance of trade in the world market. It soon became obvious that the government was going to use agricultural products to correct the situation. We exported vast quantities of feed grain, and this had a direct effect on the higher prices dairy farmers must pay for feed today.

The now infamous Flanigan Report and Atlantic Council Report bear out the government's policy regarding international trade. In essences, these reports recommend that the U.S. export feed grains and some other products and import manufactured dairy products. This is exactly what the government has been doing, yet, the government denies that the reports are official policy.

Simultaneously, U.S. milk production continued to decrease, as farmers, faced with record-high costs, began excessive culling or complete liquidation of their herds. They lost confidence in dairying and government. In effect, all government actions were counter-productive.

And then another problem came to the front. A differential of return between butter and nonfat dry milk and cheese was as high as \$1.83 per hundred weight of milk in the *Land O'Lakes* area. Dairy processors were faced with terrifying alternatives. They could pay a competitive milk price, much higher than their return, lose money and eventually go broke. They could pay a price in relation to return, lose much of their milk supply and perhaps still go broke. Or they could build a cheese factory, which many of them did, and still run the risk of financial disaster.

Time and again we warned government officials of the foreseeable havoc that would result from artificially pushing the pendulum in favor of cheese. Nothing happened.

To make matters worse, the Grade A blend price in some months, in some orders, was lower than the manufactured milk price. In an effort to correct the situation, we negotiated sizeable Class 1 premiums which resulted in higher Class 1 prices and a decrease in fluid milk consumption. Dairying just can't win.

Now, where are we today? Cheese production is up 20-25 percent over a year ago. Butter is down 18-20 percent. Nonfat dry milk is down the same or a bit more. And consumption of fluid milk continues to decrease. There seems to be only one bright spot and this is an increase in sales of consumer-pack instant nonfat dry milk. But we don't know how long it will last.

This spring the USDA set price supports for 1974-75—again at the minimum level. There have been times years past when we advocated maintaining the level, but not this time. We strongly urged an increase to 90 percent of parity. To no avail. However, the tilt favoring cheese was removed. Raising supports to 90 percent of parity would have had no effect on consumer prices since present hard product markets are over supported price, but let prices drop to the 80 percent support level and farmers are in financial trouble. We informed the government of this eventuality.

Now, about the future. Considering present production and usage trends, there is a question as to the supply of butter and nonfat dry milk this fall. And yet, we are still faced with the possibility of more imports.

Obviously the law of supply and demand has not been allowed to function in the dairy industry of late. Complicating matters further could be the results of the 1973 Trade Act and the upcoming trade negotiations.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

It is essential to the survival of the U.S. dairy industry that no trade-offs be made. It is also essential that countervailing duties be enforced.

There will be an agricultural advisory committee and commodity group within the larger trade committee, and dairying will be represented. It is of utmost importance that these people take a united approach and that the entire dairy industry work together, because we could lose all if we do not.

The 1973 Agricultural Act called for a study to be made by the USDA concerning some of the problems of dairying. The study is now in its infancy. We can only hope that findings of the study will set the record straight and that the errors of the Flanigan Report and Atlantic Council Report will be corrected.

Another area that bears watching in the future is health standards and sanitation inspection in foreign countries of foreign dairy products destined for shipment to the U.S. If the government were to certify these inspections, they would do little more than lead credibility to the standard of the products even though the products do not come close to meeting the standards imposed on our dairy farmers and dairy plants. We must never let this happen.

I see in the future vast overproduction of cheese and whey and a continuing decline in fluid milk consumption. Undoubtedly there will continue to be a decrease in domestic milk production. If milk prices start slipping further and if farm expenses do not decrease, we could see another exodus of dairy farmers.

In summation, the dairy industry is in a tough, new ball game with a new set of rules. Unless the government takes positive action and the industry pulls together, the game is going to get tougher.

Editor's note: In its continuing effort to correct the present dairy situation, Land O'Lakes sent, on April 30, the following telegram to U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz. The telegram was signed by Melvin Sprecher, chairman of the board.

"We are deeply concerned about the impact market price declines for butter (10½¢) and cheese (6¢) on milk prices to producers. They call for immediate action to prevent milk prices from dropping further below costs of production. Dairymen today are faced with 40 percent higher feed costs and sharply higher costs for fuel, fertilizer, labor, machinery and equipment than a year ago.

"These cost increases have resulted in milk production declining for 17 consecutive months and a milk-feed ratio of 1.48 in March, below the usually low level of last year when milk production declined 4 percent. Declining milk prices today will cause the ratio to fall even further in coming months, resulting in reduced production, tighter milk supplies this fall, and then price increases to consumers. We cannot afford to let this occur at a time when there is an urgent need to increase milk production, restore the confidence of dairymen, and responsible supply established markets with domestic produced products rather than price-depressing, subsidized imports. Therefore, we urge you to immediately increase price supports for milk to 90 percent of parity and check this deteriorating condition.

"Increasing milk price supports at this time would level prices, improve production incentives, and result in a more orderly marketing of milk and milk products. Furthermore, this action would be in the best long term interests of providing an adequate and continuing supply of dairy products to consumers at reasonable prices while providing fair prices to producers."

JAMES A. FARLEY

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I am both proud and honored to bring to the attention of my colleagues the awarding of Notre Dame's highest honor, the Laetare Medal, to my good friend and neighbor, James A. Farley. The annual award has historically been reserved for men and women of high principle and integrity. This year is no exception. The following articles recount the moment of this noteworthy occasion:

[From the Catholic News, May 23, 1974]

JIM FARLEY RECEIVES LAETARE MEDAL

The University of Notre Dame presented its highest award, the Laetare Medal, to the New Deal (Democratic) political leader James A. Farley at a dinner held in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel here.

"Today, when America's faith in its political institutions and personalities is challenged as never before, you stand as a beacon of integrity," said the citation. "Your public life, as well as your business career, is on record for all to see."

Father Theodore Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of Notre Dame, read the citation and made the presentation.

The dinner was attended by some 200 people, including members of Mr. Farley's family. Notre Dame officials and other distinguished leaders from the fields of religion, business and public affairs.

The Laetare Medal is so-named because its recipient is announced each year on Laetare Sunday, the fourth Sunday of Lent, which is named for the opening word of the Latin Introit of the Mass (Is. 66:10: "Rejoice ye with Jerusalem").

Established in 1883, the award was originally restricted to laymen, but in recent years has been opened to clergy.

Recipients have included John Gilmary Shea, first editor of The Catholic News, the 1923 Democratic Presidential candidate Alfred E. Smith (1929), journalist Anne O'Hare McCormick (1944), AFL-CIO President George Meany (1955), President John F. Kennedy (1961), and Catholic Worker leader Dorothy Day (1972).

Though Watergate was not mentioned during the award dinner for Mr. Farley concern about the current state of public morality was reflected in the medal citation and comments by Father Edmund Joyce, C.S.C., executive vice president of Notre Dame and master of ceremonies for the dinner.

"In politics and in business, where it is often easier to do the expedient thing, you have been a man of principle," the citation said, going on to recall Mr. Farley's break with President Franklin D. Roosevelt over the issue of a third term.

Father Joyce reported that at a 1937 banquet honoring Mr. Farley, Vice President John Nance Garner commented, "He is an honest man. He is honest politically, and that is saying a lot, for if you are honest politically, you are generally honest every other way."

In his response, Mr. Farley who is now 85, reminisced about his long career in state and national politics, as well as his subsequent business career as chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation. He also recalled his associations with Popes Pius XII, John XXIII and Paul VI.

June 20, 1974

[From the Catholic Standard and Times, May 16, 1974]

"GENTLEMAN JIM FARLEY" IS LAETARE MEDALIST

NOTRE DAME, IND.—James A. Farley, an internationally prominent Catholic layman for more than 40 years, has been chosen to receive the 1974 Laetare Medal, the University of Notre Dame's highest honor.

The choice of Farley, Postmaster General under Roosevelt and currently honorary chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation, to receive the award, given annually since 1883 to outstanding American Catholics, was announced by Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University.

"In a day when the craft of politics is held in low esteem by the general public," Father Hesburgh said, "it is well for us to honor a man who practiced it with both integrity and affinity."

Although Farley never held a high elective political office, he became a major influence in the Democratic Party in the 1930s. Born the son of an Irish brick manufacturer in Grassy Point, N.Y., in 1888, Farley completed high school and worked 15 years for the U.S. Gypsum Company as a bookkeeper, company correspondent and salesman. His first foray into politics was his election as town clerk for Stony Point, N.Y., in 1911, and he moved up through various state Democratic party positions to state party chairman in 1930, the year Franklin Delano Roosevelt was re-elected governor of New York state by the unprecedented plurality of 725,000 votes.

Farley became Roosevelt's field man as the governor looked toward the 1932 Democratic presidential nomination, and one was more effective at the traditional approach to party workers—the personal letter, the long distance calls, and the hand shake. The indefatigable Farley was Roosevelt's floor leader at the 1932 Democratic convention which nominated the New York governor for the presidency. After Roosevelt's election, Farley became Postmaster General in his cabinet and also national chairman of the Democratic party. He remained a mentor of the president and a familiar figure at the White House and in August, 1936, took a leave without pay from his cabinet post to run Roosevelt's second campaign, which resulted in a landslide victory.

It was after this victory that Farley revealed himself as good a customer of the mails as an administrator of them. He sat down and dictated more than 36,000 personal letters to Democratic workers from all over the country, exhausting six secretaries in the process. Even today at 85, his trademark green signature goes at the bottom of an average of 120 letters a day, and on his birthday some 6,000 cards and letters are received—and each is personally acknowledged.

Two other traits biographers never fail to mention are Farley's pleasant nature and his phenomenal memory for names and faces. "The former quality earned him the nicknames 'Gentleman Jim' and 'Genial Jim,' and the latter is surrounded by legends about those whom Farley met on occasions separated by several years and still recognized with an effortless first-name handshake.

Farley split with Roosevelt over the third-term issue, resigned as Postmaster General in August, 1940, and campaigned only perfunctorily for Roosevelt's third term. Just before the Democratic convention in 1944, he resigned as national party chairman to dramatize his opposition to a fourth term.

Several biographers have commented on Farley's honesty while in office. Although his Postmaster General's salary was \$15,000, he left the cabinet in debt because he insisted that a building materials firm he had started

in 1920, and in which he still had a business interest, should not solicit orders where his influence would count and should reject all public business offered.

The year he left the cabinet was also the year that Farley was elected chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation, and he has worked as hard as ever as the number one salesman for the soft drink company. Only after a heart attack in 1972 did he cut back from a schedule which in 1971 included 131 luncheons and 105 banquets, most of them sponsored by groups interested in foreign trade. In May of last year he was appointed honorary chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation. He continues to arrive at his New York City Coca-Cola office at 9:15 A.M. each morning and walks the three blocks back to his Waldorf-Astoria apartment between 4 and 4:30 P.M. in order to rest before dinner. A widower since the death of his wife, Elizabeth, in 1955, Farley has two married daughters and a son as well as 10 grandchildren. His biography includes a long catalogue of civic, religious and fraternal activities and honors, including some two dozen honorary degrees from colleges and universities.

Farley joins a list of Laetare Medal winners which includes President John F. Kennedy (1961), Clare Boothe Luce (1957), Senator Shriver (1968), Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan, Jr. (1969), and Dorothy Day (1972). The medal is normally presented at Notre Dame commencement exercise, scheduled this year for May 19.

[From the National Hibernian Digest, March-April 1974]

#### JAMES FARLEY TO RECEIVE ND'S LAETARE MEDAL

James A. Farley, an internationally prominent Catholic layman for more than 40 years, has been chosen to receive the 1974 Laetare Medal, Notre Dame's highest honor.

The choice of Farley, Postmaster General under Roosevelt and currently honorary chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation, to receive the award, given annually since 1883 to outstanding American Catholics, was announced Saturday (March 23), on campus by Fr. Hesburgh.

"In a day when the craft of politics is held in low esteem by the general public," Fr. Hesburgh said, "It is well for us to honor a man who practiced it with both integrity and affability."

Although Farley never held a high elective political office, he became a major influence in the Democratic Party in the 1930's. Born the son of an Irish brick manufacturer in Grassy Point, N.Y., in 1888, Farley completed high school and worked 15 years for Universal Gypsum Company as a bookkeeper, company correspondent and salesman. His first foray into politics was his election as town clerk from Stony Point, N.Y., in 1911, and he moved up through various state Democratic party positions to state party chairman in 1930, the year Franklin Delano Roosevelt was re-elected governor of New York state by the unprecedented plurality of 725,000 votes.

Farley became Roosevelt's field man as the governor looked toward the 1932 Democratic presidential nomination, and on one was more effective at the traditional approach to party workers—the personal letter, the long distance call, and the handshake. The indefatigable Farley was Roosevelt's floor leader at the 1932 Democratic convention which nominated the New York governor for the presidency. After Roosevelt's election, Farley became Postmaster General in his cabinet and also national chairman of the Democratic party. He remained a mentor of the president and a familiar figure

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

at the White House, and in August 1936, took a leave without pay from his cabinet post to run Roosevelt's second campaign, which resulted in a landslide victory.

It was after this victory that Farley revealed himself as good a customer of the mails as an administrator of them. He sat down and dictated more than 36,000 personal letters to Democratic workers from all over the country, exhausting six secretaries in the process. Even today at 85, his trademark green signature goes at the bottom of an average of 120 letters a day, and on his birthdays some 6,000 cards and letters are received and each is personally acknowledged.

Two other traits biographers never fail to mention are Farley's pleasant nature and his phenomenal memory for names and faces. The former quality earned him the nicknames "Gentleman Jim" and "Genial Jim," and the latter is surrounded by legends about those whom Farley met on occasions separated by several years and still recognized with an effortless first-name handshake.

Farley split with Roosevelt over the third-term issue, resigned as Postmaster General in August, 1940, and campaigned only perfunctorily for Roosevelt's third term. Just before the Democratic convention in 1944, he resigned as national party chairman to dramatize his opposition to a fourth term.

Several biographers have commented on Farley's honesty while in office. Although his Postmaster General's salary was \$15,000 he left the cabinet in debt because he insisted that a building materials firm he had started in 1929, and in which he still had a business interest, should not solicit orders where his influence would count and should reject all public business offered.

The year he left the cabinet was also the year that Farley was elected chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation, and he has worked as hard as ever as the number one salesman for the soft drink company. Only after a heart attack in 1972 did he cut back from a schedule which in 1971 included 131 luncheons and 105 banquets, most of them sponsored by groups interested in foreign trade. In May of last year he was appointed honorary chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation. He continues to arrive at his New York City Coca-Cola office at 9:15 a.m. each morning and walks the three blocks back to his Waldorf-Astoria apartment between 4 and 4:30 p.m. in order to rest before dinner. A widower since the death of his wife, Elizabeth, in 1955, Farley has two married daughters and a son as well as 10 grandchildren. His biography includes a long catalogue of civic, religious and fraternal activities and honors, including some two dozen honorary degrees from colleges and universities.

While Farley has had reservations about some recent directions of his party, he has retained the honorific title of "Mr. Democrat." Last year, fellow Democrats honored him as part of the last hurrah to New York City's National Democratic Club building at 233 Madison Avenue, which the party was leaving after almost a half century. A reporter who was present wrote, "It was a great night for Jim Farley. The honor bestowed on him was reserved in the past for Democratic presidents such as FDR, Truman and Johnson."

Farley joins a list of Laetare Medal winners, which includes President John F. Kennedy (1961), Clare Boothe Luce (1957), Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan, Jr. (1969), and Dorothy Day (1972). The medal is normally presented at Notre Dame commencement exercises, scheduled this year for May 19.

#### ATHLETES FOR A BETTER URBAN SOCIETY ALL-STAR SPORTS WEEK

##### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, young people in New York respect and idolize successful professional athletes. Children announce to their parents and friends plans to be just like their favorite sports figure. Some ambitious youngsters announce that they are going to be some fantastic combination of great athletes; and young people mimic the styles of the great athletes as they compete on city playgrounds.

Professional athletes are, in short, an integral part of the lives of New York youth. On June 10, Mayor Beame, of New York City, announced that the week of June 10-15 would henceforth be designated as "Athletes for a Better Urban Society All-Star Sports Week." Undoubtedly, this plan, which will be initiated by several all-star athletes, will be the source of great enjoyment and education for New York City youth. I, therefore, commend Mayor Beame for this thoughtful project. I have taken the liberty of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mayor Beame's press release announcing his plan for the benefit of my colleagues:

##### ATHLETES FOR A BETTER URBAN SOCIETY ALL-STAR SPORTS WEEK

Mayor Abraham D. Beame today proclaimed the week of June 10-15 as "Athletes for a Better Urban Society All-Star Sports Week."

In a 10:00 A.M. ceremony on the steps of City Hall, the Mayor praised the all-star athletes of the A.B.U.S. who have formed a "clearing house" through which they donate their time, skills and prestige to work with youngsters from all over the city.

Mayor Beame said:

"These talented athletes have put their prestige to work to help build a better urban society. In playground workshops, in drug education programs, and in the city's schools, prisons and hospitals, this organization shapes healthy and constructive activities for our city's youth."

Attending the morning ceremony were Dick Barnett, Assistant Coach of the N.Y. Knicks and President of A.B.U.S., Carter Campbell, lineman for the N.Y. Giants, Rick Caster, Jets' end, Matt Snell, retired Jets' fullback, Ralph Baker, linebacker for the Jets, Seth Cartwright of the N.Y. Jets and Carole Graebner of the N.Y. Jets.

Sports Week will begin on June 10, with "Super Ball I," a dinner-dance at the New York State Theater at Lincoln Center honoring famous athletes for their outstanding contributions to sports in America. During the next five days sports workshops will be held by New York's pro stars at the West Side YMCA with a celebration wind-up on June 16 at three locations, Central Park, Tompkins Park in Brooklyn and a Bronx park to be selected later this week.

## LAND-USE CONTROL: FROM WHENCE?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the committee report which accompanied H.R. 10294, Land-Use Planning Act of 1974, in discussing major issues and committee action with respect thereto, at page 37 contains this paragraph:

These provisions of H.R. 10294 have received consistent support from the National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Association of Counties, and the National Association of Regional Councils, as well as the Council of State Governments.

Many Members continue to wonder why the above-named organizations are so dedicated to the land-use concept over private property.

Some insight into land-use control and the proponents listed in the legislative report may be found in a recent Metro News column by syndicated author, Jo Hindman, of Powell Butte, Oreg.:

## LAND-USE CONTROL: FROM WHENCE?

(By Jo Hindman)

Alarmed citizens and landowners literally "poured it on" when Congress was presented with the Udall land use bill (HR 10294). The House Rules Committee postponed action on the Land Use Policy and Planning Assistance Act, due in part to the public anger aroused.

But the citizenry cannot stop there. The people who made themselves heard should now rid themselves of the mechanism which pushed land use control to the very boundaries of their private properties.

Public control of private land started to creep faster on Americans in the fifties. Congress launched the revolutionary urban renewal 1954 amendment to the National Housing Act. In the same year, a unit of political syndicate 1313—the National Municipal League (NML) of New York—published its "Model State and Regional Planning Law," the seed bed of all planning and land use laws written from then to now.

One objective of the 1313 sample law was "to prepare . . . a generalized land use pattern."

At first, the inflammatory phrase "land use control" rarely appeared in print, land use being just one of many components that constitute a comprehensive master plan as espoused by governmental jurisdictions. Land control could ride in under wraps. In urban renewal, control was achieved by zoning, the most common land use regulatory device.

NML, author of the first major land use "model" law, is the policy making unit of the 1313 syndicate. Endowed by Rockefeller funds, the 1313 political conglomerate is helping to turn the United States into a regional dictatorship.

Other 1313 groups wrote land use controls. For instance, the Council of State Governments (CSG) in 1957 developed a law authorizing a state office of planning services to examine problems and policies. But only the naive will expect to find 1313 groups handing out full-fledged land use laws. The concept is tailored and written to fit each occasion.

Prodded by the 1313 syndicate, Congress in 1959 created the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR). 1313 completely controls ACIR which started carrying out radical recommendations.

In 1962, ACIR recommended that local governments exercise zoning and subdivision regulations beyond their boundaries. In 1964, ACIR urged regulatory action to preserve

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"open land" around urban areas. In 1967 windowdressed with anti-pollution trappings, ACIR openly mentioned land use goals. In 1968, ACIR wrote, "Government must be able to plan the future use of land . . ." (p. 121 *Urban and Rural America*, ACIR's A-32).

A saturated Congress began oozing land use bills. Sen. Henry Jackson requested ACIR's opinion on his land use bill that failed in several tries but passed the Senate in 1973. The Udall land use bill started moving in 1974. It was stopped by the House Rules committee.

The whole gamut has been repeated many times over, at various governmental levels. First, the land use control idea is fed out from 1313 agencies. Picked up by 1313's agents, the measure is introduced in bill form. 1313 units charge out in full force to lobby. In the Congressional debates, many 1313 names pop up as backers of land control bills. Such as ACIR, CSG, the National League of Cities (NLC), National Governors Conference (NGC), Conference of Mayors (USCM) and National Assn. of Counties (NACo) which now is nagging the House to bring the National Land Use bill to the floor for a vote.

Those organizations and more, all belong to troublesome 1313, author of land use control. A petition requesting Congress to investigate 1313 is stalled in both the House and Senate, as this is written. (Copyright by Jo Hindman 1974.)

## A CASE FOR NATIONAL PLANNING

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House overwhelmingly adopted the conference report on the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974. One week before, by a near tie vote, the House rejected the rule for a National Land Use Planning Act. And we have yet to even consider a national energy policy.

Some may wonder how these items are connected, but if they have to ask then they do not understand why the vote yesterday will probably not lead to any great change in the status quo. While I strongly supported this progressive legislation, I doubt that any new leadership will be founded by this step, until the Congress, as a body, recognizes the interrelationships of the various actions that are taken both inside and outside of Congress. It is only when we understand the complicated interconnections of the society we live in and take a total systems view of a problem that we will begin to truly solve the problems we are attacking.

It is frequently easier for those who are slightly removed from a process to obtain the clearest picture of the problems that process may have. Perhaps this is the reason a recent editorial in *Cry California* was able to make such a convincing case for national planning that would pull together all of the problems we are now attacking in pieces.

I commend this article to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

"ONE NATION, INDIVISIBLE . . ." A CASE FOR NATIONAL PLANNING

(By John W. Abbott)

Alaska . . . Hawaii . . . California . . . Washington . . . Maine . . . Vermont . . . New

June 20, 1974

Hampshire . . . Massachusetts . . . New York . . . Delaware . . . Florida . . . Wisconsin . . . Connecticut: these and some other states are making an effort to grapple with the "problems of the environment," including the economic effects of protecting a coastline, preserving open land, and achieving a decent quality of air and water. Articles in this issue give an account of the manner in which two western states, other than California, are going about this.

In working for comprehensive state planning, however, perhaps we have for too long overlooked a major point: the lack of federal government leadership. Leadership not alone in "land use" planning, such as proposed in legislation currently before Congress. Something more fundamental: planning and budgeting, with recognition that federal land ownership, installations, and funding and planning policies are closely related to state and local concerns in scores of ways.

California is an example. About half the land in our state is owned by the federal government. Transportation, water, employment, agriculture, shipping and many other aspects of our economy depend heavily on what is done in Washington. Yet there is now neither coordinated federal planning and budgeting nor a state, regional and local planning system to complement it.

At first glance, it seems difficult to account for an apparent national reluctance when it comes to planning. We expend billions on education and the dissemination of information. Yet we appear indifferent to or uninformed about the steady depletion of our natural resources and the reckoning which awaits us if we do not soon mend our ways.

As individuals, we are adjured to plan wisely—savings, life insurance, college for our children, home purchase, vacations, retirement—even a final resting place! Yet the application of planning principles to the quality of life for society as a whole continues to encounter stiff resistance.

Perhaps we are prisoners of our long-cherished belief that there are no limits to the planet's resources and no constraints necessary in our galloping consumption of them.

Or we are held, as Russell Train has observed, by our stubborn conviction that ". . . if for a time, we found ourselves in a tight squeeze, then we could—in the nick of time and out of nowhere—count on the *deus ex machina* of our unrivaled scientific and technological capability, not to speak of our unexampled ingenuity, to extricate us from our difficulties and set us off once more on our predestined path to the promised land of progress and prosperity."

The national administration's budget for the coming fiscal year reflects little of Mr. Train's insight. Given the rapid rate at which our resources were being gobbled up even before the recent energy "unpleasantness," what is to be said of the campaign for attaining self-sufficiency in energy and other resources? The budget beginning in July will funnel huge sums into the production of nuclear power, coal, oil and gas, all, of course, involving immense disruptions of the physical environment. If you look hard enough, a little money can be seen for solar and geothermal energy research, and a few windmills.

As Senator Humphrey noted in a speech to the American Institute of Planners a few weeks ago: "I find it incredible that a proposed federal budget of \$300 billion in fiscal 1975 offers no decisive new direction whatsoever in the national planning for balanced growth and development that is so critically needed today."

Senator Humphrey might also have noted the absence of emphasis upon the need to conserve resources, including those which produce energy.

The *California Tomorrow Plan* points out that a major obstacle to comprehensive state planning is the lack of an institutional framework to carry it out. The problem for states is further compounded by the want of a federal planning structure.

The plan also emphasizes the importance of dealing simultaneously with diverse but interconnected problems, whether social, economic, or those of the physical environment. All of our problems, whether associated with land, air, water, education, transportation, jobs, housing or others, are environmental. To make distinctions, including a category of "environmental" problems, is to confuse public understanding.

Whatever the label, we must develop a national system, a national planning process to which state plans can relate. Without a method for spelling out alternatives and a means to establish goals, we will be unable to relate our needs and national resources to those of the rest of the world.

There could be no better occasion than the President's next State of the Union message to present the challenge and hope of a better life by proposing realistic and forward-looking plans together with the means to carry them out.

The primary responsibility for federal planning and budgeting now rests with the executive branch, specifically the Office of Management and Budget—OMB, in Washington jargon. Thus the actual control of agency programming rests largely with OMB, because departmental budgets must pass its scrutiny before submission to Congress.

Without a strong mandate for comprehensive planning from the President and Congress, OMB serves mainly as a money-traffic controller. Its effectiveness is further limited when agencies which feel themselves to be unfairly dealt with begin rearguard actions with friends in Congress to obtain restoration funds, or to hold onto a disproportionate share. So as matters stand now, the chance for both efficient budgeting and good planning is slight. Moreover, how OMB operates at present, how it plans or does not plan, is virtually unknown. This is an all-important agency; the public should keep close track of its work.

The way in which the Congress is organized is another obstacle to good planning at the national level. The committee system, in particular, abets Congress' prevailing piecemeal approach to legislation. From the standpoint of national planning, the division of House and Senate into specialized committees makes overview and comprehensive action uncertain and slow. Although the time is long past when it was thought that the principal business of Congress was to pass appropriation bills, mail out the free garden seeds and go home, the machinery still bears a startling resemblance to that earlier era.

The need for planning and budgeting of national dimension is impervious to any amount of rhetoric about "states' rights," "home rule," or other slogans which offer no alternatives to the methods now so clearly failing us.

#### LAND USE FUROR

#### HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, many persons were disappointed when the Land Use Planning Act was defeated. I would like to insert the following article which favors the defeat of the legislation. I hope this is of interest to my colleagues:

#### THE LAND USE FUROR

When the House defeated the Land Use Planning Act of 1974 in a close vote the other day there were enough howls of dismay to suggest that it had just voted 211-204 to repeal motherhood.

The Sierra Club fired off an urgent Telex

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to editorial page editors accusing the House of "dereliction of duty." The New York Times, as is its wont, blamed it all on Watergate politics. And Senator Jackson, as is his wont, promised to use his considerable parliamentary skills to revive land use in the form of a rider to some must bill.

But those of us who are less impassioned on the issue might conclude that the House acted with considerable wisdom. There is little persuasive evidence that it struck any kind of really damaging blow at environmental interests. And on the positive side, it may have headed off a movement toward overplanning that could, over time, seriously damage economic growth.

Fundamentally, the defeated bill would have authorized \$800 million for grants to states to help them set up "comprehensive land use planning." The federal government would have had considerable power, of course, to decide how the money would be put to use.

Assuming that the federal government can afford \$800 million, which is not a safe assumption these days, it may well be that the bill would have achieved some positive results. However, it might also have encouraged the kind of forced draft planning that soon would have had every acre of some states tied up in red tape that would create long delays for people looking for a place to live or conduct a business.

There is no persuasive evidence that any such forced draft is necessary. The states already are taking initiatives in land use planning. And other federal laws, most importantly the environmental protection and coastal zone management acts, already put strict limitations on the kind of land uses that cause "quality of life" problems that disturb environmentalists.

Given the cosmic effects that land use regulations can have, it seems to us more sensible to address land use problems on an "as needed" and "where needed" basis, rather than through some grandiose federal initiative. If the Colorado plan works, it might be something other states can emulate. The same for Delaware. But there is no point in everyone getting locked into something that doesn't work just because of pressures to spend federal money.

We already have seen some of the consequences that flow from the difficulties oil companies have in finding sites for new refineries and utilities have in siting power plants. These were not totally responsible for the energy crisis, but they played a role. Some businessmen think a national land use policy that would clearly authorize such sites would be a good thing. But we doubt that the defeated bill was headed quite that way. As things now stand, states individually weigh the drawbacks of attracting industry against its benefits, which probably is a good thing.

At any rate, we don't feel any great sense of loss. And it seems to us that the House deserves some praise for knowing when to say no.

#### COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT TOWSON STATE COLLEGE IN MARYLAND

#### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 2 of this year, Dr. James L. Fisher, president of Towson State College in Maryland, delivered a stirring and inspiring charge to the 1974 graduates of the college during commencement exercises at the school.

As he points out in his speech, "all the

ritual commencement platitudes" are missing from his address, and in their place Dr. Fisher has inserted the practical wisdom that is his surpassing characteristic and that infuses the institution he leads.

Dr. Fisher speaks with simple eloquence and firm conviction of an America we are all striving for, of a faith in ourselves and in each other which can see us through these days of national trial.

I know my colleagues in the Congress will benefit from reading Dr. Fisher's memorable address, and for that purpose I insert it in the RECORD at this time.

#### CHARGE TO THE GRADUATES

(By James L. Fisher)

Mr. Ambassador, Mr. Kem, Mr. Frenkil, distinguished guests, members of the faculty and staff, parents, relatives, friends, and most especially members of the class of 1974 of Towson State College.

After four years or more together, I don't believe there is too much need for either a lengthy preamble or an extensive discourse. Custom and convention for this occasion suggest that at this time I make certain relatively predictable remarks. As I promised many of you on Wednesday and Friday nights this week, I will not evoke all the ritual commencement platitudes.

My most immediate personal need is to convey to you and your families and friends my profound sense of pride in your accomplishment, the honor which accompanies your personal effort and sacrifice, and the effort and sacrifice of your families and other loved ones who have made possible your success.

I've spent too many hours in earnest, yet informal, conversation with so many of you present today to feel now any special need to give you advice or personal comfort on this occasion. Most of you know my beliefs and my principles, and many of you have put them to the test—a much truer measure. Whether in seminars or at college dances, for me, these random dialogues and encounters were filled with your wonder and wisdom, the mind-expanding quality of your questions, and frequently although often unspoken, an abundance of goodness and charity and even love. Those conversations, I tell you now with gratitude and thanks, comprise almost all my inspiration for the present and indeed all of my hope for the future.

My second reason for declining to orate according to prescribed formula at this commencement is out of the awareness of experience—I believe that there is little I may say here that will add significantly to your way of life and to what you have learned during your years at this college; and yet, peculiarly, a dilemma remains, for in spite of the probability of my words blowing in the wind (to use the language of the freedom ballad) as your president there are things I feel that I must say to you on this occasion, for we are in the dilemma that has remained more or less constant since the first man-ape lifted a bludgeon and set upon his neighbor for the greater glory of some vagrant truth. Only today that dilemma is more serious, for we have only recently learned how to destroy the entire human species.

As I continue, I ask that you bear in mind the words of Secretary-General U Thant's 1969 prediction:

"That the members of the United Nations have perhaps ten years left in which to subdue their ancient quarrels and launch a global partnership to curb the arms race, to improve the human environment, to diffuse the population explosion, and to supply the required momentum to develop efforts. If such a global partnership is not forged within the next decade, then I very much fear that the problems I have mentioned will

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

have reached such staggering proportions that they will be beyond our capacity to control."

Why is it that in all our recorded history we have yet to profit from the misdeeds and mistakes of our past? Regardless of our schools, our churches, our families, and most certainly our governments we have yet to stop killing and cheating one another in the name of God, country, vengeance, and other euphemisms for greed. We have yet to stop teaching our children that one race or religion or class or sex is better than another.

And certainly we have yet to design a system of government and power that has not eventually included corruption and exploitation. Each revolution has heralded a new era freed from the selfishness, repression, and licentiousness of its predecessor. Yet each of those governments somehow becomes infected and falls victim to the same conditions, as its early purity and zeal soon turns to exploitation of the many for the excesses of the few.

The passage of time seems to invariably bring persons to power who serve as the instruments of the advantaged or those who feed the passion of the current irrational social philosophy. Why has no revolutionary government, including the United States, ever built into its nature an effective system of regular and frequent checks on those in power? Surely all of recorded history has taught us that we cannot take for granted the integrity of our leaders, for the sad truth is that power has tended to corrupt. I am convinced that our form of government is the best yet conceived or tested by man, but to prosper and survive we must add fuller measures of intelligence, open and regular vigilance, and most importantly, broader participation in public affairs by enlightened citizens. We simply must have a secure and committed check on those who would serve us. That includes all of us. While we must not strap them in a vise of audit, we must inhibit them from any notion of participation and activities that would compromise the public interest.

Although the fourth estate and the judiciary can play a role in this process, neither has proven sufficient. I believe that the key to our good future is the courageous and unselfish involvement of enlightened citizens in the important affairs of our community and government. The result of this condition will be fuller scrutiny of both elected and appointed officials. I am reminded of Sulla's words to an incredulous Cicero as he ascended to the dictatorship of Rome, thus heralding the end of the republic. Sulla said words to this effect, "my friend, Cicero, the people get what they deserve."

Well, in spite of having some uncertainty about the lull of 1974, I believe that your generation stands in the vanguard of a new and more perfect era. This era has its roots with the young and its ultimate creation will be a higher reason and morality freed from the hypocrisy of our past and inspired by the beauty and the purity that is the basic idea of the United States. And, assuming these things, yours will be the generation that deserves the full flower of this idea.

I say to you, as college graduates, that to believe in and support the idea of the United States is nothing for which you need apologize. Often today, for reasons that are understandable, educated men and women tend to vacillate about their country. Unfortunately, patriotism to many today suggests a narrow, pinched phobia and some kind of pride that is no more appealing than any other manifestation of arrogance that binds its victims to their own shortcomings and cruelly denigrates the virtues of others. That kind of patriot builds his love of country on hating others.

A self-governing people is by definition a critical people. Our very involvement in the process of government invites conflict. Our forefathers were so convinced of this that

many of them thought that our government could not survive at all.

In the American context, love of country is not judged by loud proclamations of loyalty to any group of rulers, by complacent acceptance of any particular social, economic, or political arrangement, or by withholding objections to established orthodoxies.

Patriotism can be an important and even beautiful word. Patriotism should be defined as the degree to which one is committed to the idea that is the American creed. Our origins are not shrouded in the hazy myths of primitive legends or held together by blood claims or dim memories of God-like figures. We are founded on an idea based on individual freedom and reasonable constraints and we are sustained by that same idea. Our origins were rooted in more prosaic, reported history. Our fathers were not superhuman demagogues, but fallible human beings who left behind their testimony in cool political prose.

Our stronger myths, if the word is not abused this way, are certain rational propositions about the nature of government—the limit of constitutional authority, the equality of all citizens, the rule of law, and the right of the people to govern themselves.

To be faithful to these ideas is to be much more the patriot than any self-proclaimed saviors of the republic who confuse conformity with conviction or uniformity with the union that binds Americans together into one nation.

A patriot is to be judged not by how loudly he proclaims his love of country but by how well he lives up to the ideals of this country. And this is the idea of America that I believe will serve as the center of this new time that you must fashion with your minds and hearts. For in this process the character of our time-honored institutions will be changed and revitalized, and our children will not only survive but they will inherit a better world.

I can say these things now with surety because I have known you these past years.

## RECOGNITION OF ARABELLA MARTINEZ: A COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK  
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, one of the real benefits of service in this body is the opportunity to meet and work with new friends. Arabella Martinez is one of those whom I feel privileged to have met during my first term in the House.

She is a capable and concerned community leader. Last Saturday Arabella was recognized for her service. The University of California Alumni Association presented her with the Rosalie M. Stern award for "significant voluntary contributions to her community in the first 15 years after graduation."

I commend a recent Oakland Tribune article about Arabella and Oakland's Spanish Speaking Unity Council to my colleagues. Their successes are an inspiration to us all.

The article follows:

## A BIG AWARD TO A PETITE CHICANA

(By Marjorie McCabe)

Five-foot-one Arabella Martinez looks a bit dominated by the big executive chair in her office at Spanish Speaking Unity Council headquarters at Fruitvale and 38th Ave.

But that impression doesn't last long, because when the SSUC's director starts telling

June 20, 1974

about the strides the organization has made and her role in making it all work, it is clear she is not easily dominated.

This Chicana is a young woman of quiet determination and dedication. Her participation in a mind-boggling number of community activities (ranging from the Drug Abuse Council to the Oakland Chamber of Commerce) has brought her the 1974 Rosalie M. Stern Award.

This is given annually to a young alumna from Berkeley who has made "significant voluntary contributions to her community in the first 15 years after graduation." Presentation was made to her Saturday by the University of California Alumni Association during Commencement Luncheon activities.

"I didn't have to say anything at the luncheon, which was nice," she smiles, "and I'll be using the \$500 award for a trip to Europe in September."

Despite the fact that her comments at the presentation were limited to a "thank you," Arabella is eloquent on the needs of La Raza in Alameda County and what the SSUC is doing to meet those needs.

Her own awareness of the Chicano community movement came relatively recently, she says. Around the time of her graduation from U.C. in 1959 as a social welfare major, she "sort of did some work in the civil rights movement there, but had no interest or involvement in the Chicano community.

She attributes it to the fact that when she was young, her widowed mother married an Anglo and Arabella was raised Anglo.

"Maybe I wanted to be Anglo. I felt a sense of inferiority about my ethnic background. It doesn't take too much discrimination to make you feel like a small person, and there wasn't much support when I was growing up."

After she was grown up, support did come, surprisingly, from her Anglo husband, from whom she is divorced (she resumed her maiden name).

"He was a nice person. He liked things Mexican—I guess that's why he married me. He knew a great deal about Mexico and spoke about its lovely language, art and culture. He helped me gain pride. I didn't have a hard time after that to develop my own identity and to work for human rights."

At that time, she was working for the Contra Costa County Social Service Department, and "with the foundation set, began inquiring about what was happening in the Chicano community. I was told about a meeting that Saturday; I went, and got so turned on that I wanted to get involved."

It was suggested to Arabella that she get in touch with James Delgadillo, who was president of the Community Service Organization. "The CSO was at the tag end of its viability in Oakland (though it's still strong in other places). Its money was gone, but there was a lot of leadership left."

There was also a proliferation of disorganized Chicano organizations. "At one meeting, there would be 10 people from the 10 different organizations, at another, nobody. Being a brash young lady at that time, I said to Jimmy, 'We ought to form a unity council!'"

It was founded in 1964, and in 1969, Arabella was named executive director.

She is responsible for its \$600,000 community development program, which gives priority to youth education, urban development (economic and housing), and manpower (training and employment) projects.

Arabella is particularly proud of the SSUC's assistance to Spanish-surname individuals in getting together data to petition the Small Business Administration for loans, and for the success of these ventures. "We've considered the best minority business packaging organization in the Bay Area."

Their expertise also provided the technical assistance to obtain a charter for City Center Federal Savings and Loan, of which Arabella is a director. She also is on the United Bay

Area Crusade board of trustees, a far cry from the days when she was among those picketing UBAC for its racist attitude.

"Till 1969, no Mexican organization got money from UBAC. Since that time, we have developed such a track record as a credible organization, we don't have to picket anymore. That is not to say we don't continue to advocate for our community, but we don't have to take drastic measures—people are listening. But that doesn't mean we wouldn't if it were important—if the community were ignored or discriminated against. Injustices keep going on."

And how much of Arabella's time does this take? "I think it's my whole life, if you want to know the truth."

**SHANKER HITS WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS FROM NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS BY U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION**

**HON. HERMAN BADILLO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, each Sunday, Albert Shanker, president of the United Federation of Teachers in New York, publishes a column in the New York Times on education issues of the day. Mr. Shanker's June 16 editorial dealt with the inexplicable withholding of badly needed Emergency School Assistance Act funds from New York City schools which a year earlier were considered highly qualified for such Federal aid. Because there are many questions still unanswered on this matter and because of the difficulty we are having in getting a satisfactory response from the U.S. Office of Education, I believe that Mr. Shanker's analysis of the situation deserves to be brought to the attention of my colleagues. I include his column in full at this point in the RECORD:

THE ESAA FUND CUT: RAW DEAL FOR NEW YORK CITY

(By Albert Shanker)

In the past few years, the New York City Board of Education and some of the individual community school boards in the city's decentralized system have shown great courage in resisting ill-conceived proposals put forward by U.S. government agencies.

A memorable example of such dauntlessness was the firm stand taken by District 19 against a proposal by the U.S. Office of Education which would have established separate standards for minority group children in reading and mathematics. District 19, as a result, was threatened with the loss of almost a million dollars in federal funds. It took a lawsuit finally to restore the funds to the district.

In another encounter, several districts refused to permit their pupils to respond to a questionnaire which they considered racist. Such questions as: "Which of these are you? . . . I am Black . . . I am White . . . I am Brown . . ." and "How do you think your parents feel about Black and White students going to the same school together?" came under vehement criticism. Again there loomed the threat of a loss of funds—a threat turned back by a defiant Board of Education and an aroused public.

Now it seems that these government agencies have at last found a way of getting back at the recalcitrant New York City school system. The device: a sharp reduction of the funding which New York schools now receive under the Emergency School Assistance Act (ESAA). The original purpose of ESAA was

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

to finance efforts by school districts to promote integration and to offset the harmful effects of racial isolation. Last year the U.S. Office of Education provided New York City with \$14.5 million in ESAA funds for such programs as bilingual minischools, remedial reading and mathematics, diagnosis and treatment of reading disabilities, early childhood integration centers, and dropout prevention. Now ESAA funding has suddenly and mysteriously been reduced by 50%. This slashing of aid to the city is not part of a general fund reduction. On the contrary, the allocation of funds to New York State as a whole has actually been increased from \$17.8 million to \$19.5 million. New York City's school Chancellor Irving Anker quite properly describes the cuts as "shocking." Of the \$19.5 million given the state, the city's share will be a mere \$7.3 million. Yet the city enrolls 72% of the black pupils in the state and 90% of those with Spanish surnames.

The cuts mean the end of programs in 12 districts and the end of all ESAA programs conducted by the central Board of Education. 98,000 children will be deprived of the special instruction which they had last year.

What justification has been offered for these cuts? Robert H. Seitzer, Regional Commissioner, in a letter to Dr. Anker, declares: "The educational quality of your proposed program and the needs described in the application were not sufficient to merit the award of assistance at this time." The letter goes on to say that New York's "need for assistance" and the "effective net reduction in minority group isolation . . . received so low a score that we cannot support your application from limited ESAA allotment grants to districts in New York."

To the uninformed, such judgments may appear to have substance. But they just don't stand up to analysis. The letter questions the "educational quality" of programs which were approved last year and, in all the months they were in operation, received not one word of criticism from the U.S.O.E. How was it possible for programs deemed of "high" educational quality last year to be rated "low" this year? If U.S.O.E. had felt impelled to revise its opinion of the quality of the programs in mid-year, why didn't it inform New York City so that the programs could be altered? The agency's generalities aside, what specifically is wrong with these programs?

Seitzer's letter to Anker asserts that the "needs for assistance" are not sufficient. But these are the same needs which were invoked last year. Just how have the needs of New York's minority group pupils changed? What criteria does U.S.O.E. use? What yardstick of need was used to determine that New York City schools, which enroll 79% of the minority group students in the state, will receive only 37% of the state's funds?

As for the "low score" given the city for proficiency in reducing minority group isolation, the plain fact is that the percentage of white students in the schools has been decreasing and the percentage of black students increasing. But this has been true in almost all other urban school systems which are receiving ESAA funds—and many of these systems have not made the efforts and taken the initiatives which have distinguished New York's endeavor.

The President of our city's Board of Education, Dr. Seymour Lachman, has categorically rejected the U.S.O.E. "explanation." In his words, "Such an explanation is incredible when there has been no substantial change in the circumstances of our children over last year, when similar programs were funded. In addition, we have been unable as yet to obtain any explanation of the criteria and methods by which these programs have been reviewed and found without merit by the U.S. Office of Education . . . It is outrageous that in this post-Watergate era an agency of the federal government, the U.S. Office of Education, makes decisions affecting the lives

of children without stating the reasons for those decisions. What standards and what criteria were used by this federal agency in deciding how funds would be allocated to districts? Public disclosure of the standards and criteria used in reviewing proposals, as well as the process by which they are applied, is essential in order to remove any doubt raised as to the rationale and objectivity of the U.S.O.E.'s actions."

Almost a month has gone by since Dr. Lachman's protest, and U.S.O.E. has yet to give reasons for its provocative actions. Unless there is public disclosure by U.S.O.E. we have a right to assume that these actions were purely of a capricious and vindictive nature. Who knows what school district will be the target of U.S.O.E. tomorrow? Meanwhile, 98,000 New York City minority group children are being callously victimized.

**HOUSING STARTS DOWN**

**HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, in 1968, the Congress determined that the need for housing in the United States by persons of low and moderate incomes could be met over the following 10 years if we built an average of 600,000 additional units per year. This goal is not being met. By way of illustration, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues two articles on our housing situation: the first appeared in the Washington Post on February 17, 1973, and points out that we have a need for additional housing and a need for replacement housing as more than one-fourth of the Nation's housing stock is in excess of 50 years; the second article which demonstrates what has happened in the past few months, appeared in the Wall Street Journal of May 19, 1974.

We of the Congress have made a commitment to all Americans through the Housing Act of 1949 when we called for the realization of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family.

These articles demonstrate that we have fallen far short of that goal, and I call them to the attention of my colleagues in the hopes that their contents will rekindle the spirit behind the 1949 act and enable us to pass a 1974 housing act which carries out this commitment: [From the Wall Street Journal, June 19, 1974]

**HOUSING STARTS FELL 11 PERCENT IN MAY FROM APRIL LEVEL**

WASHINGTON.—Homebuilding activity dropped sharply in May under a renewed mortgage-credit crunch and continued high interest rates. And building permits, an indicator of future housing construction, tumbled even more steeply.

Housing starts were at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 1,450,000 units, down 11% from April's upward-revised 1,631,000 units and 38% from May 1973's 2,330,000 units, the Commerce Department said (see chart on page one).

Building permits issued by the 14,000 localities that require them slid 19% to an adjusted annual rate of 1,055,000 last month from April's 1,300,000. The permit figure was a whopping 43% below May 1973's 1,838,000 units, and was the lowest since April 1967, when a previous credit crunch slowed permits to a 1,035,000-unit annual rate.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 20, 1974

The May deterioration in housing starts "rules out any housing recovery this year," asserted Michael Sumichrast, chief economist of the National Association of Home Builders. Mr. Sumichrast said he expects a further decline, with starts at the 1.2 million level for several months. He also has lowered, to 1.5 million units from 1.6 million, his prediction of the rate of starts for all of 1974.

"The situation is just plain bad," he said. "The price of money is terribly expensive and there really is no money."

Nixon administration officials were dismayed by the latest barometers of housing activity. James Lynn, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, termed the figures "disappointing." However, he said the downturn "emphasizes the importance" of the administration program designed to pump up to \$10 billion into the housing market. That program, announced in early May, didn't help the housing picture last month and mightn't show up for another month or so.

Earlier this year, home buyers were returning to the marketplace after last fall's credit squeeze. But government efforts to damp soaring inflation through stringent monetary policies has again depressed the housing industry. Mortgage money is in short supply again and, where it's available, the terms often are much more restrictive.

The housing pace last month was the slowest since December, when starts were at a 1,403,000-unit annual rate. The rate of housing starts and building permits declined nationwide last month. Construction was off substantially for single-family dwellings and for buildings of five units or more. Starts for buildings with two to four units were slightly above the April level.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 17, 1973]  
To REPLACE OLDER DWELLINGS—NEED SEEN FOR HOUSING

(By Benjamin Ronis and William B. Rucker)

Most housing production forecasts for 1973 have indicated a downward trend from the 2.38 million level of new starts achieved in 1972. Yet, despite the problems within and without the housing industry, there are some basic reasons why housing production can and should be expected to rise in the 1970s.

Foremost among the problems mentioned by experts are higher costs of construction, rising costs and scarcity of traditional building and lack of skilled labor, shortages of many traditional building materials and withdrawal of government subsidies.

Some of the observers place great reliance upon the forecasting credibility of the historical housing cycle, to be on the ebb, though the results of 1971 and 1972 indicate otherwise.

Most of the experts also commented in varying degree on their fears about over-production, probably referring to the high volume of unsold houses at year's end in 1971. Many reasoned that continued over-production would certainly lead to a drop in the housing supply during 1973, and for this reason most anticipated a grade reduction, perhaps as much as 15 per cent, in the 1976 reduction below \*\*\* during 1972.

Under-emphasized in recent forecasts of housing production trends is a market ingredient that has the potential for radically altering all predictions. This is the replacement housing market. There are presently numerous indicators from both the social and economic sectors showing that replacement of millions of obsolete dwelling units by modern residential facilities is likely to be an increasingly significant factor in housing production over the next decade.

Consider that the bulk of the nation's

housing stock of around 70 million units is old. While as many as 30 million new dwelling units have been added to the housing inventory since World War II, the average age of this category is almost 20 years.

And an estimated 15 million units were constructed during World War I and the decade following it. Thus, nearly one-fourth of the total has been in service about half-a-century. The rest of the occupied housing stock ranges above 50 years. Many of the older units were most likely built between 1885 and 1905, period during which most U.S. cities were struck by the great wave of immigration inspired by the expansion of the industrial complex. As a consequence, much of the stock of housing falling within this age category still exists today in the central portions of the larger metropolitan areas and most of the nation's medium-sized and smaller cities and towns.

The continued usage of much existing urban type housing can now be classified as substandard and a prime target for recycling is coming more and more under attack because social and economic conditions that once made these dwellings viable are gone or rapidly disappearing. The mass housing market of the 1890s and early 1900s was aimed at social and economic classes that were practically powerless. Many in this market were also immigrants from foreign countries where they had lived under conditions far worse than those they were being offered in U.S. cities and towns of that period. Those urban dwellers had little to say about the design of the dwelling that they and their children after them would occupy for long periods. At that time those urban immigrants also possessed little political or economic leverage to effect desirable changes in their environment or living conditions.

Today's urban dwellers, even those in low-income groups, possess infinitely more political resources and leverage to improve their living conditions.

Much of this out-moded housing was built to accommodate life-styles of 50 or 60 years ago. Hence, it creates a false impression as to the adequacy and habitability of the nation's housing stock.

So outmoded housing is likely to disappear in the wake of the proliferation of activity by consumer and public interest law groups driving hard for elimination of substandard conditions.

In past years the traditional analysis of expectations of housing demand placed considerable emphasis on population growth, birth rates and new household formations particularly through marriages. The 1970 census showed some interesting statistics to illustrate that other factors are emerging. Many areas which showed a population decrease between 1960 and 1970 actually recorded increases in the number of households in those same areas during that period. In times past, many persons (particularly singles) were forced by economic or other considerations to live at home or in group quarters. Today large numbers of houses, condominiums and apartments are being occupied by one-person households. Previously, both lenders and landlords had shunned the single buyer or tenant, especially in the younger generation. Now these singles seem to be more than welcome anywhere, often being favored over families with children.

Until recent times, a large portion of new households entered the housing market via the acquisition of a used home. This type of housing decision was usually prompted by economic necessity, plus a willingness by the new owners to devote a great portion of their leisure time to scraping, patching, painting, papering and other home repair chores.

Now many first-time buyers are capable

of acquiring a new house, especially with the current liberal conventional financing, some up to 95 per cent of the sale price.

As this trend increases, the attractiveness of buying or even renting used dwellings is likely to decline.

Recently, the rate of replacement of outmoded residential structures began to be affected by several strong factors. With the rapid increase in scarcity of traditional suburban building sites due to sewer and zoning moratoriums, many in-town areas previously devoted to low-density housing of various older types are being eyed by builders for their redevelopment potential. Since the use of these properties is generally predicated upon the removal of the older dwellings, more of this removal will likely occur if the suburban sewer and zoning crunch continues.

Further, while suburbia in general is locking out developers with "no-growth" policies, the central-city jurisdictions, which previously had lost population and tax revenue to the suburbs, now are almost often welcoming this regeneration. In-town sites are generally more expensive than the typical suburban site, so the new developments replacing the outmoded dwellings are quite likely to produce a higher number of dwellings per acre than before.

Some examples of this type of activity already are surfacing in the Washington area, with the plans for demolishing and replacing Buckingham in nearby Virginia, Falkland in Silver Spring and McLean Gardens in the District.

With an estimated 20 to 23 million existing residential units having already reached some stage of obsolescence, a replacement rate below 1 million units annually would hardly make a meaningful dent in the backlog. Due largely to normal housing market factors this additional million could boost annual housing production to well over three million starts without any great risk of glutting the market.

Recently, a small East European country with about the population of New York State (but with considerably less wealth) adopted some new housing goals. Under a five-year housing plan, it proposes to replace every dwelling that does not conform to modern standards established within the past 15 years.

Cannot the United States, with infinitely greater resources, at least match those aspirations?

(The authors of this article are consultants in architecture, development and urban planning. Both teach related courses in area colleges.)

## FLORIDA CRACKDOWN ON DRUGS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, while it is fashionable these days to speak only ill of the Federal Government, there are nevertheless many, many Federal programs which are of substantial benefit to the American people and which do carry out their mandate to combat national problems.

Recently, the director of the Division of Operations of Florida's Department of Law Enforcement, drew my attention to one Federal agency which had engaged in a very fruitful cooperation with the State of Florida to effect a dramatic crackdown on drug trafficking in Florida.

I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to the following letter which details the effective law enforcement activities of the U.S. Department of Customs in conjunction with Florida State and local agencies, and to commend all those involved for their fine law enforcement efforts:

DEPARTMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT,  
Tallahassee, Fla., May 28, 1974.  
Mr. VERNON D. ACREE,  
Commissioner, U.S. Customs Service,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER ACREE: During the past seven months, the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the United States Customs Service, the Internal Revenue Service, the Florida Marine Patrol, and numerous other law enforcement agencies have been involved in an investigation of large-scale marijuana smuggling in Florida. This investigation resulted in the arrests of several individuals and the seizure of approximately 50,000 lbs. of marijuana on December 23 and 24, 1973.

However, those arrested comprise but a small segment of the overall organized smuggling ring responsible for importation of illegal narcotics. This investigation has identified over 200 persons involved in this conspiracy which has been in operation for at least one year within our State.

The arrests, seizures, and subsequent intelligence gathered could not have been achieved without the cooperation of all agencies involved. Due to the success of the initial phase of this investigation and other investigative matters of mutual concern, a Task Force was formed. This Task Force has been successful in identifying and providing intelligence information on a multitude of persons involved in the overall conspiracy. We believe that, with the continuance of the Task Force effort, these persons will be prosecuted and the smuggling ring broken. The scope of this investigation is so broad that no agency could attempt to undertake it alone. To date, due to the Task Force effort, more than 33 indictments have been handed down, 30 tons of marijuana seized and more arrests and seizures expected. As the investigation continues, information obtained by the Task Force and presented to Federal and State Grand Juries should lead to the arrests of the high echelon of the smuggling ring.

As stated previously, without the aid and full cooperation of the United States Customs Service, especially the Miami and New Orleans Regions, this investigation would not have been successful.

Please convey this Department's appreciation to the following United States Customs Service Offices:

Regional Commissioner of Customs, Miami, Florida.

Regional Director of Investigations, Miami, Florida.

Regional Director, Patrol Division, Miami, Florida.

U.S. Customs Air Support Branch, Homestead, Florida.

Regional Commissioner of Customs, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Regional Director of Investigation, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Regional Director of Patrol Division, New Orleans, Louisiana.

In continuing our joint efforts, there is a need for further assistance and close coordination with the United States Customs Service. To facilitate this cooperation, it would be a definite asset to have continuing Customs representation on the Task Force.

Please be assured of our cooperation in all matters of mutual concern.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM A. TROELSTRUP,  
Commissioner.  
EMORY B. WILLIAMS,  
Director, Division of Operations.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### THE OBJECTS OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, from June 23 to June 26 some 18,000 members of Kiwanis International will be in Denver, Colo., for the group's 59th annual convention.

A special function of the convention will be to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the "Objects of Kiwanis," which were adopted at a convention in Denver in 1924. The following series of editorials from the Kiwanis magazine illustrate the way the organization has changed and grown to meet the challenges that have come over the years. I commend them to my colleagues:

#### THE OBJECTS OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL HUMAN VALUES AND THE GOLDEN RULE

In 1917, two years after he helped build the first Kiwanis club in Detroit, professional organizer Allen S. Browne created a motto and a creed for the new organization. The motto was "Service Brings Its Own Reward." The creed was a wordy document, too long to quote in its entirety here, but it began as follows:

First—To realize that I am a business man, and wish no success that is not procured by giving the highest service at my command.

Second—To do my best to elevate and improve the business in which I am engaged and so to conduct myself that others in the same line may find it profitable and well to do likewise.

And it ended with this statement:

Twelfth—To realize that I live not only for myself but for others.

Taken all in all, Browne's creed wasn't bad; the concepts of fairness and of service were there, and even if tagged on at the end, so was the spirit of altruism. But it did have its faults. For one thing, it focused heavily on business, thus ignoring the possibility that nonbusinessmen might want to join Kiwanis clubs. And it really didn't go very deep; it didn't even mention certain fundamental values that many Kiwanians, having recently endured the most dreadful war in the history of mankind, wanted expressed.

So the creed lasted only until the Providence convention of 1918. There a Constitution was drawn up for the fledgling organization and with it a group of underlying principles called "Objects." The Providence Objects reduced Browne's business emphasis and promoted organizational growth and fellowship. They began with:

1. To standardize and disseminate Kiwanian principles of fair dealing and practices and observance of the Golden Rule.

2. To encourage, promote and supervise the organization of Kiwanis clubs.

And they concluded with:

6. To promote and encourage the living of the Golden Rule in private, civic, social and business life.

These new Objects were a vast improvement on Browne's creed. They were blessedly concise and the golden rule was given prominence. But they still weren't all that some Kiwanians believed they could be. The language remained prosaic and, most important, those fundamental ideas still weren't expressed. Nevertheless, Kiwanians had more urgent matters to attend to over the next six years, and it was not until 1924—after a spurt of growth that changed Kiwanis from a tiny businessman's organization with 10,000 members in 83 clubs to a nationally-

respected service club with 90,000 members in 1,249 clubs—that a new Constitution was drafted at the International Convention in Denver. With it, as Article II, came a new—and permanent—set of Objects.

To Give primacy to the human and spiritual rather than to the material values of life.

To Encourage the daily living of the Golden Rule in all human relationships.

To Promote the adoption and the application of higher social, business and professional standards.

To develop by precept and example, a more intelligent, aggressive and serviceable citizenship.

To Provide through Kiwanis clubs a practical means to form enduring friendships, to render altruistic service and to build better communities.

To Cooperate in creating and maintaining that sound public opinion and high idealism which make possible the increase of righteousness, justice, patriotism and good will.

Much better. So much better, in fact, that today, after half a century, the Objects of Kiwanis International remain as fresh, meaningful, and incontrovertible as they were the day they were presented for approval to the delegates at the Denver convention. The second of these new Objects was a direct descendent from both Allen Browne's creed and the original Objects, yet more inclusive and precise than either. But it was the first Object that broke new ground, that said to the world: "We are not simply a businessman's club. We are not a group of happy-go-lucky, once-a-week back-slappers. We have a mission in life worthy of any man who joins us. We know why we exist and we know what we seek—a more perfect relationship between men through the application of the highest standards we can conceive of."

Since that time Kiwanians have given tangible meaning over and over again to those first two Objects. In 1936 the International Committee on Support of Churches in their Spiritual Aims (now the Committee on Support of Spiritual Aims) was created, and the countless activities generated by that one committee alone are an eloquent testimony to the upholding of human and spiritual values. The same values have been uppermost in efforts to salvage the young from the potential wreckage of addiction through Operation Drug Alert, in Project Environment's design to improve the quality of life, and in this year's program aimed at enriching the lives of the aging. In fact, these first two Objects underlie all Kiwanis service activities, as well as the aspirations of all Kiwanians in their own daily lives.

In his address to the Denver convention in 1924, International President Edmund F. Arras, a Columbus, Ohio, real estate man, expressed in simple yet visionary terms what he believed to be the meaning of the first Object: "The inventive genius of the age has emphasized the comforts and luxury of the material side of life until man has been lured from the primary human and spiritual values of life to the material values, and each day he searches for new amusements and thrills only to find true happiness unattained. Life's greatest victory belongs to those who have stood for great truths in the ordinary walks of life, those who have faced the strife of daily affairs with hopes born from high ideals and who by example have visualized great principles in their relations with their fellowmen."

Concerning the second Object, President Ed said: "The application of the Golden Rule takes envy's poison out of the tongue and sheathes the sword of hatred. It is the control of passions and the refinement of intelligence."

On that day in Denver he and his fellow Kiwanians set a standard by which they and thousands—indeed millions—of men to follow could gauge how well they were sharing their lives. Standing for truth in the ordi-

nary walks of life, controlling passions, and refining intelligence were healthy ideals then; they remain healthy ideals today.

#### A CHANGE IN EMPHASIS

One crucial characteristic of Kiwanis is that it has never fundamentally changed. Kiwanis remains in spirit—and many ways in practice—as it was a half century ago. And that fact is important to its success.

Conversely, however, Kiwanis does change. As it has grown it had added some new characteristics, discarded some old ones. And that too is important for its success.

The third Object of Kiwanis International, written in 1924, reads:

To Promote the adoption and the application of higher social, business and professional standards. The men who conceived that Object lived in an age when hucksterism was rife, the age of the Tea Pot Dome scandals. As good businessmen they reacted to the events of their time by pledging to uphold ethical standards in business. Five years earlier Kiwanis had appointed an International Committee on Business Standards and Methods. It was to continue in service for thirty years, and its Code of Ethics is still included in the supplies catalog of Kiwanis International.

But times did change and with them Kiwanis priorities. In 1949 the two long-standing International Committees on Public Affairs for Canada and the United States changed their names, becoming the Committees on Public and Business Affairs. Meanwhile, the old Committee on Business Standards and Methods was discontinued.

In 1971 those two committees gave way to the still more encompassing International Committee on Citizenship Services.

But as the Object on business standards assumed less importance, another Object took on more. The fifth reads:

To Provide through Kiwanis clubs a practical means to form enduring friendships, to render altruistic service and to build better communities. The first of these aims, the quest for enduring friendships, has remained constant from the beginning emphasized by the work of inter-club relations committees, by US/Canada Goodwill Week, and finally by International Extension itself. Meanwhile, however, the goals of altruistic service and building better communities have taken on increasing importance.

It started in the early years with activities on behalf of youth. Supporting Scout groups sponsoring baseball teams, building playgrounds, aiding crippled children were among the first programs of Kiwanis. During the Depression a favorite activity was the donation of milk to school children. After World War II the emphasis turned to education, where it remains today. Key Club, though founded in 1925, had its largest period of growth in the early Fifties. Circle K came into being in 1948. Vocational guidance was introduced as a major emphasis program in the Fifties. Scholarship and loan programs became increasingly important, until in 1972 Kiwanis clubs loaned nearly \$2 million to students. And through the years Kiwanis expanded its services to benefit others as well: the elderly, the ill, the mentally retarded, those in prison.

The quest for better communities also gained momentum over the years—a result, in part, of the decline of small towns as people flocked to urban areas. Farm/City Week helped cement fragile relationships. Tree plantings, cleanup drives, and other conservation projects became popular. Safety campaigns of every kind imaginable were sponsored. Parks and recreation areas, hospital wings and clinics were built. And perhaps most important, thousands of Kiwanians accepted the responsibilities of local office and of membership on committees dedicated to civic improvement.

Strangely enough, though International President Edmund F. Arras made the new

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Kiwanis Objects the subject of his speech to the 1924 Denever convention, he made no reference at all to one of them, the fifth. Perhaps he felt that the references to enduring friendship, altruistic service, and better communities spoke for themselves. If so, he was right. The fifth Object really didn't need anyone to speak for it; in terms of results achieved it has become the most accurate statement of Kiwanis purposes ever made.

#### A NEW ROLE

When after much writing and rewriting, a small group of Kiwanians approved the Objects of Kiwanis International a half century ago, the last thing on their minds was drug abuse and its hazards for the young. Though looked on with horror even then, drugs were simply not regarded as a serious threat to the average North American family. Heroin was unknown to the vast majority of citizens, and the opium dens of China seemed a long way away.

Yet when in the late 1960s the time came for Kiwanis clubs to recognize the virtually epidemic proportions of drug abuse and act to arrest it, a mandate for such action already existed. And it was nearly fifty years old.

The men who wrote the Objects believed that their society was underpinned by certain fundamental moral values. They also believed that it was the duty of all members of that society to uphold those values. They stated both ideas in not one but two of the six Objects presented for ratification to the Denver Convention. Number Four reads:

To develop by precept and example, a more intelligent, aggressive and serviceable citizenship, and Number Six reads:

To cooperate in creating and maintaining that sound public opinion and high idealism which make possible the increase of righteousness, justice, patriotism and good will.

Without mentioning the word, these two Objects suggest a means of achieving the goals they set—namely, education. Nevertheless, it took a while for this concept to sink in. Early Kiwanis clubs dedicated themselves almost exclusively to philanthropic activities. They were great builders and givers, but only gradually during the decades preceding World War II did they begin to attempt projects with an educational format. And those were primarily fellowship activities of the kind that characterized observances such as US/Canada Goodwill Week and, later, Farm/City Week.

But when the dike broke it broke for good. In the late forties, and especially in the fifties a flood of education-oriented programs poured forth from Kiwanis International, and then from its clubs. Kiwanians by the thousands sponsored vocational guidance programs on behalf of boys and girls seeking meaningful careers. Ballot Battallion became a favorite election-year activity as Kiwanians answered the question, "Why vote?" and helped get voters to the polls by distributing lapel buttons and windshield stickers. Safety programs taught young and old the importance of guarding against accidents. Operation Law and Order instructed boys and girls about the laws of their communities. National Public Work Week made people more conscious of the job being done by public servants. And no program was more directly linked to education—and to Objects Four and Six—than the scholarship and loan activities of hundreds of Kiwanis clubs.

So by the time Operation Drug Alert was launched in 1969, a tradition had been established. A service club could deal forthrightly and usefully with contemporary issues; it could continue to build hospital wings or help underprivileged children as it had always done, but it could also step into the forefront when specific social problems arose in the community. In short, it could work to

June 20, 1974

develop better citizens and to create and maintain high idealism.

And indeed, shocked by the wave of drug abuse that left shattered, disturbed, imprisoned young people in its wake, Kiwanians did step forward. Late in 1970, after eighteen months of Operation Drug Alert, 4200 Kiwanis clubs had become involved to some degree in the program. They had distributed millions of copies of anti-drug literature to young people, they had sponsored visual education on drug abuse, they had conducted forums, encouraged news media, and cooperated with education and health officials in providing community-wide programs to combat the drug menace. And they had spent approximately \$800,000 as well as countless hours of their own time to do it.

Operation Drug Alert continued for two more years as a major emphasis program of Kiwanis International, and even today clubs are rendering important service in the drug field. Fortunately, the epidemic seems to be subsiding as more and more young people recognize that drugs offer no permanent solution but can become a permanent problem.

Kiwanians involved in Operation Drug Alert or any other of the multitude of Kiwanis activities rarely think as they work of the Objects of Kiwanis International. But the Objects nonetheless helped chart the early course of Kiwanis, helping give the organization direction and guidance along the way. Today they remain an inspiration and a beacon for any of us who choose to rediscover them.

## MURMURATION ON THE HILL

### HON. LESLIE C. ARENDTS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. ARENTS. Mr. Speaker, columnist James J. Kilpatrick has written a number of thought-provoking columns on Watergate and the impeachment investigation. Another such column appeared in the June 14 edition of the Washington, D.C., Star News.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this column for the benefit of my colleagues who may not have had an opportunity to read it.

#### MURMURATION ON THE HILL

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

A great deal of murmuration continues in our town on this whole prospect of impeachment—impeachment in theory, and impeachment in fact. For whatever it may be worth, my own impression is that the President's fortunes are looking better on either approach.

Murmuration is the word used by bird-watchers for the noise made by a flock of starlings. The noun is more precisely defined as an act of murmuring, which is to say, the muttering of low complaints; grumbling. That is largely what we are doing now.

For a variety of reasons, the movement to impeach Mr. Nixon and to oust him from office is losing its momentum. A great many members of Congress would like to be rid of the President, but their ambition is now badly tangled in theory, fact, timing, politics, and human inadequacy. Instead of charging toward impeachment, the House is merely drifting toward impeachment. It is entirely possible that the House will never get there.

Part of the trouble lies in leadership. The last time the House undertook to impeach a president, a century or so ago, a strong and implacable voice summoned the House to its duty. No such voice is audible on Capitol Hill today.

Peter Rodino, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, is not a Thaddeus Stevens nor was he meant to be. Neither is there a zealot in the Senate to match Charles Sumner. If the impeachment movement were going anywhere, we ought to be hearing Catonian cries. Instead, we are hearing—murmuration.

Another difficulty arises from a general confusion on the theory of impeachment. The leading theory, propounded by all the experts, is that when it comes to ousting a president, an "impeachable offense" is something broader than a "criminal offense."

But that theory causes great uneasiness. The situation is different as to the removal of federal judges. Under the Constitution, judges serve "during good behavior." The commonsensical implication of that provision is that judges therefore may be removed on a finding of bad behavior. In every impeachment proceeding of this century, the House has confirmed that view: It has charged judges with "misbehavior."

No such amorphous charge constitutionally can be brought against a president. Here the House is limited to "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors." In the view of some members, it is not enough to demonstrate that a president has behaved badly. Any such notion would fundamentally alter our structure of government: It would give us presidents who serve at the pleasure of the Congress.

In the end, legal theories may count for less than political realities. Questions of theory provide tidbits for law professors to munch on, but the politicians who make up the House have other fish to fry. Putting aside the law and the evidence, the practical question is likely to come down to this: Is impeachment popular? Do the people want to see Mr. Nixon removed from his office?

The polls suggest that the question is close, but the polls reflect a national constituency. Members of the House run by congressional districts. As time trudges by, an impression gains strength that in many congressional districts, more voters are passionately pro-Nixon than passionately anti-Nixon.

The time factor grows increasingly important. It now appears that Rodino's committee will not act before August. This timetable could compel an up-or-down vote on the floor immediately before the campaign adjournment in September. Some members of the House are walking around with the look of batters facing an 0-and-2 count. They don't know whether to swing at the pitch or let it go by.

Granted, the situation could change overnight. Mr. Nixon is entirely capable of provoking the temper of the House or so insulting its dignity that his impeachment could be voted with a whoop and a holler.

The pattern of Watergate has been one explosive bombshell after another. But the longer the House murmurs and fidgets, while the President flies boldly around the world, the more likely it seems that Mr. Nixon will survive this crisis after all.

#### THE ENERGY CRISIS

**HON. TOM BEVILL**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, each year since becoming a Member of Congress, I have been privileged to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of the top winners in the annual Albert Rains Speech Contest, held at Snead State Junior College, in my district.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

As in the past, this year's speeches are very good. They express a keen interest in some of the very real problems facing us today. And they show that the young people of our Nation are very much interested in presenting their views and in helping develop ways to meet some of these problems.

The speeches are timely and thought provoking and I am sure my colleagues will find them of interest.

The speeches follow:

##### THE ENERGY CRISIS

(By Walter Alves)

Contrary to what you've read in the newspapers and what little you hear from the government, the energy crisis means much more than a shortage of gasoline and oil; much more than turning down thermostats and digging deeper in your pockets at the gas station. The energy crisis, as I perceive it, is related to every aspect of our life here on planet earth, from the food we eat and water we drink to the very air we breath.

Energy is the basis of all life. Each day though much of the time we are too busy to notice it—heat and light from the sun keep us alive. Plants, whose growth depends on the sun, fill our bellies and feed our cattle and even give off the oxygen that we breath.

I will discuss the energy crisis with this view in mind; that the crisis encompasses all phases of human life, and unless we begin to recognize the depth and scope of this awesome problem, mankind has a date in the near future with disaster.

For years we citizens of America have taken energy for granted. Our country has been blessed with the largest reserves of coal in the world, and our population, which comprises 6 percent of the world's people, uses over a third of the world's energy. Energy can turn a poor man into a rich man. The reason per capita income in the U.S. is so high, according to the President's Commission on Population Growth, is that the average American worker has at his command more energy than any other worker in the world.

The average American family is used to buying a new car every three or four years. Most of us have never known what it is to be truly hungry or without enough clothes to wear. We waste more paper in a day than many people use in a year. Each day the cities of our country are faced with the disposal of 250 million tons of solid waste. Almost everything we buy comes in packages which we immediately throw away.

But, the richest nation in the world is chocking on its own affluence. Our nation is also the most wasteful in the world. We have labored too long under the assumption that everything must be bigger and better, and now we are beginning to pay for our ignorance. Gas prices have shot up, and will get higher in the future. Food prices, meat in particular, are exorbitant and in some cases prohibitive. And yet we continue to add fuel to the fire.

The world population has doubled in the past 50 years, and is increasing at a rate of some 80 million persons annually. If current growth rates continue for another 50 years, the world's population will jump to 10 billion. The more people there are, the more energy consumed; more oil to drill for, more mouths to be fed, and more houses and cars to build.

Right now, "Population Growth and The American Future," tells us, because of our large population size and high economic productivity, the United States puts more pressure on resources and the environment than any country in the world. Unlimited growth is the philosophy of a cancer cell, and yet the human population continues to climb.

Our cities grow larger and larger. Each day a few more trees are cut, a few more factories planned for, a little more energy used. I don't

mean in New York or Los Angeles either; the problem is here, in this area, knocking on our front door.

It is predicted that by the year 2000, the Tennessee Valley will, because of cheap and plentiful hydroelectric power, become the 16th most populated urban region in the U.S., a giant metropolitan area, and this can only intensify the crises we already face.

Our water and air will become polluted with industrial excrement; food prices will soar even higher; and our minds will become polluted with endless noise and endless worries: What woods will our children play in since they built an apartment complex where the forest used to be? Will we be safe to walk the streets at night? and on and on and on.

To add a few more strokes to the bleak picture I've already painted, let me throw in a couple more pieces of information that are especially frightening. World grain supplies, usually sufficient for over two years, have dwindled to the point that there is not even enough left for six months. Ecologists predict mass famines, due to cyclical droughts, by the last 1970's, which will lead to mass starvation.

According to geologist, Mr. King Hubbert, most of the earth's coal will be used up in a couple of hundred years, and 80 percent of all the oil in the U.S. will be used up by 1999.

The Research Director of the British Petroleum Company of France, predicts there will be a protein shortage in the world of 10 million tons by 1980 and a shortage of 22 million tons by the year 2000. And, to top it all off, a report prepared by The National League of Cities, states that by the last 1970's almost half of America's cities will have no place left to dump their garbage. If the ocean and rivers get too polluted, maybe we can go swimming in our own waste.

I've thrown this barrage of statistics at you to try to get you to realize the seriousness of the problems we face and the urgency we must utilize in solving them. There are solutions to these problems—that can work if we dedicate ourselves to them. But, before any practical solution can come, there first must come in each of us a change of heart, a change of values, and a reordering of priorities.

We must learn to love the land again. We must look at earth as not merely a commodity to be manipulated for profit and personal gain, but as the mother of all human life, as our provider and guardian, not as our slave. As was asked in "A Moment In The Sun," "Have we become a nation of people that would sell the sunset if someone put a price on it?" I pray to God, we haven't.

Assuming that a change of heart will come to America, when she sees herself in light of what she is rapidly heading towards, there are several steps that may be taken to alleviate the many energy crises that beset our planet, and our nation: Number 1. The most important and practical step of all is to limit future population growth. More people will only add to our already strained energy requirements. If each of us were to plan a family, for two children, say, instead of three or four, or eighth or nine, we could also plan on more fuel in the future, more food for those two children to eat, less industrialization and hence a cleaner and safer world for our children to grow up in. Number 2. The next most important step to take is to let the government know that we are concerned with these crises of energy, and that we want something done. Research into new energy sources is being stifled by a lack of adequate funding. The present administration has not allocated even the minimum amount of money for research into new energy sources recommended by expert panels that were appointed by the present administration.

What are some of these new potential energy sources?

Well garbage is one source being studied. Methods to make use of it include burning it, gasifying it, liquifying it, and even fermenting it. Speaking of fermentation, the Coors Brewery, outside of Denver, which has the largest brewing plant in the world, is experimenting with a project that would use all of Denver's municipal waste—to provide all of the brewery's fuel requirements.

Much research is also needed into our nuclear power sources, our nuclear plants, to be sure that they are safe enough to be used. There are already some three dozen such plants in the U.S. which supply about 5 percent of the nation's electrical capacity.

Geothermal Energy, heat from below the earth's surface, is also being studied. It does not have to be converted to electricity to be useful. In Iceland, for example, one city heats its homes and industries with geothermal energy from hot springs.

Even windmills are being considered as alternative sources of energy. New and lighter materials for building improved understanding of aerodynamics, and more efficient methods of storing the wind's power have encouraged the development of this energy source.

Lastly, and perhaps most important, I mention solar energy. It is hoped that someday homes and businesses can be heated through the use of large panels that collect the sun's radiation and store it by transferring the heat to water, rocks, or special salts. Solar power, if we can efficiently tap it, can provide us a limitless source of energy that is safe and doesn't pollute the environment. Solar heating units for the home should be on the commercial market in five years or less.

What can you do everyday to help relieve the energy crisis? Here are a few ideas: When you go to grocery stores, don't take a sack unless you need it. If you can carry something in your hands, carry it. Sacks add up to trees that have to be chopped down to make paper.

Whenever possible, buy food in reusable containers. There is no reason to add to America's monumental garbage problem with throw away containers. Also, when you can get returnable bottles, do so, as one sack or bottle may not seem like much but multiply them times the population of the U.S., roughly 200 million—and you get a lot of paper and glass.

Thank you for listening. When you go out of here into the sun today, have a good look at the earth for me. Better yet, for yourself.

#### THE NEED FOR ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

(By George Silk)

How do you, as citizens of the United States, feel about our present energy policy? Do you like being dependent upon the Arab nations for oil in which we are exposed to blackmail, extortion, and ridiculous pricing? Certainly not. It seems unbelievable that this great country of ours, with its enormous technological potential, has been unable to develop a means of independence to supply its energy wants.

But the big question is . . . How do we become independent? How do we develop that perpetual energy system.

The National Academy of Science estimated that the large deposits of petroleum and natural gas in the world will be completely exhausted in 50 to 75 years. So why put so much emphasis on a fuel which is limited in supply and time usage?

I suggest that we seek another means of fulfilling our energy demands—a means that would be more economically feasible and potentially everlasting.

Today I would like to reveal my four point

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

plan—a plan that I think would accomplish the objective for energy independence.

First, we must go back to nature. We must utilize the abundant sources of coal in this country. At the present time, we have 16 billion tons of coal in this country and through a process called gasification it is possible to extract this coal from the ground and convert it into high quality pipeline gas.

Now of course, this project will be technologically difficult and extremely expensive—but if we concentrated our revenues into this gasification process, then the project would become a reality. And then there are your environmental limitations to such a project, since controlled strip mining would be necessary to extract the coal. But if the government could provide, as a cost of production, \$2000 per acre for the restoration of the damaged land, then we could minimize the environmental damage. Thus, by 1985, coal could play a 50% role in our energy policy and by the year 2000, coal could play a 75% role in contribution and from that point, coal's existence could last a century and a half. Therefore, we accomplish two objectives through the utilization of coal: (1) we gain energy independence away from petroleum (2) we extend the longevity of our energy.

The next step we must do to become independent is to open up and use the oil in the Alaskan pipeline and tar sands in Canada. In fact, it is being estimated that the tar sands alone could possibly have more oil than all the Arab countries combined. So let's use that oil while we have it.

The third step I would like to illustrate is the need for the expansion of our atomic energy program to provide electricity.

Through the fission of uranium 235 it is possible to release vast sources of energy for utilization. But there have been limitations and disadvantages which have hindered our atomic energy program. People fear that the radioactive emission and the high heating of natural waters by water breeder reactors are damaging to the environment. But at a little more cost. Why couldn't we sink these reactors, say, 500 feet underground therefore eliminating any danger of radioactive emission. Furthermore, let's do as Europe has done and build large water towers for our reactors instead of using local reservoirs.

A further bonus point that we can gain through the expansion of our atomic program is the breakthrough in the fusion process of fusing together Deuterium to provide energy. There are obviously, limits to the uranium 235 which we have, but if we could successfully fuse Deuterium then we would have almost limitless energy supply because Deuterium is readily available in our oceans.

The fifth step we must stress is the development of our solar energy program. Right now solar energy is impractical, because of the movement of the sun and our inability to store ample amounts of solar energy at reasonable cost. But with all our advanced space technology, why couldn't we send up satellites which could focus the rays of the sun at directed energy reservoirs throughout the United States and thereby utilizing the rays of the sun, therefore, creating a perpetual energy source.

Now I didn't mean to come up here to present a lot of hocus pocus and science fiction to obliterate the recognition of the energy crisis. But I am sick and tired of the pessimism and finger-pointing in this country. We have a problem and there are various justifications to what caused it, but we now must solve it. I say let's be more optimistic and use this dilemma as a golden opportunity to stress world leadership. So let's get off of our rear ends and innovate—and create that independent perpetual energy system.

June 20, 1974

#### THE INSECURITY OF SOCIAL SECURITY—PART 3

HON. BILL ALEXANDER  
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 days I have been sharing with my colleagues an article discussing the weaknesses and problems with the present Social Security System. This article, written by Mr. Warren Shore on the staff of Chicago Today, has been brought to my attention by several of my constituents who are also concerned about the money they are investing in our current Social Security System.

Today the last segment of his article points out a possible way out of our insecure social security situation.

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

THE INSECURITY OF SOCIAL SECURITY—  
PART 3

(By Warren Shore)

#### A WAY OUT

The U.S. Social Security system is bankrupt. Like the Penn Central Railroad and other bankrupts, it can only survive through larger and larger acts of public charity or a total reorganization.

Because the American wage earner has been willing to pay the charity (in the form of an 800-percent rise in payroll tax without a matching rise in benefits), Social Security has been able to conceal its bankruptcy for the last 20 years.

But hiding this bankruptcy will get more and more expensive for U.S. workers in the years to come. Up to now the cost has been paid by converting our Social Security system into both the poorest kind of insurance and the worst of welfare.

Judged as insurance:

Social Security pays different benefits to people who have paid the same tax and no benefits to some who have paid thousands.

The system is designed to raise "premiums" (taxes) at a faster rate than it will raise benefits.

The so-called "trust fund" the government says "pays the benefits" doesn't exist.

Judged as welfare:

Social Security offers benefits without regard to family need—only past income.

The system collects 5.5 per cent of the income of a \$13,000-a-year worker and 1 per cent of the income of a \$50,000-a-year worker.

The over-65 worker is penalized for working regardless of his need.

Those who continue to doubt Social Security's bankruptcy should consider The Great Trust Fund myth.

In the federal pamphlet, "Your Social Security," we are told: "During working years employees and their employers pay Social Security contributions which are pooled in special trust funds. When earnings stop, monthly cash benefits are paid from these funds."

That statement is simply not true. By the government's own insurance regulation standards, a fund of more than \$600 billion would be needed to guarantee present Social Security promises.

Yet the Social Security Administration's total retirement and disability trust fund now stands at \$36.5 billion—scarcely enough to guarantee benefits for the next 10½ months.

The truth is that, in spite of government

claims, the trust fund is not used to paying benefits and hasn't been for 20 years. Today's payroll taxes are used to pay today's benefits—and the difference is critical. Here's why:

In every branch of business making financial promises to the public (insurance companies, banks, stock brokerages, bond sellers, etc.) the government requires a trust or reserve fund be set up to guarantee those promises. The reserves are rigidly monitored by law.

A company whose reserve fund falls even slightly below the promises it's made is considered "impaired" and barred from doing further business.

"An insurance company that sells a policy without adequate reserves," says the Illinois Department of Insurance, "is really saying 'This policy will only pay off if we sell more policies later.' If they don't sell more, the policy holders are out of luck. That's why we keep a tight watch on reserves."

Put simply by a spokesman for the State Insurance Department, "Using present premiums to pay off present claims is an insurance fraud because it conceals a state of bankruptcy."

When first enacted in 1937, Social Security was a small system taking a small tax (1 per cent) and offering a small return or "cushion." During the next 20 years benefits were raised without a matching rate of tax increase.

Thus, because Congress was creating a generation of workers who would get more from Social Security than they put in, there was logic in assuming that these workers would continue to vote for legislators who favored the system.

So the Social Security Administration didn't bother with a true reserve fund. After all wasn't the "selling of future policies" a virtual certainty?

But there was a fatal flaw: Giving more to one generation than it paid for, using the payroll taxes of the next generation without a reserve, means the third generation will get less than it paid for.

That third generation, the generation of victims, is today's young worker. Forty years of promising what didn't exist means today's wage earner must buy a "policy" full of government attempts at maximizing taxes while minimizing benefits.

This has led to:

Offering a benefit package worth less than a third of what it costs to offer;

Pegging benefit increases to the cost of living index and Social Security tax increases to the "average wage" which traditionally rises faster;

Keeping the earnings test (which reduces benefit checks) at below the poverty level; and

Enacting a six-month waiting period for disability payments.

As we have said before, the present promises (even for currently older workers and retirees) can be kept only with future tax increases. Can the Congress continue to be certain that young workers will vote for legislators to keep this system in force?

Obviously the time has come to find a way out.

The following proposals are a synthesis of discussions with Prof. Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago, Prof. Colin Campbell of Dartmouth, Prof. James Buchanan of the University of Virginia, and John Brittain of the Brookings Institution.

While they may seem radical, keep in mind that it is also radical to continue measures which, in private business, would result in bankruptcy.

It is suggested that we:

1. Repeal the present payroll tax for Social Security.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

2. Replace the payroll tax with a system of Social Security Bonds.

3. Continue to pay existing beneficiaries, partially out of bond revenues and partially out of general funds, but stop accumulating benefits for those workers who wish to opt out of the present system.

If he has not worked ten years (here he gets no retirement benefit).

If, in the case of a married woman, her widow's or wife's benefit equals or exceeds her own retirement benefit. (Regardless of the fact both she and her husband were taxed.)

If a disabling injury is "not expected to last one year." (More than 90 per cent do not.)

A Social Security bond holder would know exactly what his government (or a private bond issuer) owes him and when payments would begin. Bond-holders cannot be subjected to "earnings tests," waiting periods, marital status tests or the like.

Still to be considered is the present death benefit and disability features of Social Security. Since the present system offers these features only in their cheapest form (term insurance for the death benefit and a six-month waiting period for disability), they could be duplicated in the cheapest way.

The features could be added to the new Social Security bonds for three to five times less than we are now paying.

Those who choose to buy more than the minimum in Social Security bonds would be free to sell the coverage anytime they wish into the open market—like any other bond. The present system, although much more expensive to most than private life insurance, offers no cash value at all.

The present Social Security system has taken 40 years to become what it is—no bond system or any other proposal will solve all the problems overnight.

The only vital reaction is that we recognize the present generation of young workers for what it is: They are a generation of Social Security's victims whose financial condition is getting worse every day.

### U.S. APOLOGIA FOR THE CHILEAN JUNTA

#### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, two subcommittees of the House Foreign Affairs Committee last week were treated to a very revealing display of an American foreign policy at odds with itself. The occasion was the testimony of a State Department representative on the status of human rights in Chile, but it was quite easy to imagine that the Chilean junta's information minister had assisted in the presentation. For an administration that has championed in public pronouncements the principles of pluralism has decided to offer excuses for the Chilean junta that has disregarded the fundamental liberties of its citizens by every account.

I commend to every Member's attention the following testimony by Harry Shlaudeman, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, for its stark portrayal of a foreign policy that makes righteous assertions of concern for human rights around the world while offering apology for political re-

pression when it suits some undefined national interest.

The text of Mr. Shlaudeman's statement to the House Subcommittees on Inter-American Affairs and International Organizations and Movements on June 12, 1974, is reprinted below:

#### STATEMENT BY DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY SHLAUDEMAN, JUNE 12, 1974

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Department has been following with attention and interest these hearings on developments in Chile. We have carefully read the testimony and the various reports introduced here. The concern for the protection of human rights in Chile is one we share with you and with Chileans of all walks of life who must have the ultimate responsibility for the course of events in their country. While we recognize where that responsibility lies, we are not indifferent to what happens in Chile. We have not and could not be indifferent in the case of a country with which our ties of history and common endeavor are so strong.

The observance of human rights is an important factor affecting our relations with other countries. However, it is not the only factor. Secretary Kissinger noted last week that these relations must depend on a wide variety of factors in addition to what he called "moral approbation." As he said, we prefer democratic governments and attempt to exercise our influence to that end; but we also know we cannot impose our political and legal structures on others. My remarks on Chile and United States policy toward Chile should be understood in those terms—in light of the commitment strongly affirmed by the Secretary to the hemispheric principle of non-intervention.

#### CHILE AND THE UNITED STATES

One of the most striking developments in U.S.-Latin American relations over the past decade is that while we continue to share in this hemisphere most of the aspirations that inspired the Alliance for Progress, we have come to recognize that they are not all equally or easily attainable. We have come to understand some of the limits of excessive dependence on externally-inspired programs.

Chile illustrates this process well. Chile's history of democracy has frequently provided special opportunities for cooperation. At the start of the Alliance for Progress, the United States and Chile adopted an ambitious program of cooperation for development. This program was strengthened after the election of Christian Democratic Government in 1964.

As time passed, the level and degree of United States participation in Chilean development began to decline. It was recognized on both sides that our activities should be limited to avoid the appearance of paternalism and interventionism. Higher foreign exchange receipts in the latter years of the Frei government were also a factor. The United States undertook no significant development lending in Chile after 1968.

The election of a Socialist government in 1970 posed many new problems. But our policy was to have the kind of relations with that government it wished to have with us. Previous trends toward lesser involvement continued. But we did maintain those programs that had proved of enduring value under the previous government: the Peace Corps and Food for Peace, technical training, community development, military assistance, narcotics control and various forms of scientific research and collaboration.

When the Allende Government fell last September, much of the continuity of relations was unaffected. We continued the same assistance programs in effect under the Allende regime. The military assistance program for example, has been unaffected. It has historically been of roughly the same

magnitude as those carried on with the larger countries of the Andean group. Like the other major South American countries, Chile has received no grant U.S. materiel assistance since 1968. We have no public safety program of police assistance to Chile except for one communications project in the late 60's. I should note that cooperation in military training and modernization goes back more than a quarter of a century now, and constitutes an essentially non-partisan contribution to regional stability.

If I were therefore to characterize the general evolution of our relations with Chile over the past decade, I would have to conclude that they have been remarkably in tune with the general evolution of our policy toward the rest of Latin America. We have passed from a phase of activism often criticized as highly paternalistic for its attempts to encourage development along lines similar to those of the United States, to a period in which we place greater emphasis on policies designed to foster common interests on a basis of mutuality.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS

One of the major lessons of the past decade is that the United States is not and cannot be responsible for everything that happens in Latin America. It is not and has not been responsible for the course of events in Chile.

As I have said, however, this does not mean indifference. As Americans, we attach great importance to human rights and to their protection everywhere. As Americans also, we are concerned that the advancement of human rights be a practical reality, not an abstraction. We must be concerned with the effectiveness of our support for human rights. That is why this hearing is so important. That is why responsible expressions of concern are so necessary. I might add parenthetically that I say "responsible," not because I arrogate to myself a judgment of the internal Chilean situation, nor because I wish to substitute my moral standards for those of others, but out of a concern that we recognize the limits of our influence so that what we do may be most effective.

For our efforts to be effective, they must be credible. They must show an awareness not only of the abstract principles to whose universal realization we are dedicated, but also of the practical conditions under which they must be promoted.

Chile today is still recovering from the convulsions of an unprecedented situation—what an earlier witness described here as a "trauma." The polarization and political antagonisms generated by events of the past decade and more specifically of the past two years have scarred Chilean society and affected Chilean democracy. But they have not destroyed it. Most Chileans, whether in government or out, whether supporters of current policies or critics, are embued not only with the historic aspirations of Chilean democracy, but with the pride that tradition has engendered.

Like friends of Chile everywhere, we should do what we can to help at this time of need. Tempered by the experiences of the past decade, our assistance programs today are as non-partisan and balanced as they have ever been. They seek to provide material help and security to a nation whose trials have led it to feel beleaguered. As public order and confidence are restored, it is our hope and belief that the bitterness and conflict of these past few years will dissipate.

Despite pressures to the contrary, the United States Government adhered to a policy of non-intervention in Chile's internal affairs during the Allende period. That policy remains in force today. Yet our concerns, differing according to the needs of the times, have also been well-known.

The remainder of this statement addresses the specific questions posed by the Chairmen in their letter of May 21 to Governor Holton:

First, with respect to the legal situation

in Chile, we should note that the governing Junta has declared a state of siege—in accordance with existing provisions of the Chilean Constitution—under which a wide variety of civil liberties can be suspended and by which the government may detain individuals without formal charges for the duration of the condition of "internal unrest." (I would also note here that one of the difficulties in assessing the Chilean situation is our tendency to make comparisons with American or Anglo-Saxon legal practices.)

Recently, however, the Chilean Junta has stated publicly that no one would be held indefinitely without charge and increasingly, formal charges are being formulated against detainees and the pace of trials is accelerating.

Under its emergency powers, the Chilean Government has detained several thousand persons for investigation of suspected illegal activity. Detention pending investigation to determine whether or not charges are sufficient to formulate an indictment is, as I have indicated, common practice in Chile under civil law procedures antedating the coup. Many persons have been released and others, we understand, have been tried and sentenced to relatively short prison terms or internal exile; some have been acquitted; still others have received more severe sentences. In the first months after the coup there were a number of executions. However, the decree permitting summary executions was soon rescinded and so far as we know there have been no executions carried out for some months. Furthermore, the Junta has asked to review all military court sentences of capital punishment, and a number of death sentences have been commuted in recent days. International experts have been permitted to observe trial procedures.

The Chilean authorities have acknowledged instances of mistreatment of detainees; they have declared that such abuses are not sanctioned, and that persons responsible for them are being tried and punished.

We are not in a position to judge the degree to which Chileans may have lost jobs for "arbitrary or ideological reasons." We would note that there is an effort in both the public sector and in those private firms which were intervened by the Allende Government to reduce personnel who were added to the payroll by the previous government for allegedly political reasons. These reductions in force are reportedly being made in the interests of more efficient operation. I note that the Chilean Government has recently consented to receive a fact-finding team from the International Labor Orgaization.

A number of university schools and departments were recessed after the change in Government. Activities in some cases were suspended for the remainder of the academic year, but most institutions are now functioning normally. The authorities have forbidden political activities on campus.

Like its two predecessors, the new government has announced a full reform of the educational system at all levels with the object of better meeting Chile's manpower needs. The currently proposed reorganization seems to draw heavily on the reforms instituted by the Frei government.

With the exception of persons in custody, or in asylum in foreign embassies awaiting permission to depart (the latter now number less than 50), there are no unusual impediments to leaving Chile. An exit tax of 50,000 escudos (about \$70) is applicable to all departing residents, Chileans and non-Chileans alike.

With respect to U.S. assistance, current projections for FY 1975 call for approximately \$0.8 million in grant military assistance (all of it for U.S. and overseas training in various professional areas for the three armed services); \$20.5 million has been projected under the Foreign Military Sales credit program

for the purchase of equipment. This is the same figure for Peru and is comparable to the amounts programmed for the other larger Andean countries. Allocation within that amount have not been made.

On the economic side, a \$20 million loan is being planned for the coming fiscal year to strengthen small farmer cooperatives and increase food production in that sector. A five million dollar loan is contemplated to support Chile's on-going programs in nutrition. Supplementing this would be one million dollars of grant technical assistance funding principally in the agricultural sector. This will continue the people-to-people type activities of recent years. Also being planned is PL 480 Title 1 assistance to help make up the 1973-74 harvest shortfall. Chile's most acute problem is in this area. Continuing heavy food imports will be required. Two million dollars in PL 480 Title II donations is also projected.

The Department has taken into consideration the totality of U.S. policy interests in planning for U.S. assistance to Chile. Congressional interest in human rights, as exemplified in Sections 32 and 35 of the Foreign Assistance Act, has of course been carefully borne in mind. It is to be hoped that our assistance in reestablishing a sound economy will contribute to hastening the return of normal internal conditions to Chile, while improving living standards.

The Department has followed human rights developments closely. We have endorsed and supported the work in Chile of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the UN High Commissioner on Refugees. We have consulted with the Chilean Government regularly on problems in this area and the government is fully aware of our longstanding views on human rights.

We have no special restrictions on the entry of Chileans into the United States. Since the Western Hemisphere quota is greatly oversubscribed, as a practical matter there is little opportunity for a Chilean who recently applies for an immigrant visa to enter the United States without a substantial wait. Although the statistic, as a consequence, has little meaning in the context of our present discussion, between September 11, 1973 and May 29, 1974, 409 Chileans and 62 non-Chileans received immigrant visas from our Embassy in Santiago. During this period 29 immigrant visa applications were disapproved; the reasons for denial were fraud and misrepresentation (4), likelihood of becoming a public charge (5) and inadequate documentation (20).

Under special pre-parole procedures instituted in response to a UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) request for resettlement opportunities for third-country refugees, as of May 29 we had processed 141 applications of which 25 had been approved. The latter figure included 13 Chilean dependents. Of the 91 disapprovals, it was judged that 71 could either return to their countries of origin and/or continue to live in Chile without apparent fear of political persecution; eight were disapproved under the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and twelve were dependents who could not be approved because principal family members were disapproved. Eleven applications were not acted upon when the applicants accepted relocation elsewhere. Fourteen applications are still being processed.

The Department has supported the interest and efforts of the Inter-American Human Rights Commission with regard to Chile, and applauds the Chilean Government's decision consenting to an IAHR visit. The Chileans are aware of our position.

The role of the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs during consideration of the Chilean situation by the UN Human Rights Commission and the UN Economic and Social Council was the normal one in which the affairs of a country in a given bureau are being dealt

with by UN organs. In such cases, the geographic bureau and the Bureau of International Organizations share responsibility for formulating the U.S. Government's position.

Mr. Chairman, as always the Department is interested in the views of Members of the Subcommittees. I can assure you that they will be very carefully considered by all of us who work on these matters.

#### ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES IN NORTH AMERICA

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter into the RECORD at this time, by permission previously granted, remarks of Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton to the Symposium on Endangered and Threatened Species in North America, Washington, D.C., June 11, 1974:

[Department of the Interior news release]

#### REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR ROGERS C. B. MORTON

I have long admired Marlin Perkins' success in cornering so many varieties of the world's wildlife on his *Wild Kingdom* television program. It is obvious—judging from this program and its list of participants that his lovely wife Carol is equally adept at tracking down and cornering individuals who—because of heavy schedules or other reasons—are nearly as elusive as the specimens with which Marlin deals!

I'd like to add my thanks to those the organizers have already received for making this symposium possible.

As I look across this audience I'm impressed by the varied backgrounds and interests represented.

We have among us political leaders, scientists, entertainers (not to be confused with political leaders) professional wildlifers, students, writers and many others.

We have protectionists, sportsmen and consumers—all with a common interest in wildlife albeit from different perspectives.

A scant decade ago it would have been nearly impossible to convene such a diverse group.

Such a gathering is conclusive evidence that the conservation of endangered species is of vital concern to us all.

However those of us concerned with both the conservation of wildlife and the wise use of natural resources have seen a disturbing polarization—in some cases even within our own ranks—over many issues. These divisive attitudes and "family squabbles" divert and waste much time, energy and resources that could be better utilized.

The sportsman expends much effort in trying to defend his sport and explain the harmony with nature he feels while trying to entice a skein of geese into range over his decoys. Too frequently, he singles out the so-called preservationists as those against whom he should concentrate his defensive efforts.

And the preservationist fearing the plight of our environment, vigorously strikes back—presenting the spectacle of two groups who should be allies—busily ripping each other apart!

In another arena we find the business man or the industrialist—squared off against the environmentalist. The one sees his goal of providing goods, services and employment as a national necessity. The other points out that attainment of that goal means nothing if we desile our environment in the process. Both are right but neither appears ready to acknowledge it!

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Nowhere is the confrontation more evident than in the various government agencies. Those charged with developing and utilizing our natural resources are often at odds with similar agencies who are responsible for the conservation of those resources.

And, despite the tremendous success of this Administration's foreign policies, differences of opinion exist between nations concerning conservation issues.

Is this growing polarization necessary? Is it inevitable?

I think not!!

The responsibilities of my Department have placed me in the middle on many controversial issues and, from that unavoidable position, I've had the opportunity to talk to key figures on both sides of some of these issues.

Invariably I've heard good, sound, logical cases presented for each side by honest, sincere persons. In these cases, unfortunately, those who do most of the talking frequently do little of the listening.

All too frequently it is impossible to find a point of agreement—a piece of common ground—upon which to pause until satisfactory compromises can be reached.

However, events which have transpired over the past several months leave me hopeful that such a common ground may be in sight.

In February 1973 I had the pleasure of being a member of the U.S. delegation which participated in the negotiation of the "Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora."

Over 80 nations spent 3 weeks in drawing up a treaty that is looked upon as the most significant step yet taken in the area of international wildlife conservation. Representatives of nearly 50 nations have signed that treaty.

A multitude of differing viewpoints existed among the negotiators:

Eastern and Western;

Developed nations and non-developed nations.

Despite this, the entire complicated 50-page document—in addition to well over 100 amendments—was negotiated in less than three weeks. The urgent business of putting together a mechanism to make possible the conservation of the world's endangered plants and animals provided a common ground on which all those represented could stand.

I'm not going to describe the details of that treaty—many of you are already familiar with it and the rest of you will become so as it is implemented—but I do think two provisions are of interest.

First, the treaty establishes a Secretariat, to be provided by the United Nations' Environmental Program, to carry out its international responsibilities.

Second, each signatory nation will establish national Management and Scientific Authorities who will carry out their nation's responsibilities under the treaty. Many of these nations presently have no organization responsible for wildlife conservation.

Thus, over the next several years, we will see an international network comprised of a central body concerned with the welfare of wildlife, and supplemented by a series of national organizations.

This should provide an effective means of cultivating that common ground discovered at the negotiating table.

In this country, one of the most important wildlife events to take place during the past year was the enactment of the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Passage of this legislation—first proposed in the President's 1972 Environmental Program—was the culmination of several years effort on the part of this Administration as supported by the major conservation groups.

This new law provides the authority and

means for establishing an effective, coordinated national program for the conservation of endangered species. It picks up where the Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1969 left off.

The new law contains several important features:

It gives consideration to *all* animal life. The earlier statute did not address the vast majority of the species of animal life with whom we share this planet and who play major roles in the earth's ecosystems.

It provides for recognition of two degrees of threat. The earlier statute spoke only to species that were "Endangered"—i.e., "threatened with extinction."

The new law retains that classification but adds another category of "Threatened" species—i.e., "a species which is threatened with becoming Endangered."

This new authority enables the action agencies to recognize species that are heading toward the brink of oblivion and to begin taking preventative action *before* that critical stage is reached.

This ability to use "an ounce of prevention rather than a pound of cure" not only enhances the likelihood of a successful recovery of that species. It enables the use of less drastic and usually more effective and economical techniques.

The new law recognizes the need to consider populations as well as species or sub-species. The earlier statutes recognized only described species or sub-species rather than the more ecologically valid concept of population conservation embodied in the new Act.

This authority when coupled with the ability to determine "Threatened" as well as "Endangered" species permits authorities to apply protective regulations where and to the degree needed.

The Act recognizes the importance of the continued existence of wild plant as well as animal species. It provides for the development of a program to conserve Threatened or Endangered plants. It further provides for the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution to coordinate within one year a review of threatened plants and to develop methods of conserving them—including legislative proposals if necessary.

Two aspects of the new law are especially important:

It implements the International Treaty I spoke of earlier. This enabled the United States to become the first nation to ratify this treaty and to begin setting up the mechanisms for cooperation with other nations as they complete their ratification procedures.

It requires a high degree of concern on the part of Federal agencies in insuring that their activities do not amplify the threat faced by threatened or endangered species.

Last—but by no means least—the Congress recognizes the historical role of the States in managing so-called "resident wildlife" and the need for close Federal/State cooperation if our efforts to conserve these species are to be successful.

The Act provides for an "Establishment Period"—not to exceed 15 months—during which each State is to develop and submit its proposal for an "active and effective" program for the conservation of Endangered or Threatened species. States which submit acceptable proposals retain their authority to regulate the "Taking" of such species and become eligible to participate in the "Grant-in-Aid" provisions of the Act.

We are aware that some States may lack adequate statutory authority to participate fully in our efforts to conserve some species—especially forms such as reptiles, amphibians or invertebrates. To help remedy this, at the Department we have been working with the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners in drafting

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 20, 1974

a model State Endangered, Threatened and Non-Game Species Bill. If enacted by a State, such a bill should provide adequate authority for that State to launch an aggressive program on behalf of such creatures.

I have provided each governor a copy of this model bill and I very much hope that it will be quickly adopted by the legislatures of those States not having a comparable law. You can play a major role by encouraging the enactment of legislation which will enable your State to participate fully in this program.

The fabric we see being woven then, consists of:

An international organization and mechanism which gives concern to the status of all wild plants and animals on a worldwide basis, and which provides for:

The establishment of similar organizations at the national level which, in this country, was accomplished by the 1973 Endangered Species Act which, in turn,

Encourages the rapid establishment of similar, compatible programs at the State level.

I recognize that no governmental program can succeed without the active support and involvement of interested and knowledgeable non-governmental person and organizations.

The new Federal Act provides for scientific, commercial and public participation in all significant actions taken under its authorities. This public participation is formalized by extensive requirements to publish proposed actions in the Federal Register and to solicit and consider public comment.

Moreover, the Act also requires a State to have a system that provides for "... public participation in designating ... species ... as endangered or threatened ..." before its program can be considered acceptable.

This broad array of new and strengthened authorities are designed to create a truly cooperative effort to conserve endangered and threatened species.

I believe it also contains the deed to a long sought and badly needed piece of common ground where erstwhile adversaries can meet and talk and listen:

The hunter and the protectionist,

The industrialist and the environmentalist,

The resource developer and the resource conserver.

Perhaps, on this common ground, we can find that our views are not as different as we thought and that more can be gained by talking to each other than by shouting at each other. I am certainly not so naive as to think we can all agree on all points but I do feel that most of us can agree on many points.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I pledge to you the full cooperation of the Department of the Interior in making the Endangered Species Conservation Program an area where we can join hands rather than lock horns as we pursue our goals of rational resource conservation.

It has been said that the health of our planet's flora and fauna is an indication of the quality of our environment.

The swelling number of species that teeter on the brink of extinction is not encouraging. But the emerging awareness of the need to take positive action to prevent further losses is heartening indeed.

As Secretary of the Interior I am thankful for the role I can play to preserve our plant and animal life. The enthusiasm generated by this symposium indicates that we share the same concern. I look forward to working with you for the benefit of all creatures, great and small.

## FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF THE ENERGY CRUNCH

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) must halve their oil prices or the world will face a financial crisis within the next few months the likes of which has never before been witnessed. At present prices—which are utterly unrealistic and grossly unfair in relation to lifting costs and world need—this small group of small countries will receive in excess of \$100 billion each and every year for their oil exports.

This is at the expense of the solvency of nation after nation that must have oil to survive. It is also a crisis situation because substitutes, or oil from coal for example, will not be on the line at commercially feasible prices for years hence, no matter what crash programs are undertaken.

Major developed countries, developing nations, and underdeveloped nations are all in the same boat. It is predictable that their combined response may involve confrontation as the financial drain becomes drastic, including the ripple effect of acute inflation and massive unemployment.

If it be argued on behalf of OPEC that the reserves are depletable, let these oil exporting countries manifest their co-operation and good faith by cutting their price in half, modestly reducing their flow of export, and forming an international financial agency to channel the massive sums they receive for their oil into projects designed to create alternate sources of energy—from which they will derive a long-term payout.

The dimensions of the financial crisis are indicated in alarming proportions by Mr. David Rockefeller, chairman of the board of Chase Manhattan in his recent address to the International Monetary Conference at Williamsburg, Va., on June 6, 1974. I commend a careful reading of Mr. Rockefeller's remarks to the thoughtful consideration of readers of the RECORD:

FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF THE ENERGY SITUATION  
(By David Rockefeller)

When this conference met a year ago, both international monetary reform and the long-range energy problem were discussed. At that time, however, little connection was made between the two.

Certainly none of us foresaw the huge rise in the price of oil which was to come in the final months of the year, or the disruptive impact it was to have on world financial relations. In retrospect, the relevance of Secretary Shultz's speech last year is clearer to most of us now than it was then.

These developments once again illustrate how our best laid plans can often be disrupted by unforeseen external developments—what economists are fond of calling "exogenous variables" and others often call "good excuses!"

Well, what was exogenous yesterday is very much a fact of life today, and it is the sub-

ject our panel will discuss with you this afternoon.

For my part, I'll begin by laying out the broad dimensions of the problem, pointing to some of its implications for international financial and political relations, and suggesting what seem to be some promising approaches to solutions. My distinguished associates on the panel will then give us their various perspectives on the situation.

In the final quarter of last year the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) increased the price of oil fourfold—a substantially more rapid increase in price than that of other critical commodities. Given these prices and present levels of production, this means they will receive more than \$100 billion yearly for their oil exports. Of this \$100 billion, the oil-producing nations will spend some \$40 billion for goods and services—leaving \$60 billion or so as a surplus to be reinvested. This \$60 billion surplus, incidentally, compares with a \$4 billion surplus by the same countries in 1973.

Taking into consideration existing reserves and interest and dividends on these massive funds, total reserves of the oil-producing nations are likely to exceed \$70 billion by the end of 1974, \$140 billion by 1975 and \$200 billion by the end of 1976. These are staggering amounts—and only over a three-year period.

The principal holders of these reserves will be in the Gulf Area, with Saudi Arabia, Iran and Kuwait accounting for about one half. Other important reserve holders will be Iraq, Libya and Venezuela. And, of course, Nigeria and Indonesia will also benefit.

These huge surpluses of necessity must be offset by corresponding deficits on the part of oil consumers. The balance of payments deficit of the developed countries is projected to increase by \$40 billion. The key deficit nations, after adjusting for other balance of payments considerations, will be Italy, the United Kingdom, France, Japan and the Scandinavian countries. My own country will swing from a surplus in its current account, which it had struggled hard to attain, to a deficit this year.

The developing nations, for their part, will face a severe increase in their combined deficit of close to \$20 billion a year. Countries such as India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka will have particularly hard times.

All of this suggests a structural disequilibrium of major proportions in the balance of payments of countries around the world—one that could have serious implications for the world economy and international financial mechanisms. Somehow, in some manner, the huge surpluses of the oil producers must be recycled back to the deficit oil consumers. As it is, higher prices are having damaging inflationary impacts on the domestic economies of oil consumers. On the other hand, if recycling does not occur, the oil consumers will be forced eventually to deflate their economies with severe consequences for the Free World.

In considering this recycling problem it is helpful to distinguish between the short run—say the next year to eighteen months—and the longer period. One must also distinguish between three groups of oil consumers: First, the industrial nations; second, developing nations which are in a fairly strong financial position; and third, those developing nations which are in a decidedly weak position.

We already have gained some experience in the short run. The first sizable payments were made by the oil companies to the producer nations in March, April and May, and thus far they have been recycled back successfully—principally through the international banking system.

The oil-producing nations, for example,

have been placing their money mainly in the Eurodollar market or in sterling. The banks have been the major recycling vehicles, taking this money on deposit, usually at call or on very short maturity, and relending it to oil-consuming nations for periods of five to seven years—a process which obviously creates a very unbalanced and precarious maturity structure.

So far this year, \$12 billion or more has been committed to industrial nations to help cover their 1974 balance of payments deficits. To a considerable extent, the borrowing is being carried out by governments or governmental entities, such as the British railways.

While this process can be successful for a limited period of time, there are at least four very serious shortcomings to it, especially in view of the astronomical amounts that loom ahead.

First, the banks cannot continue indefinitely to take very short-term money and lend it out for long periods of time. We hope that this problem will be alleviated to some extent by countries in the Middle East agreeing to place funds at longer maturity as they become more familiar with the recycling process.

Second, and even more serious than the question of maturities, is the likelihood that banks eventually will reach the limits of prudent credit exposure, especially with regard to countries where it is not clear how present balance of payments problems can be solved.

Third, the oil-producing countries cannot be expected to build up their bank deposits indefinitely. They, too, will soon reach prudent limits for individual banks or even for individual nations.

My own view is that the process of recycling through the banking system may already be close to the end for some countries, and in general it is doubtful this technique can bridge the gap for more than a year, or at most 18 months. \* \* \*

Finally, this form of recycling is not even a temporary solution for lesser-developed countries in a weak financial position—countries like India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka which are not in a position to borrow at all in commercial markets. The World Bank estimates that an additional \$2 billion will be needed in 1974 by financially weak lesser-developed countries for balance of payments purposes. This may not seem a huge sum in an absolute sense, but even this relatively small amount places tragic strains on the countries involved—strains that can only be alleviated by new international governmental approaches and a firm sense of global commitment and cooperation. And these are strains that will accelerate dramatically in 1975 and beyond as already limited reserves are exhausted.

Compounding these very pressing shorter-range problems are a host of far thornier questions and obstacles down the road. Structural adjustments, of course, will gradually get underway between the economies of the oil producers and the consuming nations. Prices may be reduced somewhat, and the oil producers will step up their imports and increase the speed of their own internal development.

Countries like Iran, Venezuela, Nigeria and Indonesia have a longer-run capacity to use most of their oil surplus for internal purposes. But these processes will take considerable time. In the interim, these countries will be large accumulators of reserves.

Moreover, countries such as Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates clearly lack internal absorptive capacities commensurate with the incomes they will receive. On the contrary, one of their major aims is eventually to accumulate a body of invested wealth outside their countries which will yield an income great enough to replace their oil revenue as it runs out. Naturally they are concerned about such matters

as world inflation, exchange risks, and the possibility of expropriation of their assets.

We are fortunate in having Dr. Awad on our panel, and I am sure he will be able to tell us more about the uses to which the oil-producing countries in the Middle East expect to put their surplus funds for both internal and external purposes.

Looking at the situation realistically, I believe it is clear that both the private sector and governments must play a much more significant role in the long term investment process.

Financial and industrial concerns from Europe, Japan and the United States already are proving of some assistance in speeding up internal development in the Middle East. My own bank, for example, is establishing a merchant bank in Saudi Arabia and a commercial bank in Iran (both jointly owned with local participants) as well as branches in Egypt, the United Arab Emirates and elsewhere. We plan to serve as one of the bridges between the Mid-East and the industrial world—both for internal development and for external investment. Yet ours can only be a small supporting role in a drama of massive proportions.

Though not yet large, long-term investments by Middle Eastern countries in the industrial nations are beginning to build up on a modest scale in real estate, selected securities and some direct investments in industry. Hopefully, in the future they may be persuaded to participate more widely in such investments, as well as to assist in the financing of major international undertakings like the James Bay power project in Canada. Yet the sums requiring investment are so enormous, and the institutional facilities necessary to carry them out so limited, that I question whether such investments will have much impact on the gap for some time to come.

All of this clearly suggests that both the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund will increasingly be called upon to play key roles in the recycling process. The World Bank will need to concentrate on those lesser-developed countries that are in most serious need, while the Monetary Fund will probably have to deal with both developed and developing countries.

Ideally, funds for this purpose should come from the surpluses generated by the oil producers. Iran, for instance, has already offered to lend funds to the World Bank and IMF, and also to make some direct loans to India and others at concessionary rates to finance oil imports. Similarly, the recently announced willingness of the oil producers to establish a \$2.75 billion "oil facility" to help countries with balance of payments problems is a positive move at least in the shorter term.

I fear, however, that this can only be seen as a modest first step when one considers the magnitude of the funds that must be redistributed. Solutions in many cases will demand more concessionary terms than those currently envisioned by the oil-producing nations. Moreover, both the world bank and the IMF may have to adopt more flexible concepts of risk.

We must apply even more in terms of resources and imagination at all levels if we are to arrive at constructive long-range solutions. Critical additional steps are necessary on both the philosophical and administrative fronts to handle the massive needs involved. New techniques, strategies and mechanisms will have to be devised—and devised quickly. Most importantly, a premium will have to be placed on international cooperation.

For some time, for example, the committee of 20 in the IMF has been considering a new central reserve asset—a revised SDR, which would represent a basket of currencies, and hence neutralize the exchange risk between major currencies. Perhaps this asset could play a role in future investment plans

of the oil-producing nations, and, indeed, it is assumed that it will be part of the new IMF "oil facility."

It may additionally be possible to work out international guarantee arrangements with regard to expropriation. In this respect, we should remember that the oil producers have one important alternative to accumulating reserves and making investments abroad—they could leave the oil in the ground. From the point of view of the consuming nations, this would create serious shortages, at least for some years to come.

It is also highly desirable that ways be found to channel surplus oil revenues into projects designed to create alternate sources of energy. This would not only help the world at large, but also provide a source of continuing revenues for the oil-producing nations after their reserves have been exhausted. It will have to be done in collaboration with the industrialized nations which have the necessary technology, and it is to be hoped that serious discussions along these lines will not be delayed.

Finally, it is imperative that the developed countries of the world join with the oil producers to assist the less-developed nations. Unless there is a far more concerted effort by all, including my own country, in this direction, I fear that the only result will be economic and political chaos. In this connection, it is imperative that Congress act favorably on the replenishment of the International Development Association as quickly as possible. It has perhaps never been so clear that the true self-interest of any nation depends ultimately on the welfare of others.

Underlying all of these requirements, however, is the fact that we must come up with a means of recycling funds on a far more massive scale than now possible. Some argue that we should simply wait for the forces of supply and demand to bring prices down and create a new structural equilibrium. Others feel that inflation in the oil-consuming nations will help alleviate the problems.

While there is some validity to both of these positions, I believe we must also be aware of their limitations. First of all, inflation has little hope of answering the problem since the purchases of even the largest oil producers are so relatively small.

Second, I fear that relying solely on supply and demand can have disastrous results for many of the developed nations—leading to disruptive domestic unemployment and depression in these countries, and to a general sense of distrust in the world community. One cannot ask nations to call continually on their reserves when they can see no clear light in the future. This is like draining one's swimming pool in the midst of a drought. Moreover, if the position of the developed nations is eroded further, the developing nations can have little hope at all.

On the other hand, of course, some painful structural changes will be required, and it would be imprudent to ignore them. The challenge, it seems to me, is to achieve a delicate balance between necessary concessions to countries with problems and an orderly realization over time of the inevitable impact that the laws of supply and demand will have on shifting world resources.

Creating a mechanism to handle recycling on this scale and to determine acceptable concessions and risks is, of course, exceedingly difficult. Perhaps the mission of the IMF could be expanded in this direction, or perhaps it would be best to create a separate vehicle so as to avoid burdening the IMF with the dual responsibilities of policing monetary affairs and curbing unemployment.

Whatever the means, I believe it is imperative we develop swiftly a new way of looking at world financial needs—a perspective that emphasizes global stability as well as individual national credit worthiness. If

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

we are to progress significantly, we must have a vehicle that allows us time both to act realistically to correct structural disequilibriums and to avoid disharmony. And this vehicle must result from a conscious decision of both the oil-consuming and oil-producing nations. I would hope this question would be high on the agenda of the Committee of 20 when it meets later this month.

Needless to say, all of this may seem somewhat academic if either the price of oil or the demand for oil should suddenly decline. The outlook here is highly uncertain, though hardly cause for unbounded optimism. I'm sure Mr. Morris will be able to enlighten us on these issues.

Let me just say that there are some signs that the present high price is restricting demand for petroleum products in the consuming nations to a limited extent. Our bank estimates that world petroleum consumption this quarter will run slightly behind a year ago, whereas an increase normally would have been expected. Also, we believe that production has been expanded so that it is now running somewhat ahead of consumption. If this is the case, pressure could very well build up on prices, and it will be interesting to see how the OPEC countries react to the problems.

While oil prices may eventually come down somewhat, my own judgment is that plans and policies throughout the world should not be based on the assumption that the decline will be large enough to solve the recycling problem. Modest price reductions may give us more time, but they will not materially alter the basic situation. Indeed, I would guess that we would need a price reduction of some 40% to 50% to produce anything close to a new structural equilibrium. Thus we have no choice but to face up to the recycling challenge and, in cooperation with the oil producers, to devise the institutional arrangements necessary to cope with it.

The successful creation of such mechanisms will be highly dependent on the political climate. Here, one conclusion is certain: The Middle East countries, by reasons of a shift of wealth and resources, are entering a new period—a period during which their political influence, as well as their economic weight, will loom larger on the world scene.

The strenuous efforts in which Henry Kissinger has been engaged provide testimony to that fact, as has the parade of cabinet members from other countries to the Middle East in recent months. At the same time, the new wealth in the Middle East is likely to strengthen the hands of moderate governments in that area and orient them more firmly toward the West.

If sustained, this trend toward moderation may well be a highly desirable and significant political dividend. It will also be essential in assuring the stability that must underlie an orderly approach to the redistribution of international capital.

The situation is still beset with uncertainties, both political and economic, and we are running out of time on many fronts. Given a clear realization of the interdependence of all the nations involved, however, I believe we can find ways to transform the problem of surplus capital in the hands of some nations into many positive opportunities for progress and development worldwide. But this will not happen by itself. It will demand the involvement and dedication of both the public and private sectors on a scale far exceeding that which exists now.

Above all, it must involve a degree of global teamwork which we have not seen up to this point. If the nations of the world approach the energy situation sincerely and resolutely, there is reason to hope that it can be used as a catalyst and

a rallying point for a new era of international cooperation.

It is a sad fact that challenge is too often the most effective father of unity. In the past, the fear of Communism has served to lend common purpose to the nations of the Free World, and the threat of nuclear holocaust has awakened all nations to the necessity of meaningful joint solutions. Now, as these threats diminish in the minds of many, some may well be tempted to place immediate, more selfish concern ahead of global imperatives. It would be tragic if the energy situation becomes a force for further divisiveness. Let us hope rather that it is a new spark to rekindle a mutual striving among nations that recognizes the world's inevitable interdependence.

---

THE NEED FOR FLUE GAS DESULFURIZATION

---

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the increased use of high-sulfur coal is necessary in order to avoid predicted coal shortages and to free valuable but diminishing oil and gas reserves for other purposes.

Air quality regulations of the Clean Air Act require that toxic sulfur oxides in coal be reduced to acceptable levels before emission from powerplant stacks. Flue gas desulfurization is by far the most advanced technique to accomplish this. Stack-gas scrubbers have been installed commercially on 13 American and 10 Japanese plants, and have been demonstrated as feasible and effective. Other processes for using high-sulfur coal without polluting the atmosphere, such as coal liquefaction and gasification, will be unavailable until sometime in the 1980's.

As Clean Air Act deadlines approach and reserves of low-sulfur coal decline, energy and environmental needs indicate that a sensible national coal policy demands a commitment to the perfection and further installation of flue gas desulfurization—FGD—equipment. Research must be continued and directed to the resolution of the remaining technological problems associated with FGD. These include accurate retrofit design and the disposal and utilization of scrubber by-products.

The present and potential status of FGD technology was examined in a recent article in *Science* magazine. The authors, members of the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior, have evaluated FGD in the context of the nation's general electric power situation. They conclude that stack scrubbers will be an important component in providing sufficient electric power in the future without adverse environmental effects. I include herewith excerpts from the article in the April 19 issue of *Science*:

HIGH-SULFUR COAL FOR GENERATING ELECTRICITY

(By James T. Dunham, Cary Rampack, and T. A. Henrie)

The United States has an abundance of coal. Coal reserves economically recoverable by today's mining technology are estimated

June 20, 1974

at 200 billion tons, and total domestic coal resources are of the order of 3 trillion tons, or enough to meet a large part of our energy needs for centuries. We are experiencing an energy shortage in the 1970's, despite such vast amounts of coal, because we have become overdependent on natural gas and oil to supply some of our increasing energy needs, among them that for electrical power.

Electricity provides about 25 percent of our total energy needs. According to a Department of the Interior study, per capita use of electricity increased from slightly more than 2000 kilowatt-hours in 1950 to 7800 kwh in 1971, and is projected to reach about 32,000 kwh by the year 2000.

Cheap, convenient low-sulfur oil and natural gas are competing with coal as the preferred fuel for the electric utility market (Table 1). While annual consumption of coal for power plants in the northeastern and east northcentral regions of the United States stayed approximately constant in the 6 years from 1966 to 1971, oil consumption has increased by factors of 3 and 25 in these regions, respectively, and gas consumption has increased by up to a factor of 3. Continued use of petroleum and natural gas at the present rate will aggravate the serious supply problems for these fuels.

Programs under way to augment our oil and gas supplies and to diversify our energy base, such as coal gasification, extracting oil from western oil shales, harnessing solar energy, wind, and geothermal steam and brines, will have little impact on electricity generating needs for many years. Similarly, although nuclear reactor power plants are expected to provide up to 25 percent of the demand for electricity by 1985 and up to 50 percent by 2000, these optimistic estimates assume the timely development of the fast breeder reactor program and satisfactory solution of environmental problems in siting and operating nuclear reactors. In the meantime, fossil fuel-fired power plants must supply a large part of our electrical power demands, and only coal is available in the United States in sufficient quantity to provide this energy for the next 25 years.

TABLE 1.—Sources of energy for generating electricity in 1972

	Electricity generated (percent of total)
Coal	42.2
Natural gas	22.1
Petroleum	16.9
Hydroelectric	15.7
Nuclear	3.1
Geothermal	Negligible

AIR POLLUTION FROM COAL COMBUSTION

An important factor influencing the change in the pattern of energy use in thermal electrical power generation from coal to oil or gas in recent years has been the limitation on the emission of pollutants to the atmosphere. Air pollution regulations affecting power plants are primarily concerned with three pollutants: particulates, nitrogen oxides, and sulfur oxides. Of these three, sulfur oxides are of the most concern from a regulatory standpoint. Ambient air quality standards and emission standards can generally be met only by burning coal containing 1 percent sulfur or less. In coal, sulfur occurs in both the inorganic and organic forms. Substantial amounts of inorganic sulfur, mostly pyrite, can be removed by mechanical cleaning, but the organic sulfur cannot. Because the sulfur in high-sulfur (3 to 6 percent) coal is often about half pyrite and half organic, mechanical cleaning alone does not reduce the sulfur content to the point that the coal can be burned without exceeding the emission standards for sulfur oxides.

Fuel trends in the heavily populated and industrialized regions reflect the impact of air pollution regulations on the use of coal. Burning low-sulfur oil or natural gas has

been one method of controlling sulfur oxide emissions, but when switching to oil or gas has not been feasible, utilities have turned to low-sulfur coal, often at great expense because of high transportation costs. Most of the available low-sulfur coal in the United States is in the West, and much of that in the East is captive and used by the metallurgical industry. Accordingly, utilities in Chicago meet air pollution regulations by using low-sulfur coal mined in Montana and Wyoming and pay as much as \$8.50 per ton for unit train rail haulage.

In his report to Congress on the energy situation on 23 January 1974, President Nixon urged postponement of the implementation date for air pollution standards to permit conversion of oil- and gas-fired electric generating plants to the use of coal. On 6 February 1974, a report issued by the Federal Energy Office cited ten eastern plants that converted from oil to high-sulfur coal and several other plants that were willing to convert if environmental, technical, transportation, and supply obstacles could be overcome. These actions have freed some oil and gas for other uses. In 1973, use of coal for generating electricity increased slightly at the expense of oil and natural gas. However, widespread conversions by established utilities or construction of new plants designed to burn high-sulfur coal are unlikely unless utilities can be assured that they can ultimately comply with air quality regulations.

#### CONTROL OF SULFUR OXIDES AT POWERPLANTS

One of the major deterrents to the unlimited and widespread use of coal for generating electricity in the United States, particularly in the Midwest and East, is the quality of the combustion gases released to the atmosphere. If high-sulfur coal is burned, there are three alternatives for producing gaseous emissions meeting air quality standards: (i) Coal can be converted to a sulfur-free fuel; (ii) coal can be burned directly at a rate and under conditions that generate emissions meeting ambient air quality standards; or (iii) coal can be burned and the sulfur oxide gases removed during combustion or before discharge of flue gases to the atmosphere. In the near future, sulfur-free fuels derived from coal by gasification or liquefaction will, at best have limited application in electrical power generation. The other alternatives are more likely for immediate and short-range use.

#### REMOVING SULFUR DIOXIDE FROM FLUE GASES

Research to develop technology for removing sulfur dioxide from gases generated during coal combustion in electric utility boilers covers a span of 40 years in the United States and abroad. These processes include (i) injecting limestone or lime into the combustion chamber to produce a throwaway product; (ii) high-temperature regenerative systems (that is, those that recycle the absorbent) using solid absorbents to concentrate sulfur dioxide gas for conversion to sulfuric acid or sulfur; (iii) direct catalytic oxidation of the dilute flue gases to sulfur trioxide and then to sulfuric acid; (iv) wet scrubbing of the cooled gases with alkaline solutions or slurries to yield throwaway products; and (v) wet scrubbing with regenerative solutions to produce either liquid sulfur dioxide, sulfuric acid, or elemental sulfur. This technology is still controversial, with opinions varying as to the reliability, operating and capital costs, and acceptability of the end products or byproducts of the various processes.

In a 1970 study of available technology for stack gas cleanup made by the National Academy of Engineering, it was stated that "contrary to widely held belief, commercially proven technology for control of sulfur oxides from combustion processes does not exist." In May 1972, a federal inter-agency committee responsible for evaluating state

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

air implementation plans formed an inter-agency task force to evaluate flue gas desulfurization systems. The task force, designated the Sulfur Oxide Control Technology Assessment Panel (SOCTAP), issued its final report on 15 April 1973. Having examined the status of stack gas cleaning in the United States and Japan, the task force concluded that the removal of sulfur oxides from stack gases is technologically feasible in installations of commercial size, and that a large number of the nation's coal-fired steam electric plants can ultimately be fitted with commercially available stack gas cleaning systems. Of many processes considered, four wet-scrubbing systems were rated as sufficiently developed for full-scale commercial application within the next 5 years; these processes were as follows wet limestone or lime scrubbing, magnesium oxide scrubbing with regeneration, catalytic oxidation, and wet sodium base scrubbing with regeneration.

The EPA supported the SOCTAP conclusions and evaluations in testimony at public hearing, and added double-alkali sodium scrubbing systems to the list of commercially viable processes. The citrate process, also studied by EPA, was later added to the list of promising desulfurization systems.

Utility representatives at the public hearing did not agree with EPA's conclusions and testified about operating difficulties with the scrubbers that are installed. They claimed that reliability of units 100 megawatts or larger has not been demonstrated adequately enough to warrant the conclusion that the control systems are commercially available. Another major concern of the utility representatives was the disposal problem attendant with the throwaway control systems. These systems—lime or limestone wet scrubbing and double-alkali scrubbing—produce calcium sulfate and calcium sulfite, which have no market value and must be disposed of in permanent impoundment areas.

The processes considered most advanced have only been tested in a limited number of large-scale demonstration projects, if any, and the controversy continues as to whether the technology is reliable enough for widespread application to coal-fired utility boilers. Large-scale test programs now under way or being planned may, in the next 2 or 3 years, solve the engineering design and operating problems to assure fully reliable sulfur oxide control systems. In the meantime, promising new processes now being developed should be available for installation before the end of this decade. Concerned parties are appraising cautiously the more thoroughly researched and advanced processes with regard to their merits and deficiencies.

#### SUMMARY

We must expand the use of coal for electricity generation as rapidly as possible to help alleviate the immediate oil and natural gas shortage, which threatens to become more acute unless the pattern of energy is changed.

It is not likely, nor is it proposed, that coal should completely replace oil or gas in power generation; geographic location of plants and ready availability of high- or low-sulfur coal will to some extent dictate the choice of fuel. However, replacing 50 percent of the oil and gas now used in power generation would release more than 200 million barrels of oil and 1.9 trillion cubic feet of natural gas (1 barrel of oil = 0.16 m<sup>3</sup>; 1 cubic foot = 2.8 × 10<sup>-2</sup> m<sup>3</sup>) annually for other uses such as home and commercial heating, transportation, chemical feedstock, and selected industrial and manufacturing uses. Even more important, use of coal instead of oil or gas in new fossil fuel-fired electrical generating plants would go far toward conserving natural gas resources and holding the line on increased petroleum imports.

In recent years, U.S. pollution regulations

restricting sulfur oxide emissions from power plants have been one of the major deterrents to the use of the high-rank, high-sulfur coals of the Midwest and East. Reliable flue gas desulfurization processes that permit burning of these coals without adverse environmental effects are approaching full development and should encourage wider use of coal in electricity generation for the next 25 years. Estimates indicate that more than 40 sulfur dioxide scrubbing units will be installed on power plants totaling about 20,000-Mw capacity by late 1976. The cost of these units will approach \$750 million. Although this is not a significant amount of our coal-fired generating capacity, these installations should give impetus to construction of more and larger ones by 1980 and the next decade; this would refute the tenet that wide use of coal and a clean environment are mutually exclusive. As the choice of proved scrubbing technology broadens, no single process will dominate the market. Individual utilities, in addition to considering the economics, will be faced with making choices on the basis of the type of coal burned; water, land, and air pollution regulations; and the marketability of the end products.

The cost of the flue gas desulfurization will be high, ranging from 1.2 to 3.2 mill/kwh. The average increase in electricity cost to consumers is expected to be about 3 to 6 percent, and in some instances as much as 15 percent. However, the added burden may not be as high as that of dependence on foreign oil, both in terms of price and reliability of supply. Combustion of high-sulfur coal followed by stack gas cleanup appears to be the cheapest alternative for meeting our electricity needs in the next few decades.

## WHO IS MAKING THE PROFITS FROM INFLATED FOOD PRICES?

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, with the cost of food to the consumer edging ever upward and what appears to be a boom year for farm prices, it may be easy for some people to point to the American farmer as some sort of phantom reaping huge profits at the expense of other citizens.

Such is simply not the case. In spite of high food prices in the market place, the producers—the farmers, the cattlemen, the chicken farmers, etc.—are not the groups realizing the windfall.

Who, then, is making the money from inflated food prices? I think that our colleagues, and their consumer constituents, will be interested in looking into this question further.

I insert the following newspaper story, which deals with the how's and why's of higher food prices:

[From the Washington Post, June 16, 1974]  
FEELING OUTRAGED ABOUT HIGH PRICES DOWN ON THE FARM

(By Jim Hightower)

"Farmers never had it so good," declared President Nixon at a press conference in March. But have they? Certainly, farm people do not share the President's cheery outlook on the farm economy. In fact, farmers were shocked and outraged, and one national farm group considered the remark so callous as to warrant impeachment.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

With the highest food and farm prices in memory, what caused farmers to bridle at the President's comment? Two things in particular.

First, farmers did not benefit most from the exorbitant food prices of 1973—the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) reports that food middlemen continued to take nearly three-fifths of the consumer's food dollar in 1973.

Second, the President was trying to make political hay out of a temporary farm price boom that already is fizzling out—1974 does not look all that great to farmers.

Consider the first question: who profited? There can be no doubt that 1973 was a good year for farm income, especially for grain and livestock farmers. As it turns out, administration publicists were a bit overzealous in their initial claims for farm income and they had to revise their early figures downward by \$2 billion. And there is considerable doubt that all of the \$24 billion farmers supposedly earned actually ended up on the farm, since a good many corporate processors and marketers of such commodities as eggs and poultry get counted as "farmers." These quibbles aside, however, 1973 was not a bad year to have been a farmer.

But it was not the kind of year that warrants being singled out in a Presidential press conference. Even with the record income levels of 1973, farmers received only 46 cents of the consumer's food dollar. The rest went to the corporate middlemen that process, market and retail food. Nor does every farmer in America draw 46 cents every time a consumer lays down a dollar; most farmers never see that kind of ratio.

For an example, the chicken for which you pay \$1.50 pays the chicken farmer 6 cents. USDA statistics show that a can of peaches cost consumers 41 cents last year, but the peach farmer got only 7 cents of it. You spent 28 cents for a loaf of white bread, but only 4 cents trickled back to the wheat farmer. A head of lettuce cost 43 cents at the supermarket, but paid only 4 cents to the farmer.

## PROCESSOR'S PROFITS UP

At a time of skyrocketing food prices and consumer disgruntlement, the President pointed to farmers, without bothering to mention that food corporations were enjoying even better times. Far from flattered, farmers felt picked on. Cattle ranchers are said to have done especially well in 1973, but none did anywhere near as well as such corporate cowboys as Iowa Beef Processors, with a 66 per cent profit increase last year, or American Beef Packers, with a 288 per cent profit increase. Food processors grumbled all last year about government price controls, but their 1973 profit figures suggest that they grumbled all the way to the bank. For example, the big canners of fruits and vegetables did much better than the farmers who grow them with such firms as Del Monte taking a 35 per cent profit increase in 1973, Campbell soup 23 per cent and Castle & Cook (Dole) up 52 per cent.

The May 4 issue of *Business Week* offered another interesting insight into how the chips actually fell last year. In a listing of salary increases for corporate executives, the food industry was found to be very generous. Food firms and government officials are quick to point to rising labor costs as an inflationary villain and a drain on corporate profit margins, but they do not draw attention to inflationary jumps in executive salaries. In 1973, food industry workers had wage increases of 6 per cent. Up in the executive suites of food corporations, however, there was much less restraint.

Food manufacturing firms ranked ninth out of 32 industries surveyed by *Business Week*, boosting the pay of their top executives by an average of 17.7 per cent. For example, while consumers were being advised by government and industry to switch

from beef to beans, Kraftco increased the salary of its board chairman from \$264,000 to \$321,000. Consumers ultimately get to pay for Kraftco's internal largesse. Grocery chain executives ranked fourth in *Business Week's* listing, taking home a 24.3 per cent pay increase. Safeway, which complained all last year that its profit margins were paper thin, scraped up an extra \$16,000 to round off its chairman's salary at \$200,000 a year. Nothing that these corporate executives now claim to be feeling the "pinch" of inflation, *Business Week* reports that their pay levels can be expected "to take another big jump with the expiration of controls."

## FARM PRICES DOWN

Grocery shoppers undoubtedly are puzzled over the phenomenon of the "disappearing price drop" in our food economy. Since September, 1973, the news media have been reporting each month that the farm value of food has been falling. But that price drop on the farm has not made its way into the supermarkets. Farm prices fizzled 16 per cent from August to December of last year but supermarket prices remained sizzling hot. Even as President Nixon was making his remark about the good fortunes of American farmers, the price they were being paid was falling for the sixth straight month, while the price charged to consumers actually was rising.

Not only did food firms pass all of the farmers' 1973 increase right through to the beleaguered consumer, but they also attached a sizeable markup of their own. The Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago reported on March 8 that food middlemen increased their take from consumers by 6.5 per cent in 1973. That is an increase exceeded only once (in 1970) in the last 20 years. And the Department of Agriculture reports that these firms will increase their share in 1974 at a rate that "may be more than double the 1973 increase." What that means is that consumers will pay much more for food this year and much less of what they pay will go to farmers.

In 1973, the farmer was averaging 46 cents of the food dollar. By May, 1974, that already had fallen to 42 cents, the same level it was prior to the boom of 1973. And the farmer's share is expected to fall even more during this year. The retail price of food is hardly keeping pace. A Department of Agriculture report shows that the price of bread rose from January to April by two cents, while the farm value of bread ingredients fell by two cents. That is four extra pennies picked up by middlemen every time a loaf of bread is bought.

Not only are middlemen failing to pass along cheaper farm prices, but some appear also to be holding back on supplies of farm goods. For example, Reps. Frank Denholm (D-S.D.), Thomas P. O'Neill Jr. (D-Mass.) and Lester Wolff (D-N.Y.) have suggested that meat packers and processors are widening their profit margins today by manipulating available supplies of meat.

The congressmen took a look at the meat industry's cold storage inventories in May and found an astounding amount of meat being packed away in corporate warehouses. Department of Agriculture figures showed that cold storage of beef by the packers and processors is 33 per cent above last year, pork stocks are 43 per cent greater and poultry storage is up by 87 per cent. Denholm charged that this storage "clearly pirates the prices of consumers and producers alike." By storing meat, the corporations can artificially decrease supplies in supermarkets, thus keeping consumer prices high. Simultaneously, the record inventories decrease industry demand, thus dampening prices paid to meat raisers.

During April, farm prices overall fell another 4 per cent, with the price of cattle falling from 39 to 37 cents a pound, hogs down from 31 to 26 cents a pound, wheat

June 20, 1974

down from \$3.98 a bushel to \$3.52, cotton down from 58 to 49 cents a pound and eggs down from 50 to 42 cents a dozen.

## STEIN'S STATEMENT

A remark in May by Herbert Stein, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, is depressing to farmers and consumers alike. He said, "The declines in farm product prices are likely to be reflected in much smaller increases in retail food prices than occurred in the first quarter of 1974" (emphasis supplied). Only the Grocery Manufacturers of America and the National Association of Food Chains can appreciate the logic of that.

In fact, that is the kind of logic that food middlemen can carry to the bank. The Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago said in its May 31 agricultural letter that "the available evidence suggests that higher profits have contributed to the widening farm-to-retail price spreads." That conclusion is supported by *Business Week* magazine figures showing that in the first three months of this year the largest food retailers had profits that were 59 per cent higher than a year ago, even though their sales were up just 14 per cent.

The Department of Agriculture clouds the issue of high middleman profits by reporting figures that encompass all food firms, the small with the giant. There are 32,000 food manufacturing firms in America, but just a handful of those sell nearly all the food and control the industry. In May testimony before the Joint Economic Committee, the Federal Trade Commission's Dr. Russell Parker noted that "the 50 largest [food manufacturers] controlled 50 percent of assets of 1964, they accounted for 61 percent of profits and nearly 90 percent of television advertising." According to Dr. Parker and other authorities, this level of industry concentration is increasing steadily. These are the brand-name giants, powerfully situated between millions of farmers and millions of consumers, and they are fast becoming the decisive force in the American food economy.

The average profit increase for all 32,000 food firms in 1973 would not be remarkable, but the dominant firms had "a year to remember," as *Business Week* put it. A special USDA task force on food marketing costs reported this month that the profits of food middlemen in 1973 "probably" will exceed the 1972 total of \$3.4 billion. But the task force need have no doubt about the largest firms. Analyzing the 66 largest food processors, *Business Week* reported in March that their profits averaged 17 percent higher than in 1972. The profits of those 66 industry leaders were more than \$1.8 billion, which is more than half the industry's total for the previous year.

To a significant degree, this level of profit is the result of monopoly power in the food industry.

Dr. William Shepherd, a leading authority on market concentration, reports that the food industry falls well within the category of "tight oligopoly," with the average four-firm concentration within the industry being 55 percent. In many food lines, shared monopolies exert much greater control. For example, 91 percent of all breakfast cereal is sold by four firms (Kellogg, General Mills, General Foods and Quaker). Three firms (Dole, Del Monte and United Brands) sell 85 percent of all bananas in this country. Gerber alone sells 60 percent of all baby food and Campbell's sells 90 percent of all soup.

The same high levels of concentration exist in food retailing, with more than half the cities in the country being dominated by four or fewer chains. In the Washington, D.C. area, for example, Safeway, Giant, Grand Union and A & P control 72 percent of the grocery market. Nationally, one-third of all the convenience grocery stores are owned by Southland Corp., parent of the 7-11 chain.

## PRODUCTION COSTS

There is another harsh economic reality that is squeezing farmers and causing them to think anew about the advice of old-time populist leader, Mary E. Lease: "Raise less corn and more hell." That reality is the rise in farm production costs.

Not much of what the farmer gets stays in his pockets, for he has a mess of bills to pay. As farmers move into the summer months, they are massively pessimistic. The cost of their production supplies has increased about as rapidly as the plummeting of farm prices. In March alone, farm prices fell 4.4 per cent, while the cost of farm inputs increased 2.2 percent. The Department of Agriculture predicts that farmers' expenses in 1974 will be "more than \$9 billion above last year."

A corn farmer in Iowa told the Des Moines Register of fertilizer prices this year 40 percent higher than last, of diesel fuel prices doubling since last year and of corn seed that has gone from \$25 a bushel to \$37 a bushel. The cost of new machinery has gone out of sight, and repair of old machinery is about as costly—as this corn farmer put it, "You don't need too big a truck to haul away \$500 in parts." He is having to shell out this kind of money now, while the price he can expect for his corn already has tumbled this year from \$3.25 a bushel to \$2.27.

At work here is the other jaw of the corporate vise that is squeezing family farmers and contributing to higher food prices. There may be a profit made on the farm in 1974, but there will be much more profit made off the farmer. Here's a sample of profit increases farm suppliers already have had in the first quarter of this year.

*First quarter, 1974*

[In percent]

	Profit increase	Sales increase
International Harvester	113	16
Stauffer Chemical	55	31
Occidental Petroleum	716	96
Firestone Tire & Rubber	19	17
Pfizer	33	26

Source: Business Week, May 11, 1974. "Survey of Corporate Performance: First Quarter 1974," pp. 70-90.

To put these profits into perspective, the average profit increase in all industries in this first quarter was 16 per cent. And again, these profits can be traced to the existence of monopoly power within the industries. For example, Dr. Shepherd reports that the four leading farm machinery firms hold 70 per cent of the relevant market. The Federal Trade Commission staff found in 1972 that farmers were overcharged \$251 million because of the existence of monopoly power in the farm machinery industry. The four-firm concentration ratio in the chemical industry is 71 per cent; in petroleum refining, 65 per cent, and in tires, 71 per cent.

The general public, the Congress and the press have paid little attention to the rise of corporate power in the food economy. It is time to notice, for not only has that power become significant, it already has become the single, most dominant factor affecting the food supply.

It is impossible in the long run to lower food prices, to raise farm income and to assure a steady supply of nutritious food without dealing directly with the shifting structure of the food economy. Both as suppliers of inputs to farmers and as buyers of raw commodities from them, corporations have become the determining force in the farmer's business. As manufacturers, advertisers and retailers of food, corporations have become the decisive force in the quality, choice and price of food available to the shopper.

As a minimal first step toward keeping corporate food power in check, the country's

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

antitrust apparatus ought to be focused on food. The Federal Trade Commission shows some hopeful signs that it might be listening to consumer and farmer complaints on food issues. The chairman of the commission, Lewis A. Engman, has announced creation of a special task force of lawyers within FTC's enforcement branch to develop and implement a program of antitrust action directed at the food industry. Whether Chairman Engman's highly-touted "National Food Plan" will be more than window dressing is questioned by several consumer and farmer organizations, but at this point they are grateful for any official response tossed their way.

Also encouraging are signs that at least a few congressmen are waking up to the corporate presence and beginning to probe for some answers. Within the last six months, the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, the Senate Commerce Committee and the Joint Economic Committee have conducted public hearings on the role of corporate middlemen in the food economy. In addition, the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and the Senate's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations have shown an interest in corporate activities that affect farmers and consumers.

These are halting, first steps, but they are important. Old perceptions of food power, based on the idea of independent farmers responding to sovereign consumers, no longer are valid. Increasingly, corporations are the decisive force at both ends of the food chain. That fundamental shift in power is too important a matter to be left to USDA and corporate executives.

The most lasting and significant impact of 1973's skyrocketing food prices may well be the wide public attention that the jolt of those prices attracted to food economics. The food issue will abate somewhat in intensity, but it will not go away, and neither will public attention. The food industry can expect much more scrutiny in the months ahead.

## COAL AND ENERGY

## HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues remarks made by Mr. R. J. McMullin before a meeting of the Western Energy Supply and Transmission Associates here in Washington on June 18.

I have had the privilege of knowing Mr. McMullin for many years. In addition to being president of WEST, he is a member and ardent booster of the Salt River project. He has been a long-time friend of mine, and is one of the outstanding citizens of our great Southwest.

Mr. McMullin's remarks provide a realistic look at the future of the electric power industry in the West. As head of a group of 22 major public and private utilities, he has a clear grasp of the problems the energy industry will face in the future.

He points out that one of the bright spots in our energy picture is coal. We have enough on hand to last for hundreds of years, if we are intelligent enough to launch a cooperative effort between Government and industry to realize the potential of our coal deposits. We in Congress, especially, must make

a wise decision on surface mining so that we can balance off our energy needs with our environmental desires.

I believe that this presentation by Mr. McMullin is a fine synopsis of the future of power production and distribution in the West, and I recommend it to my colleagues in Congress for its pertinent information. Text of the address is as follows:

## REMARKS BY R. J. McMULLIN

I'm in somewhat the same predicament this evening as the army private who stumbled into a tent full of generals. He knew he ought to salute, but he didn't know where to begin.

You have honored us with your presence, and your gracious ladies add more brightness to this room than all the electrical capacity represented here could muster.

On behalf of the electric utilities of WEST Associates, it is my privilege to salute you.

These are extraordinary times in Washington. Your days are long, the decisions you make are many, and your evenings at home are few. We appreciate your being with us.

By now you have read, seen, and heard about the energy crisis to the point of saturation. Cries of alarm and doom have been sounded by the general public and by all segments of the energy industry. We feel the alarm is real and that the energy shortage presents an almost unprecedented challenge to our nation.

Our purpose tonight is to give you our assessment, first hand, of the energy situation in the West—what we are doing as individual utilities and together, through Western Energy Supply and Transmission Associates, to meet the challenge of having enough electric power available now and in the years to come to meet the needs of the areas we serve and that you represent. And we want to discuss with you the kind of economic and governmental climate we believe is essential to keep the West moving in the next decade and beyond.

First, there are a few things you should know about WEST Associates—what it is, and what it isn't.

Western Energy Supply and Transmission Associates (called WEST for short) is an association of 22 major public and private utilities operating in all or parts of eleven western states. Most of our member utilities are represented here tonight.

WEST Associates was organized in 1964 to foster and encourage coordinated planning of large electrical generating facilities and extra-high-voltage transmission lines, and to sponsor research and development that is of particular interest to the utilities of our western region.

But the origins or philosophy of WEST Associates go back much farther. Since pioneering days, the history of the western region has been marked by cooperative effort. For example, we all know how interdependent our states are regarding water development. Western states are also joined by our economy, our lifestyle, and our social challenges.

And we are interdependent—in fact interconnected—in electric energy development, supply, and transmission.

In describing WEST Associates, it is important to point out that WEST, as an entity, does not generate or supply electric power. WEST does not own or operate any generating plants or transmission lines.

Under our WEST concept, joint planning makes it possible for utilities to build, own and operate generating stations large enough to provide the economic benefits of larger-scale installations. Also, WEST makes it possible to use the region's natural resources more prudently than would be the case if each utility tried to go it alone. There are environmental benefits because a greater de-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 20, 1974

gree of environmental control per unit of capacity can be achieved in a larger plant.

There are presently three projects in operation which were developed under the WEST concept—two large units at the Four Corners Generating Station in New Mexico, the Mohave project in Nevada, and the Navajo project in northern Arizona. All use coal as boiler fuel. Mohave and Four Corners are fully operational; only one of the three units at Navajo is operational, the other two are under construction.

And contrary to some statements, particularly in the eastern press, our plants are not clustered in a small area. The distance from Four Corners to Mohave, for example, is greater than the distance from Washington, D.C. to Cleveland.

This sort of eastern misunderstanding of the West aggravates our problems.

We are all aware, sometimes painfully so, that the population of our region has grown enormously, and it continues to grow. In the region served by WEST Associates' members, population growth is some five times the rate of the rest of the contiguous states. Of course, commercial and industrial development has paralleled population growth. And more and more people, occupying more and more jobs, demand an awesome amount of additional electric energy.

Members of WEST Associates had a combined installed generating capacity of about 37 million kilowatts at the end of last year. By 1980 we are going to need 60 million kilowatts to meet our customers' growing demands, and by 1990 generating capacity will have grown to approximately 114 million kilowatts, requiring a 35.3 billion dollar investment in generating plant alone.

In the years ahead, our mix of energy sources in the WEST area will change significantly. By 1990, hydroelectric generating capacity will have dropped from 20 percent today to approximately 10 percent of the total. Coal will be the fuel for 32 percent of our 1990 needs, compared with 22 percent now, assuming we are allowed to mine and burn it. And, depending on their availability, oil and gas will have dropped from 56 percent at present to about 30 percent of the total, or less, by 1990.

The big growth will be in nuclear power. Although only 1.2 percent of our capacity now is nuclear, we expect that some 26 percent of our total capacity will come from the atom by 1990.

Other potential energy sources, such as geothermal energy and solar power, cannot contribute significantly to our resource needs by 1990. And so, as we face these coming 16 years, we will have five principal means of generating electric power: hydro, gas, oil, coal and nuclear. Let's look at each of these separately.

Hydro. The generation of electricity from the energy of falling water will continue to be important. Our 1973 hydro capacity was about 7.5 million kilowatts, and we are expecting it to grow to 11.7 million kilowatts by 1990. However, there are only a few suitable hydro sites in the West, and the development of these few sites probably will be delayed by environmental challenges to governmental approvals.

Oil and gas. There are grave uncertainties associated with use of oil. Domestic supply is far short of demands. Increasing reliance upon foreign imports involves serious national security and balance of payments problems.

In the case of natural gas, the supply is fast dwindling. Its use as a boiler fuel has the lowest priority, and there is general agreement that it should be conserved for higher uses.

Coal. The abundance of coal is one of the brightest spots in our energy picture. A substantial amount of the nation's coal reserves—an estimated 296 billion tons—is in

the area of WEST members, enough coal to last hundreds of years.

And we are planning to use it. By 1990, we'll need an estimated 158 million tons per year. Our coal-fired capacity will grow from 8 million kilowatts in 1973 to more than 36 million kilowatts by 1990.

There are problems with coal . . . in mining and burning it in ways that are environmentally acceptable. To solve these problems WEST is actively supporting regional and national broad-scale research and development programs aimed at minimizing the environmental impact of using coal, and in converting it into gas or liquid.

In our opinion, coal is absolutely essential for generating a major part of the electric energy in the West, and in the nation, for the next decade. In fact, we *must* develop our coal reserves if the nation is to reach the stated goal of self-sufficiency in energy supply.

However, both the increased production and use of coal face serious obstacles. As to production, there are two major barriers. One is the moratorium placed by the Interior Department on leasing for surface mining the coal reserves owned by the federal government.

The Interior Department recently published an environmental impact statement on federal coal leasing in which it points out that no alternative is in sight in the next decade to provide the necessary energy without leasing federal coal lands in the West. We believe the public and all interested parties should be heard regarding the impact statement. But we would hope that public dialogue on this issue can be expedited, that provisions for the protection of the environment and the interests of the government are reasonable, that the ban on federal leases can be lifted at the earliest possible date, and that the coal can be mined responsibly.

The other barrier to coal production is the surface mining legislation now before the Congress. It is our earnest hope that this Congress will not enact surface mining legislation which will impose so many unworkable restrictions on surface mining of coal as to impede or halt the development and use of this vital natural resource.

We support firm but fair surface mining legislation. We believe the cost of reclamation should be included as a legitimate part of the price of coal. We do not believe, however, that past mistakes, principally those made in the Appalachian area, should be the foundation for regulations pertinent to the West, where the problems involved in surface mining are entirely different.

Regarding the use of coal, a major obstacle is the requirement for fixed emission limitations as the *sole* way to achieve compliance with national ambient air standards. We believe EPA should be persuaded to change, or the Clean Air Act should be amended to permit electric utilities to meet ambient air standards by other technically established means. In other words, utilities should be given an opportunity to demonstrate viable alternatives, so long as appropriate regional requirements are met.

Let me emphasize that we are in complete agreement with the goals and purposes of the Clean Air Act. However, we disagree with the means employed to accomplish those ends.

We are particularly concerned about the philosophy of so-called nondegradation. The *unreasonable* court interpretation that the provision means no significant deterioration of ambient air quality for non-urban electric generating stations could cripple the utilities' ability to provide adequate supplies of electricity to its customers. In fact, a strict interpretation would mean we would be prohibited from building anything anywhere.

Finally we come to nuclear. This resource

will have a tremendous impact on the energy situation in the decades ahead. The really dramatic shift in the Southwest's use of fuel for generating electricity will be toward nuclear power. At the end of 1973, only 450,000 kilowatts of WEST members' total capacity was nuclear. But by 1990 we expect to have about 30 million kilowatts of nuclear capacity installed.

Nuclear power is our cleanest thermo-electric energy source. It is the most researched, regulated and thoroughly tested fuel source the world has ever known.

But here again we face problems—problems of public acceptance and problems of siting and licensing.

Perhaps the greatest public acceptance problem we have is to convince the American people that nuclear power is indeed safe.

No discussion of electric power today would be complete without including research and development. Increased emphasis on R&D is vital to the electric industry. It is heartening to know that the federal government is stepping up its energy-related R&D activities, and we welcome the opportunity to cooperate with the government in this all-important endeavor.

You are certainly aware that all segments of the electric utility industry are working with the federal government to build a commercially feasible liquid metal fast breeder reactor demonstration plant. At the same time, research is being stepped up to create energy from controlled nuclear fusion. And both WEST and the entire electric utility industry are studying other new energy sources for generating electricity. However, the whole matter of new and exotic fuel sources and forms of generation raises the question of priorities. Our power problems are today, and we must focus on technological improvements that we need now, rather than on new concepts that may or may not prove feasible over several decades of work.

To this end WEST Associates is actively engaged in such R&D projects as these: suppression of thermal and fuel nitrogen oxides in boilers; control of sulfur dioxide in coal-fired generating units; and disposing of sulfur dioxide and trace elements recovered from stack gases.

At the national level, the utility members of WEST are supporting many other research efforts through the Electric Power Research Institute.

So far this evening we have discussed how WEST area utilities are trying to meet the increasing demand that derives from population and economic growth. But there are other aspects to demand.

For example, we in the utility business recognize that the elimination of waste in energy usage can help solve energy shortages. And we have been actively encouraging our customers to use electricity wisely and efficiently. We are going to have to continue to educate our customers to manage energy use and to use only what they need.

Rising prices will probably encourage people to avoid waste, but at this time we honestly don't know to what extent use will be determined by price. Economically, the demand for electricity has never been very elastic. But we do know that the price of electricity, like the price of almost everything else, is rising. We also know, and the American people should now understand, that low-cost energy is a thing of the past.

Electric utilities have felt deeply the constant pressures of rising costs. There is not a utility member of WEST Associates that hasn't had to raise its rates or isn't contemplating doing so. Fuel costs have risen enormously, as have construction, labor, equipment, materials, and financing costs. Inflation has had a severe impact on our industry, and the sizable expenditures we are making on environmental protection have aggravated our financial problems.

There is no question that our overall costs of providing electric service will continue to rise, and we see no alternative but that rates will have to be further increased in the months and years ahead to cover the rising costs.

While wise use of energy and higher electric rates may help to contain demand, other factors are pushing demand upward. One is that more and more people are turning to electricity as a replacement for the use of other fuels. We see this trend continuing.

Another factor is that electricity is being called upon increasingly to accomplish the essential job of cleaning up the environment—treating sewage, recycling natural resources, and performing a host of other environmentally significant tasks. This means more—not less—electric power.

Now, in this context of rising costs and increasing need for more electric power, we must assess the nation's commitment to a clean environment.

Some people are demanding that electric utilities be forced to install sulfur removal equipment, including utilities in the West which burn extremely low sulfur coal. While such equipment is commercially available at very great expense, its reliability under sustained operating conditions has not been adequately demonstrated. We think that spending billions of dollars on unproven equipment is the wrong approach, and we will resist it.

We recommend and support accelerated, intensive research to develop the needed SO<sub>2</sub> emission control equipment, by industry and federal funding. And we already are putting millions of our dollars into this research. When proven reliable SO<sub>2</sub> emission control equipment is available, we will install that equipment at power stations that need it to meet clean air standards while burning our region's low sulfur coal. Until reliable equipment is available, we believe that coal-fired power plants should continue to be operated and constructed to meet the industry's responsibilities to customers, with intermediate measures being used to control SO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

The question, in my opinion, is not whether we should work toward a clean environment, but rather "How clean is clean?" Should we try to correct the abuses of the environment that have accumulated over many decades, perhaps over as much as a century, and do all this within a very few years? We should, of course, scrub up our environment, but do we really need to sterilize it?

In summary, we in WEST are concerned about our energy supply, about rising prices and inflation, and certainly about the quality of the physical environment in which we live. All of us have to be.

But it seems obvious to us that something is going to have to give on the American energy situation. I am sure your mail bears this out.

We are hopeful that, amid the clamor and pressures, the congress and federal agencies will not be forced into legislation and regulations that may seem politically popular today, but will prove unsound over the long term. The members of WEST Associates are confident that we can meet the increasing demands for electricity in our service areas in the years ahead, provided we are not constrained by unattainable environmental controls, delayed by moratoriums on nuclear development or coal mining, or blocked by restrictive or ambiguous legislation and regulations which result in time-consuming and costly interpretation by the courts.

Given a reasonable economic, environmental and regulatory climate, we are convinced that we will be able to keep a strong light in the windows of the West when you return to your home states.

You have been very gracious to come and hear our story this evening. We have tried

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to cover most of the pertinent facts in the time allotted. But if you now have any questions, we'll try to answer them, with the help of your hosts, the representatives of WEST's member utilities who are here.

### JUNE WASHINGTON REPORT

#### HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, following is my Washington Report for the month of June:

WASHINGTON REPORT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, JUNE 1974

Impeachment hearings go forward in the House Judiciary Committee, with the probability that Articles of Impeachment could be reported by late July for full House debate in August. Should this occur, the House would put aside all other business to decide, by majority vote, whether the Senate should try the case. Predictions of how the House will vote are pure speculation: most House Members take the judicious stand that it is improper to make a judgment until all evidence is presented. If the House does vote to impeach it will name Managers to serve as prosecutors during the Senate trial.

The Senate's Role: Several weeks would pass before a Senate trial got underway, to permit the President to respond to the Articles of Impeachment. House Managers would file a "replication" to the President's response, and he would answer that. Should it wish, the Senate could take additional testimony and evidence. With the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court presiding, both sides would present witnesses and evidence. The President would have the benefit of counsel and right of cross-examination. Finally, a vote would be taken on each Article in the Bill of Impeachment. A two-thirds majority vote by the Senate is required by the Constitution for conviction.

Time-Table: No one expects the House proceedings to drag on unduly. But, if impeachment is voted, there is strong consensus on Capitol Hill that the Senate trial would not be over before the November elections. . . . even some growing concern that the trial could stretch into the new 94th Congress that convenes in January. This might pose a serious constitutional question: one side surely would contend that a trial begun by the Current Senate membership could not be continued into next year when it will have a number of newly-elected members. Others would point out that both Supreme Court and Senate precedents hold that the Senate is a continuing body, since only one-third of its membership is up for election at a given time.

Capitol Hill expects a flood of visitors who want to be eye-witnesses to history in the making. Because the House Judiciary Committee chamber will be crowded with the working press and television equipment, only 35 spectators can be accommodated during open hearings. If the impeachment proceedings reach the House Floor, Doorkeeper "Fishbait" Miller will use a rotating system, limiting spectators to 10 minutes in the galleries overlooking the House Chamber.

Congress keeps on working—Despite the many frustrations and distractions of Watergate, legislative activity has not diminished on Capitol Hill, and both House and Senate are carrying on the Nation's business. By the end of May, the House had taken 260 roll-calls, compared with 172 in the same period last year, and 175 in 1972. . . . The tempo has picked up in the House Appropriations

Committee, of which I am a member. For the first time in many years, all of our money bills will have cleared the House by August, including my Defense and Transportation subcommittees' appropriations.

National flood insurance available to you: All communities and property-owners in the 23rd Congressional District are eligible for low-cost flood and mudslide damage insurance under the improved program enacted by Congress. However, if your community doesn't apply by July 1, 1975, both it and you will be out of luck. The Department of Housing and Urban Development, which administers the program, urges early application by eligible communities. Once the community has been approved, individual property-owners may apply.

Looking ahead . . . Many of you have been kind enough to inquire what my plans are at the conclusion of my 20 years of service in Congress next January. While I have no definite plans, I shall remain in Washington in the practice of law and as a consultant. I will, of course, maintain a close association with my many friends in Cleveland.

### ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON CONFRONTS NEW YORK CITY'S RACE PROBLEMS

#### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, New York City contains, in a State of undiluted complexity, most of the difficult race problems currently faced by this Nation. Eleanor Holmes Norton, chairperson of the New York City Commission on Human Rights, has consistently and conscientiously pursued her ideals through this hazardous maze. Ms. Norton is endowed with the attributes most desperately needed by the leadership ranks in the cause of civil rights: foresight, commitment, and clear perception of a goal.

It is easy these days to escalate complex racial issues into an unconquerable mountain which must be tolerated because it cannot be scaled. In New York City, Eleanor Holmes Norton has begun the climb. She has always maintained that we must not tolerate segregation, that we must fight for an integrated, just society.

Her courage and fortitude in fighting to make New York an illustration of her ideals will, I hope, challenge others to join the cause.

I insert in the RECORD Ms. Norton's June 5 reply to a WCBS Channel 2 editorial as a tribute to her efforts and as an indication to my colleagues that commitment to the cause of integration is still very much alive in America:

#### TWENTY YEARS SINCE BROWN

(Replies to a Channel 2 editorial on the 20th anniversary of the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision, here is Eleanor Holmes Norton, chairperson of the New York City Commission on Human Rights.)

Channel 2 bemoans the fact that racial issues today seem more complicated than race and involve other factors as well, such as class. These complexities are far from new, as Channel 2 should know, but northerners were quick to condemn all manifestations of racism, however complex when the focus was in the South. Now that so

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 20, 1974

many poor blacks have gone north, northerners have begun to see how difficult it is to correct the effects of slavery and official and cultural racism. The fact is that such problems as class, and family structure among blacks are not factors that can be judged independent of racial privation. If so blacks would have followed the pattern of other ethnic groups in this country, all poor at the beginning and all middle-class inside of one or two generations. Apparently generations of slavery and racial segregation have operated to rigidify the poverty most Americans have felt, but without race as an added factor, have been able to escape.

We need to stop wringing our hands about how complex the problem is, something we should have understood long ago, and start looking analytically for ways to make integration work. The City Commission on Human Rights is working on the nuts and bolts of stabilizing neighborhoods and schools on an integrated basis at a time when too many seem to think integrated neighborhoods and schools must go through transition and resegregation.

The fact is that too little has been done to intervene into the processes that have produced white flight, segregated schools and urban decay in the North. Virtually no efforts at prevention and little more at cure have produced what should surprise no one. New York is worth more. It is worth our best efforts to save it in the only way it can survive in health—as an integrated city.

**TRENTON TERRACE REPRESENTS  
BEST OF 235 AND 236 HOUSING  
PROGRAMS WHICH SHOULD BE  
CONTINUED**

**HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, so much is said about the 235 and 236 housing programs which allude that these provisions are bad that I just felt it would be appropriate to call to the attention of my colleagues the success story of a 236 project here in the District of Columbia. Trenton Terrace is the epitome of how a successfully managed 236 housing program can work to aid the tenants and the community. We must preserve the ability of the local community to sponsor this type of housing. While the 1974 Housing Act extends the 235 and 236 programs until 1975, it is not adequate and must be extended beyond that time if the successes such as Trenton Terrace are to be repeated.

I call this story to the attention of my colleagues because I believe that it would be useful to them in understanding the issues which will surround any attempt to extend 235 and 236 programs in the 1974 Housing Act.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 17, 1974]  
VANDALIZED APARTMENTS BECOME "LUXURY" UNITS

(By Thomas W. Lippman)

An aging garden apartment project in Anacostia that was a ruin of vandalism and deterioration three years ago now is open for rental as "the ultimate in luxury for low and moderate income families."

For a monthly rent of \$152 for a two-bedroom apartment, recent newspaper adver-

tisements offered such amenities as a swimming pool, air conditioning, wall-to-wall carpets and "color deluxe kitchens."

Behind that surprising—and genuine—offer is a long story of racial transition, real estate economics and federal housing policy that epitomizes both the housing problems of Washington's low-income residents and the efforts to solve them.

It is too early to tell whether the change that has revitalized the Trenton Terrace apartments will last. Already, even before the completion of their renovation under a federal program known as "Project Rehab," some of the newly installed security systems have been ripped out, and graffiti are reappearing in some hallways.

Some tenants are grumbling, as always, although much of their discontent concerns problems inherent to Anacostia. The new owners of Trenton Terrace can do nothing about these problems, such as poor public transportation and a lack of shopping facilities. Other tenants, interviewed at random, say they are delighted with the new Trenton Terrace and proud of its trash-free grounds.

Trenton Terrace represents a high-stakes gamble by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, which has insured the project's mortgage of almost \$3 million and is providing subsidies of about \$146,000 a year.

HUD and the project's new owners are betting that a one-failed apartment project occupied mostly by poor people, in a neighborhood glutted with failed apartment projects and poor people, can be made to work. Variations of the same gamble are being made in several parts of the city, with equally uncertain outcomes.

If the demand for renovated units at Trenton Terrace is any guide, the prospects are good, because the apartments are being snapped up as fast as work is completed, according to resident manager Wesley Taylor.

A lawyer and real estate entrepreneur who redeveloped Trenton Terrace, said in an interview that she thought it could succeed because "there is a great shortage of housing, people need it and the product is infinitely superior to what it was."

Trenton Terrace consists of 216 apartments in about two dozen buildings scattered on a hillside at Mississippi Avenue and 10th Place SE, facing Oxon Run, just off Wheeler road.

It was built with federal financial assistance just after World War II to house returning veterans. For almost two decades, it was just another apartment project housing mostly middle class white residents. But in the mid-1960s it was caught up in the sudden transformation of Anacostia into a dumping ground for low-income blacks.

In 1966, Trenton Terrace was purchased by a syndicate organized by Richard and Arnold Dorfmann, brothers who made several large real estate investments about the same time. They borrowed heavily to finance their purchases and a few years later fell deeply into debt.

Leaders of a tenant's council at Trenton Terrace charged that the Dorfmanns were milking the project and failing to maintain good repair. By the middle of 1970, city inspectors had cited more than 1,800 housing code violations at Trenton Terrace, 63 apartments were vacant, the remaining tenants were withholding much of their rent and the Dorfmanns owed almost \$1.1 million on a mortgage to the Perpetual Building Association.

Perpetual did not want to foreclose, fearing it would not be able to sell the project for enough money to recoup its investment. Far Southeast then was full of garden apartment developments in much the same condition, and there was no market for them.

Then in March, 1971, the Federal Housing Administration approved the District of Columbia for participation in Project Rehab, a nationwide program to use federal subsidies

and mortgage guarantees to renovate rundown but basically sound housing.

Financed through Section 236 of the National Housing Act of 1968, Project Rehab provided financial assistance to nonprofit or limited-profit sponsors to take over the rundown buildings, fix them and rent them to persons of low and moderate income. At Trenton Terrace, for example, the maximum annual income permitted for tenants is \$7,700 for two persons or \$9,400 for four.

Under Section 236, the sponsor pays interest of only 1 per cent on his mortgage, with the government paying the difference between that and the actual rate of the loan, so the sponsor can hold down his costs. By doing that and by eliminating or limiting profits, the program was designed to make housing available for far less than it would cost on the open market.

Trenton Terrace is one of 11 projects in the District, with a total of 2,361 units, that are being renovated under Project Rehab, at a total estimated cost of more than \$50 million.

The Section 236 subsidy program, which has been tainted by scandals throughout the nation was suspended by the Nixon administration last year, but existing commitments were honored. Project Rehab itself has been heavily criticized because at some buildings being renovated tenants were forced to move out when work began.

It took a year to obtain federal approval of the mortgage insurance and subsidies that would enable the work to proceed. The proposal was turned down once and later resubmitted.

When federal approval was assured, Associated Mortgage Companies, Inc., one of the largest mortgage lending firms in the country, lent Urban Rehabilitation \$2,976,600 to pay off Perpetual and carry out the renovation. Perpetual received the FHA-appraised value of the property, \$939,600, and "forgave" the rest.

In exchange for insuring the mortgage, which means that if the project goes broke Associated Mortgage will get its money back from HUD and the government will acquire the buildings, the government imposes certain requirements and restrictions on what the owners of Trenton Terrace can do with it.

One is the tenants' income limitation. Another is that as many as 43 apartments must be reserved for tenants whose incomes are too low to enable them to pay even the modest rents at Trenton Terrace and who are eligible for an additional rent supplement under another HUD program. A third is a limitation on the owners' profit to 6 per cent of their "equity investment" per year, a figure estimated at less than \$20,000.

The project actually is worth far more than that to the sponsors. The venture already have taken in \$457,200 from 13 doctors, lawyers, businessmen and professional athletes who bought an 88 per cent interest in Trenton Terrace as a tax shelter.

These financial arrangements, not only legal but probably necessary to induce sponsors to undertake such projects, have little direct bearing on life at Trenton Terrace. The important considerations there are more basic.

"I try to counsel the tenants," said Taylor, the resident manager, "that 90 per cent of keeping this place up is up to them . . . you can put in people from better neighborhoods, and a certain percentage of people from better neighborhoods who can teach them, and with my personal touch, they can be taught how to keep it up—though they tend to relax."

Part of Taylor's job is to enforce rules such as a ban on children of different sexes occupying the same bedroom or on tenants lounging outside the buildings.

"That resident manager's office is closed by 5 p.m., but then they come around and snoop," one woman said. "They say the chil-

children can't play out front, or out back, they have to play in the park. My little girl was hit by a car trying to cross that street."

Other tenants feel differently. "This place is very nice," said a young woman whose husband has just started work as a bank teller. "People are really proud of it, and it has good security."

She and her husband had sought an apartment for seven months, she said, and "for young people just starting out this is very good."

"You start with careful tenant selection." "We are concerned for people, we want to help them. But they have to care about how they live."

"Together we can make it . . . if we can take care of our housing and infuse the tenants with our desire to keep good house for them, I hope they'll keep good house for themselves."

Mrs. Lawson said she regrets the suspension of the federal housing subsidy programs because "the government has a role in providing housing for those who can't do it for themselves. The economic forces being what they are, private investment isn't going to do it without subsidies . . . I don't know where people are going to live."

#### ORGANIZED SPORTS PROGRAM REDUCES JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN HONOLULU

**HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in our continuing fight against crime and delinquency we should not forget that organized sports activities can attract delinquent youngsters and provide them with a creative outlet for their energies. The initiation of such a program in Hawaii has proved to be extremely successful.

Implementation of an athletic program at the Kuhio Park Terrace Public Housing project in Kalihi, a neighborhood in Honolulu, Hawaii, has dramatically reduced the formerly high rate of vandalism and drug abuse in the area, and has encouraged disenchanted students to continue their education. It has demonstrated that positive efforts directed at youths from low-income families can produce significant changes for the better.

An article in the Honolulu Advertiser of Wednesday, June 12, details the evolution of the program. I am inserting it into the RECORD to emphasize that constructive programs for youngsters can yield benefits to the youngsters themselves, and to their community:

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, June 12, 1974]

DROP IN DELINQUENCY CREDITED TO SPORTS  
(By Harold Hostetler)

It isn't the environment that causes kids to get into trouble, in the view of one youth worker. It's idleness. And one of the best remedies for idleness is sports.

The youth worker is Michael T. Amii, 28, a Job Corps counselor who for the past seven years has devoted a considerable part of his spare time heading the Kuhio Park Terrace Athletic Club.

Amii has an enviable record for keeping kids busy and out of trouble. For years the

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

highrise Kuhio Park Terrace public housing project in Kalihi had been a trouble spot. There was vandalism and glue-sniffing, among other kinds of delinquency.

Today Amii has 120 boys and girls from 7 to 17 years of age playing regularly in sports such as basketball, softball and flag football. Delinquency has dropped dramatically at Kuhio Park Terrace. There is little glue-sniffing and significantly less vandalism.

"Sports attracts," Amii said simply. "With nothing to do, kids get into mischief. They cut school, their grades drop, and eventually they drop out."

"But if you play a game, they play a game. You don't have to go chase kids to get them to participate. They come out to play."

"The biggest thing about it is playing and competing," said Richard Kahuli Jr., 15, who has been in the program since its inception. "Before we had the club, I swam a lot, but that's about all."

"I just stayed home all the time watching TV," said Samuel Kawewehi, 14, who joined the program four years ago.

"But Dickie (Kahuli) kept bugging me to join. So I tried it out. It was good, so I stayed."

"I like the running. Sports is much better than TV," he said with a big grin.

Dickie and Sam are two examples of scholastic as well as athletic achievers. Both had been offered scholarships at private schools in Honolulu, but both chose to go to the Kamehameha School for Boys, where they are in junior varsity football.

"We remind the kids they should stay in school," Amii said. "We don't force them, though. And they have responded. Many have graduated, and some have had outstanding grades."

Parents of a number of the boys and girls also participate in coaching and other activities with the club. Dickie's and Sam's fathers are both coaches.

"At first we tried to get more parents to participate, but that didn't work out," Amii said. "So we just settled on working with the kids. But we have good support from the parents."

On Sunday the club, which is a member of the Police Athletic League, will hold its annual awards banquet at the non-commissioned officers' Top Four Club at Hickam Air Force Base. All 120 kids will receive an award for participating, and many will receive achievement awards.

Three days later 44 of them will leave for Los Angeles to play in a three-day basketball tournament with the Unknown Youth Organization, a club for youth from depressed areas.

So far the Kuhio Park Terrace Athletic Club has raised about \$11,000 of the \$15,000 it will need to send the team to Los Angeles. It is hoping for more donations this week.

The club is supported totally from donations, fund-raising projects (such as selling cracked seed) and Amii's own contributions from a couple of part-time jobs he has. All the funds go directly to the State Commission on Children and Youth, of which Amii is a member. The commission in turn disburses the funds as needed by the club.

#### FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION FACTSHEET

**HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, recently I toured the Federal Aviation Administration offices here in Washington, and met with Administrator Alexander

Butterfield. In view of the fact that 1973 was an exceptionally busy and hectic year for the FAA, I thought my colleagues would find the FAA fact sheet of particular interest, and I present it for their consideration:

##### FAA FACT SHEET

During 1973, in the area of aviation safety and air traffic control, the Federal Aviation Administration—

Achieved the lowest air carrier accident rate since 1949 and the lowest general aviation accident rate since 1956. We did experience, however, a slight increase in fatal accidents in both categories.

Completed the establishment of Terminal Control Areas (TCA's) at nine of the busiest air terminals in the United States. The fact that no air carrier was involved in a mid-air collision during 1973 can be attributed in part to the establishment of these TCA's.

Went through the longest period in six years without a successful hijacking of a U.S. aircraft. This fact can be directly attributed to the civil aviation security measures required by FAA, to the cooperation of airline operators, airport managers, and the American public and to the negotiation of a hijacking agreement with Cuba.

Certified, prior to the statutory deadline of May 21, 1973, some 500 airports regularly serving large aircraft of CAB-certified air carriers. Carriers using these airports handle approximately 99 percent of the annual revenue passenger traffic in the United States.

Revised our regulations to require that large and turbine-powered multi-engine general aviation aircraft be subject to a continuous inspection program, rather than a 100-hour, or progressive, inspection.

Entered into an agreement with the Department of Defense providing for FAA inspection of surplus military aircraft to determine, before their sale to the public, the potential of these aircraft for acquiring a standard airworthiness certificate.

Strengthened regulations dealing with the transportation of hazardous materials by air.

Introduced a new operational training concept for pilots that places full responsibility for all phases of required training on the flight instructor.

Assembled a planning group to study the problem of keeping airworthiness rules and regulations current. FAA procedures for promulgating or amending airworthiness regulations involved taking a large number of individual regulatory actions on a piecemeal basis. This procedure was proving increasingly less effective because of the rapid growth experienced by aviation both in the United States and abroad. In October, the planning group recommended that the single-item review be abandoned and that an FAA Airworthiness Review Staff be established to conduct a comprehensive general review of all airworthiness regulations on a two-year cycle. This recommendation was implemented in February 1974 with the establishment of a biennial airworthiness review program.

Commissioned 17 additional ARTS (Automated Radar Terminal System) III systems, bringing the number of such terminal automation systems in use at the end of the year to 61 (58 for air traffic control at terminal facilities; three for training and field and development support). ARTS III is FAA's automation system for high-density terminal areas. A total of 64 such systems have been purchased to date.

Advanced our en route automation system—NAS En Route Stage A—to a point where we had a computerized flight data processing capability at 20 air route traffic control centers.

In carrying out its responsibility to promote and foster the development of civil aeronautics, FAA—

Instituted a series of Consultative Planning

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Conferences (informally called mini-conferences) to supplement such regularly scheduled larger conferences as the Overview Planning Conference and the Aviation Review Conference. These mini-conferences give FAA's consultative planning review system the necessary flexibility to focus quickly and sharply on critical problems of immediate concern to FAA and some or all of the aviation community's various segments. These conferences are held quarterly and run for a period of two to three days.

Instituted a continuing series of Listening Sessions. Under this consultative concept, clearly defined segments of the aviation community—private pilots, air taxi operators, airport managers, and others—are invited, each in their turn, to express their views before FAA's top management on any given aviation topic. FAA representatives listen, record, and follow up with action. As a result, aviation interest groups that previously had little or no direct access to me or my key aides now have such access.

Implemented a seven-point fuel conservation program designed to save up to 20,000 barrels (840,000 gallons) of jet fuel per day.

Allocated \$284 million under the Airport Development Aid Program for construction grants. Of this amount, \$246 million (450 projects) went for improvements at air carrier and general aviation reliever airports; \$38 million (182 projects) went for improvements at airports used solely for general aviation.

Vigorously pursued the revision of bilateral airworthiness agreements with major aeronautical manufacturing and user countries to cover the export or import of all aviation products—engines, appliances, propellers, and other components. Since export sales frequently depend on foreign countries producing selected aircraft components, these revised agreements should facilitate the sale of U.S. aircraft abroad. During calendar 1973, we signed revised bilateral airworthiness agreements with Sweden, France, Belgium, and Italy.

Expanded our international technical assistance program. In the past, the bulk of FAA technical assistance to foreign governments was financed by the State Department's Agency for International Development (AID). In recent years, however, AID has redirected its resources into other economic fields, and the level of FAA technical assistance has decreased. At the same time, however, many of the emerging nations have developed a growing purchasing power and are capable of financing the technical assistance they need. FAA has taken advantage of this opportunity and is negotiating reimbursable technical assistance agreements with a number of Asian and African countries. Providing U.S. technical assistance abroad will promote the export of U.S. aeronautical products.

Took a number of actions designed to make flying more compatible with our environment. Among the more notable steps taken were (1) the adoption of rules prohibiting supersonic flights over the United States by civil aircraft; (2) requiring all newly manufactured jet aircraft over 75,000 pounds to meet the noise standards set down by Part 36 of the Federal Air Regulations.

Some of FAA's more notable research and development efforts during 1973 were in the following areas:

**Terminal Automation.** We evaluated a prototype ARTS II system—designed for terminal areas that do not have the traffic density to qualify for the more capable ARTS III system—at the Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, terminal radar approach control cab. The results of this evaluation enabled us to determine the final specifications for the ARTS II production model.

**Microwave Landing System (MLS).** This system is a key element in FAA's Upgraded

Third Generation ATC System. The system's development and implementation is proceeding in accordance with the five-year schedule set by an interagency Governmental committee. During 1973, the first phase of this program, technique analysis and contract definition, was completed.

**Intermittent Positive Control (IPC).** When in place, this technique will provide an intermittent form of ground-based air traffic control advisory and separation service to aircraft flying under visual flight rules. A plan for experimenting with and developing this service was generated during 1973.

**Discrete Address Beacon System (DABS).** This is an improved air traffic control beacon system that will allow ground equipment to interrogate, and discriminate between responses from, specific aircraft of interest.

**Aeronautical Satellite (AEROSAT).** Last December we reached an agreement with Canada and the European Space Research Organization (ESRO) for launching this international program. The program now awaits Congressional approval.

In the area of administration, FAA strove during 1973 to improve our operational efficiency and overall mission effectiveness, provide equal employment opportunity to minority groups and women, and promote better relations and understanding with our employees. Our more notable actions in this area included—

Establishment of a National Flight Inspection Field Office with centralized responsibility for the flight inspection of air navigation facilities in the contiguous United States and the North Atlantic and Caribbean areas. This facility, once it is fully operational, is expected to achieve savings of \$7 million annually.

An extensive reorganization of our Washington Headquarters. Among the functional areas involved were accounting and audit, information services, and certain administrative support services. The governing principle in these organizational moves was improving efficiency and mission effectiveness.

Reassessment of the personnel strengths at both the Alaska and Pacific-Asia Regions headquarters offices. This reassessment resulted in the reduction of positions at these headquarters offices.

Opening negotiations with recognized employee bargaining units. Sitting around the bargaining table has afforded us a new channel of communication with our employees and given us considerable insight into their views and feelings.

During 1974, in the area of safety, FAA expects to give top priority to—

Continuing to increase the effectiveness of its anti-hijacking program. We will particularly focus on strengthening the security requirements of foreign air carriers wishing to enter U.S. airspace.

Prosecuting its new biennial airworthiness review program.

Establishing 11 Group II Terminal Control Areas.

Completing the implementation of the basic ARTS III automation system at 61 high- and medium-density airports.

New rules requiring domestic and foreign flag carriers operating large aircraft to schedule operations into FAA-certified airports. We also plan to require airports that possess only a provisional certificate to meet the regulatory requirements for full certification.

FAA plans for fostering aviation during 1974 include—

A full schedule of Consultative Planning Conferences and Listening Sessions, as well as holding our older, established conferences. In addition, we intend to increase citizen participation in the consultative and decision-making process, particularly in the area of airport development.

Making aircraft more acceptable environmentally. We intend to propose or promul-

gate new rules involving (1) the retrofit of all in-use aircraft not covered by FAA noise regulations; (2) civil supersonic aircraft noise standards; (3) noise abatement takeoff and departure procedures for all turbojet-powered aircraft; (4) the reduction of engine-noise levels now employed in the type-certification of new aircraft; (5) noise standards for helicopters; (6) fleet noise requirements; (7) noise standards for small propeller-driven aircraft.

Continuing our role as a catalyst in improving aviation's prospects for adequate fuel supplies.

Increasing our emphasis on international aviation in order to expand U.S. markets and influence abroad and enhance this country's historic leadership role in aviation. This includes negotiating more bilateral airworthiness agreements, and reimbursable technical assistance agreements and increasing our foreign contacts.

Our more important 1974 research and development goals include—

Getting our flight service station modernization program under way.

Reaching the production phase in the ARTS II program.

Beginning development work on an aeronautical satellite system.

Entering the prototype phase in our micro-wave landing system development program.

Our major goals in the area of administration include—

Improving the FAA acquisition cycle.

Reducing the administrative costs involved in managing the Airport Development Aid Program.

Continuing work toward developing a new, integrated information handling system employing the latest automatic data processing techniques.

Consolidating the responsibility for policy and planning in the Washington Headquarters under an Associate Administrator for Policy Development and Review.

Consolidating the responsibility for safety in the Washington Headquarters under an Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety.

Establishing a system of accountability in the area of civil rights and equal employment opportunity. The new system will give us easy access to all data necessary for reporting and evaluative purposes.

Establishing an agency-wide upward mobility program.

Recruiting young, qualified, and imaginative people to seek careers in FAA, where their aviation and managerial skills can be fully developed and used.

## THE CASE FOR CONTINUED U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself today to a matter of extreme importance to the United States, the world community, and the spirit of international cooperation. I am speaking of the U.S. contribution to the fourth replenishment of the International Development Association.

Last January, in the wake of the energy crisis, the House of Representatives committed a grievous error in defeating a measure providing for the continuation of U.S. participation in IDA. I, as

well as many other Members committed to the principle of multilateral foreign assistance, was distressed by the House vote. Since its inception in 1960, the United States has recognized the truly valuable function of the International Development Association in the world community, and has accordingly contributed to three replenishments of the initial fund—1964, 1969, and 1972.

Since IDA has contributed enormously to the development, health, and education of the least developed countries, the House vote in January represented a major setback in the role the United States plays in providing the best kind of foreign assistance to the least developed countries. Our words of international cooperation and interdependence are indeed empty in light of the House vote on this issue.

The Senate, by a 55 to 27 vote in the end of May, rectified our mistake and authorized the U.S. contribution to IDA's fourth replenishment. Now, the House has an opportunity to rectify its own mistake and concur with the Senate, and I strongly urge my colleagues to do so. An excellent analysis of the case for continued U.S. participation in the International Development Association was prepared by Theodore Bornstein, legislative representative for World Federalists, USA, and I commend it to my colleagues:

**THE CASE FOR CONTINUED U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION (H.R. 15231 AND S. 2665)**

The International Development Association (IDA), designed to aid the world's poorest countries, is the soft loan or concessionary arm of the World Bank. Established in 1960, largely at the initiative of the US Congress, IDA provides loans (officially termed credits to differentiate them from World Bank loans) for self-help development projects to those countries with an average per capita income of less than \$375 per year and who cannot afford the loan rates of the World Bank. Recipients do not pay interest on loans; they pay only an annual service charge of 0.75 per cent. The repayment period generally extends over a fifty-year span.

On May 29, 1974, the Senate voted to continue US participation in IDA by the largest percentage margin in the history of the program. Voting 55-27, the Senate passed S. 2665 which authorizes a US contribution of \$1.5 billion over a four year period (\$375 million per year) to IDA's Fourth Replenishment.

Within the coming weeks the House will have the opportunity to reverse its January 23, 1974 defeat of a similar measure. The IDA Replenishment bill currently pending before the House differs from the earlier version in that it extends the payment period of the US contribution from three years to four years, thus reducing the annual contribution by \$125 million.

IDA runs out of funds for future loans on June 30th. Under the terms of the Fourth Replenishment, negotiated by the US and other contributing nations, the International Development Association will die if the House fails to pass the Replenishment bill. World Federalists, USA urges the House to keep IDA alive for the following reasons:

1. *IDA assists the world's poorest countries by providing infrastructure loans for development.* IDA provides credits for specific projects in the following categories: agriculture, education, electric power, industry, population, technical assistance, telecommunications, tourism, transportation, urbanization, water supply and sewage (see ap-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

pendix). IDA projects are concentrated in rural areas—where the bulk of the world's poor live. The following are examples of the wide range of IDA projects:

Drilling tube wells for irrigation in arid but potentially fertile land;

Construction of roads and improvement of river and port navigation to get crops and other products to local and international markets;

Flood control;

Expansion of hydro-electric generating capacity, thus alleviating world-wide demand for fossil fuel;

Introduction of new crops and agricultural techniques;

Secondary education and training of agricultural, industrial and administrative personnel; and

Redevelopment and improvement of farms and herds in such areas as the drought-stricken African Sahel.

2. *The poorest of the world's poor people benefit from IDA.* Although IDA credits go to governments, their effects directly benefit the poor people of these countries. IDA has been effective in aiding over two billion people in 21 countries during its 14 years of operation. Its agricultural projects have assisted 1.25 million farmers and have placed into cultivation 3.5 billion acres of land—land that had previously been fallow. IDA has brought health care to 21 million people who previously were without it. In addition, its projects have protected the health of 9 million people in five countries by improving water supplies and sewage. It also provides assistance for projects combating epidemics such as river blindness in Africa.

3. *IDA represents the thin margin between survival and disaster for millions of people in the countries it assists.* Economists report that if IDA programs are suspended for lack of funding, the mere survival of its recipient countries will be cast into doubt. Should these countries collapse, the toll in terms of human deaths and misery will cause severe economic and political strain that could have dire consequences for the rest of the world. The resultant political and economic disruption would be extremely damaging to U.S. trade and diplomatic relations.

4. *IDA avoids waste and misuse of funds.* Since its loans go only to specific projects that are carefully formulated and regulated by the World Bank, waste and misuse are avoided. IDA funds are used only for the capital costs of specific development projects. Treasury Secretary George Shultz testified: *IDA lends for specific projects; its funds go, as they always have, to pay the suppliers of the pumps, tractors, cement, industrial machinery, laboratory equipment and engineering services needed to build and carry out sound and urgent development projects.* Functioning within the context of the World Bank, which has lent \$18 billion without a loss during its 28 years of operation, the staff carefully scrutinizes projects to assure a high rate of return to the recipient nations.

5. *IDA funds are not used to pay for the increased cost of oil imports or any other such artificial economic condition.* Contrary to a widely held but mistaken belief, IDA credits do not end up in the pockets of oil producers. Since its loans go directly for the capital costs of specific projects, IDA funds will not be siphoned off to pay for increased costs of oil. It should also be noted that the vast majority of oil-producing countries are not eligible for IDA loans. It would be tragic and potentially disastrous to penalize the world's poor, who are much more severely hurt by increased oil prices than the U.S. High oil prices are particularly damaging to underdeveloped countries because of the essential role played by petroleum based fertilizers in their predominantly agricultural economies. As Secretary of the Treasury Shultz noted: *For us, the energy crisis will at worst mean that our growth curve will be*

*flat, but for the developing countries hard hit by the energy crisis, IDA can . . . make the difference between survival and starvation.* In fact, by assisting poor countries in the development of hydroelectric power and fertilizer production, IDA helps alleviate the energy and fertilizer crises.

6. *IDA helps assure U.S. access to raw materials.* The U.S. is becoming increasingly dependent upon developing nations for supply of raw materials. Presently, one-third of our raw materials come from non-industrialized countries. By 1985, we will be dependent upon them for 10 out of 15 minerals critical to our economy. By building power facilities, roads, ports, and improving river transportation, as well as directly aiding mining projects, IDA helps insure continued reliable access to essential raw materials.

7. *The U.S. economy directly benefits from our participation in IDA.* IDA credits frequently go directly for the purchase in the U.S. of supplies used in its projects. The Treasury Department reports that a very significant portion of our contribution to IDA will return to the U.S. economy.

8. *By strengthening the economies of underdeveloped countries, IDA builds markets for US exports.* Last year alone, developing nations provided a \$15 billion export market for US goods, representing close to 30% of our total exports. By helping raise the national income of these countries, IDA expands their ability to purchase US goods.

9. *The US share of IDA funding has been reduced to 33% from the 40% of past replenishments.* When the Fourth Replenishment agreement was negotiated in September, 1973 at Nairobi, Kenya, other IDA contributing nations agreed to increase their share of funding. The US contribution of \$1.5 billion over four years represents an annual contribution of \$375 million as compared to the present \$386 million per year previously allocated to the IDA. Additionally, these contributions merely represent funds available for loans and thus may actually not leave the US Treasury for years to come. Also, unlike previous replenishments, the US assessment will not be adversely affected by any changes in the value of the dollar.

10. *US failure to participate in the IDA replenishment would undermine the willingness of oil-producing nations to contribute to development aid.* Among the countries who have agreed to increase their share of development aid are some of the oil-producing nations, such as Kuwait, Venezuela and Iran. In addition, other oil-producing countries, including Libya, are considering donations to the World Bank. It should be noted that despite the dramatic rise in oil prices, most oil producing-nations are still relatively underdeveloped. In fact, only a small handful of tiny oil states have per capita wealth or income approaching or exceeding our own. Presently, the US contributes only one-third of one per cent of its GNP for development assistance and ranks 14th among 16 developed countries in terms of official development assistance. In relation to our national income, US development aid is only one-tenth what it was 25 years ago, when our real income per capita was 45% less than it is today. IDA's annual cost to the US is \$1.80 per person—less than an hour's minimum wage—and it represents only one-tenth of one per cent of our budget. The majority of countries receiving IDA loans have per capita incomes of less than \$100 per year. At a time when our trade balance, as well as our balance of payments position has significantly improved, it is incumbent upon this country to meet its obligation to aid poorer countries. As Secretary Shultz stated: *If the United States out of its wealth cannot continue its historic level of support for IDA and similar financial institutions, on what basis can we*

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 20, 1974

ask the rest of the world and the oil-producers to pick up their fair share of the new development finance burden?

11. IDA contributes to a better world. Although we have learned that foreign aid can-

not buy friendship, economic development assistance helps our trade and diplomatic posture by building stronger economies in the world's poor countries. By alleviating the frustration, anger and violence bred by pov-

erty, and their concurrent political and economic disruptions, IDA promotes peace and stability. In a world that is becoming increasingly interdependent, abandonment of IDA could be very costly to the United States.

## IDA LENDING OPERATIONS BY MAJOR PURPOSE AND REGION

CUMULATIVE TOTAL OF CREDITS APPROVED, JUNE 30, 1973

[In millions of U.S. dollars]

Purpose	IDA credits by region					Purpose	IDA credits by region				
	Eastern Africa	Western Africa	Asia	Europe, Middle East, North Africa	Latin America, Caribbean		Eastern Africa	Western Africa	Asia	Europe, Middle East, North Africa	Total
<b>Agriculture, forestry and fishing:</b>											
Agricultural credit	14.6	17.0	370.5	24.0		426.1	Development finance companies	29.5		60.0	52.0
Area development	61.5	34.8	6.5	6.0		108.8	Other		.2		.2
Food and nonfood crops	39.1	25.4	121.8	15.0		201.3	Subtotal	36.0		192.5	52.2
Irrigation, flood control and drainage	109.4	18.8	351.9	157.9	13.0	651.0	Nonproject		1,000.0		280.7
Forestry and fishing		1.3	3.5	5.5		10.3	Population			34.4	4.8
Crop processing and storage	6.3		54.2			60.5	Power	5.3	17.1	379.0	44.3
Livestock	46.0	6.4	10.6	29.5	46.9	139.4	Technical assistance			14.0	14.0
Agricultural research							Telecommunications				320.4
Other			15.5			15.5	Tourism			4.2	10.0
<b>Subtotal.</b>	<b>276.9</b>	<b>103.7</b>	<b>934.5</b>	<b>237.9</b>	<b>59.9</b>	<b>1,612.9</b>	<b>Total.</b>				<b>14.2</b>
<b>Education.</b>	<b>104.9</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>140.9</b>	<b>46.4</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>380.3</b>	<b>Transportation:</b>				
<b>Industry:</b>							Aviation			2.5	
Iron and steel							Highways	268.7	131.0	203.6	50.5
Pulp and paper							Pipelines			83.3	737.1
Fertilizer and other chemicals							Ports, waterways, and shipping	30.2	3.6	154.3	
Mining, other extraction	2.5						Railways		34.9	419.2	38.5
Small industry and industrial states	4.0		9.5				Other			8.0	188.1
							<b>Subtotal.</b>	<b>298.9</b>	<b>169.5</b>	<b>777.1</b>	<b>91.5</b>
							<b>Urbanization.</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>91.3</b>	<b>1,428.3</b>
							<b>Water supply and sewerage.</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>111.2</b>	<b>39.7</b>
							<b>Total.</b>	<b>726.1</b>	<b>381.7</b>	<b>3,899.3</b>	<b>520.7</b>
										<b>235.6</b>	<b>5,763.4</b>

WRITER OF LEAKED MEMORANDUMS—DIXON SERVED McGOVERN

### HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as we are all very much aware, the House Judiciary Committee is currently conducting one of the most serious tasks which is assigned to the House of Representatives under our Constitution. I speak, of course, of the impeachment inquiry. Such a sober proceeding, one hopes, would be conducted in as fair and unbiased a manner as possible.

To say the least, I was most distressed to learn from a newsstory in the Washington Star-News that William P. Dixon, who served as an official of Senator GEORGE McGOVERN'S Presidential campaign, now holds a sensitive position on the Judiciary Committee staff. Furthermore, Mr. Dixon's own veracity has been placed in serious doubt by a General Accounting Office report on campaign funding violations in McGOVERN'S Wisconsin campaign. In fairness, justice demands that this man be removed immediately from the staff of the Judiciary Committee, because he has shown his lack of regard for his oath of office. Furthermore, he has betrayed his trust.

The newsstory from the Star-News follows:

WRITER OF LEAKED MEMORANDUMS—DIXON SERVED McGOVERN

(By Dan Thomasson)

William P. Dixon, the House Judiciary Committee staff member whose damaging memoranda about President Nixon have been leaked to the press, was a coordinator in the

1972 Democratic presidential campaign of Sen. George S. McGovern of South Dakota.

Dixon also was one of those named in a General Accounting Office report on campaign funding violations in McGovern's Wisconsin effort.

Dixon's 14 memos, seven of which have found their way into the hands of reporters, have upset House Democratic leaders who believe the committee's investigation may be discredited. The memos have infuriated Committee Chairman Peter W. Rodino Jr., D-N.J., and John M. Doar, his chief counsel.

No one has accused Dixon of leaking the memos himself. Rodino has ordered that no more such memos be written.

Rep. Charles E. Wiggins, R-Calif., complained that Dixon's memoranda were written from an advocate's view and therefore were not accurate or complete. "Dixon was looking at only the most damaging aspects of the evidence," Wiggins said.

The memos have been extremely harmful to Nixon's case. One of them reports that Nixon told former Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell to claim the Fifth Amendment privilege, should he be asked to testify about the Watergate break-in or cover-up.

Sources said today Doar was perturbed because he considers preparation of the memos an attempt by some of the committee's ultra-liberal members to undercut the methodical, nonpartisan manner in which he has been presenting evidence to the panel.

The members who asked for and received the Dixon memos over Doar's objections, the sources said, are Democratic Reps. Robert W. Kastenmeier of Wisconsin; Robert F. Drinan of Massachusetts, John Conyers, Jr., of Michigan, and Jack Brooks of Texas. All have opposed Nixon's policies and have been outspoken in their contentions that he should be impeached.

Dixon's liberal Democratic background and work for Nixon's 1972 presidential opponent were expected to cause further problems for the committee—particularly if the memos continue to be leaked.

Dixon joined the permanent staff of the Judiciary Committee late in 1973, after leav-

ing his post as counsel to Wisconsin Democratic Gov. Patrick J. Lucey. He became a counsel on the Judiciary Committee subcommittee chaired by his fellow Wisconsinite, Kastenmeier.

One of his first tasks was to help conduct the proconfirmation investigation of Vice President Gerald R. Ford.

During the 1972 McGovern campaign, Dixon served from April to August as treasurer of the Wisconsin McGovern for President Committee. He also was state coordinator for the campaign and, after the Wisconsin primary, went to work for McGovern in other states.

On Aug. 13, 1973, the GAO issued a report stating the Wisconsin McGovern committee had violated the Federal Election Campaign Act by failing to maintain complete and accurate records of receipts and expenditures.

The report, which named Dixon and others as officers of the committee, said GAO investigators in a sample of the committee's records found \$8,100 in receipts and \$7,800 in expenditures which were either not itemized or were improperly itemized.

"We found that the records maintained by the committee were not adequate to permit us to verify the financial reports submitted or for the committee treasurer to prepare adequate reports of receipts and expenditures," the report said.

"The committee did not maintain a formal accounting system, but instead used its checkbooks, which we found to be inaccurate and unreliable . . .," it stated.

### THE RETIREMENT OF HERBERT E. HOFFMAN

### HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take notice of the retirement of

Mr. Herbert E. Hoffman as counsel to the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Hoffman is leaving Government service to become director of the Governmental Relations Office of the American Bar Association in Washington, D.C.

I have had the opportunity to serve on the Criminal Justice Subcommittee while Mr. Hoffman was counsel, and to work closely with him in that capacity in the drafting of the legislation which embodies the new proposed Federal Rules of Evidence, which legislation has passed the House of Representatives and is now pending before the U.S. Senate.

I am very happy to pay my respects to Mr. Hoffman as a very able lawyer and efficient counsel for the committee, and as a very likable individual whom I am glad to call a friend. I wish him every success in his new and responsible assignment with the American Bar Association, and I am confident that his abilities will bring him success there as they did during his distinguished service with the Judiciary Committee.

**THE BALTIC STATES HAVE A RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION**

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday, June 15, marked the 34th anniversary of the tragic annexation and incorporation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, in this age of détente with the Soviet Union, that our leaders do not pause to reflect on the internal conditions within that country and the tragic plight of the people of the captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, the Baltic nations have a right to self-determination. While we hear a clamor for one-man, one-vote in Rhodesia and South Africa and in the United Nations General Assembly where the smallest of African nations has a vote equal to that of the United States, silence prevails regarding the right of the peoples of the Baltic nations to vote at all. The opinionmakers in this country refuse to advocate self-determination for the captive nations, yet are vociferous in demanding this for emerging underprivileged nations.

While any violation of rights of Jews in the Soviet Union receives front page coverage in newspapers, scant mention is made of the human rights violations against untold numbers of Christians and others which occur daily in all countries dominated by the Soviet Union.

The 86th Congress adopted a resolution which became Public Law 86-90. This resolution assails the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia which have led, through aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Romania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Cuba, and others; and

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

Vietnam, Cuba, and others. It also resolves that the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week of July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

This was 14 years ago. The captive nations are still captive. The Soviets are still aggressors. Only we have changed—why?

In the 89th Congress just 8 years ago, both Houses of Congress adopted without a single negative vote House Concurrent Resolution 416—proclaiming the rights of the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as well as all other peoples to self-determination and national independence. Again the Soviet Union was condemned for its subjugation and deprivation of the right to self-determination of the Baltic peoples. The resolution urged the President to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

Despite these resolutions expressing the sense of the U.S. Congress, the President has made no mention of the Baltic nations nor the captive nations. He does refer to Russia and Red China, though not in this vein of thought.

In view of the many documented violations of human rights against the people of the captive nations by the Soviet Union extending from the time of the Bolshevik Revolution to the present day and in view of two resolutions expressing the sense of Congress regarding the right of self-determination by the captive nations, it would seem to be incumbent upon our President and all freedom-loving peoples to identify the Soviet dictators for what they are—the enemy of free peoples—international gangsters. The time to do this is now, not next week, nor next year.

I call upon our colleagues to speak out for the right to self-determination by Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians, and other enslaved peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of my bill, House Resolution 27, regarding Communist crimes against humanity, in the RECORD at this point:

H. RES. 27

Whereas the United States of America has an abiding commitment to the principles of freedom, personal liberty, and human dignity, and holds it as a fundamental purpose to recognize and encourage constructive actions which foster the growth and development of national independence and freedom; and

Whereas the international Communist movement toward a world empire has from its beginning adopted the means of terrorism, assassination, and mass murder as official policies to apply their application advances the Communist cause of world domination; and

Whereas there is considerable evidence that Communists in the Soviet Union and in other countries have deliberately caused the death of millions of individuals in Russia, Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas thousands of survivors and refu-

gees from Communist campaigns of terrorism and mass liquidation have been forced to flee to the United States as refugees to find the freedom and dignity denied to them by Communist regimes and have become productive citizens of the United States; and

Whereas it is fitting that the full facts of Communist terrorism in all of its various forms, including assassination and mass murder, be made manifest to all the peoples of the world so that such policies can be properly understood and condemned by all mankind toward the purpose of eradicating such policies from the body of mankind: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That—

(1) The Speaker of the House shall within fourteen days hereafter appoint a special committee of twelve Members of the House, equally divided between the majority and minority parties, and shall designate one Member to serve as chairman, which special committee shall proceed to investigate all crimes against humanity perpetrated under Communist direction. The special committee shall report to the House the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, not later than one year following the appointment of its full membership by the Speaker.

(2) For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and such places within the United States, whether the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpœna or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpœnas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member; and be it further

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Congress that a monument be erected in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital, as a suitable memorial to all victims of international Communist crimes against humanity.

**NATIONWIDE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

**HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce House Joint Resolution 1 to recognize and establish a Johnny Horizon Environmental Improvement Month, September 15, 1974, through October 15, 1974.

Johnny Horizon is the country's continuing nationwide environmental improvement program that seeks to enlist citizen participation in an effort to "Let's clean up America for our 200th birthday." To date the program has been extremely successful in attracting support that has resulted in a wide range of environmental improvement projects, such as a citywide cleanup in Hamilton, Ohio; establishment of a recycling program in Nazareth, Pa.; a tree planting project in Kings Park, Va.; a beautification program in Franklinville, N.J.; and a neighborhood cleanup in Brooklyn.

Many celebrities have given generously of their time and talent to create an awareness of the Johnny Horizon pro-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

gram. Among them are: Burl Ives, Cicely Tyson, Roy Clark, Carol Burnett, Ed McMahon, Sean Connery, Randy Sparks and the Back Porch Majority, Harry Chapin, Karon Blackwell, The New Seekers, Henry Gibson, and Larry McNelly.

Johnny Horizon environmental learning material has been distributed to elementary classrooms in California, Mississippi, Oregon, Montana, Florida, Ohio and many other States.

Just recently the National Governors' Conference endorsed the program and secured the assistance and support of the Governors of the 50 States.

The Johnny Horizon program has been recognized as an official Bicentennial activity by the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration. It has been adopted by such governmental agencies as the Civil Service Commission, General Services Administration, Department of Defense, Department of Transportation, Vista, and TVA. The U.S. Postal Service has been an active supporter of the program, as have many national associations such as the American Association of Nurserymen, American Public Power Association, American Association of University Women, American Society of Association Executives, American Seed Trade Association, National Garden Bureau, American Horticulture Society and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I would commend this program to you and our colleagues in the House and ask that you endorse the principles of the program and encourage full participation by all the people of the United States in this special Johnny Horizon Environmental Improvement Month, September 15 to October 15.

**NATIONAL TREE APPRECIATION WEEK**

**HON. DON H. CLAUSEN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to call attention to the fact that the Men's Garden Clubs of America are sponsoring National Tree Appreciation Week. Observances are being held all during this week throughout the Nation.

I am glad more people are beginning to recognize the importance of trees. This is true both in the sense of utilization and of retention.

We need trees for our basic housing needs, for the dissemination of the written word, and for a variety of other uses. In addition, we have a growing appreciation of the esthetic value of trees in their natural forest setting and in the urban environment.

Trees are great pollution fighters, they provide shade on hot days, and a home for birds, squirrels, and other animals.

Finally, the energy crunch of the past year has focused attention on the fact that, unlike oil, trees are a renewable resource. We can use them and then reforest the area from which they came as well as bring them to areas where they do not exist today.

For the benefit of the Members of Congress, I shall insert in the Record a brief summary of Tree Appreciation Week:

[From the Men's Garden Clubs of America]  
NATIONAL TREE APPRECIATION WEEK,  
JUNE 16-22

Tree Appreciation Week has been set for June 16-22 for the second annual observance of this tribute to trees which was initiated by MGCA and made one of our National projects. The purpose of the week is to dramatize and recognize the worth of trees to the ecosystem, according to F. L. "Steve" O'Rourke, national chairman for the event.

"By June trees throughout the country will be dressed in their summer best for all to admire and appreciate, and we can rededicate our efforts to restore, reforest and replenish," state Chairman O'Rourke.

Some suggested activities include locating and identifying the largest tree in the area, identifying and marking rare and unusual trees, visits to arboreta, and "trees of tomorrow" reports. Outlines of suggested programs and activities are available from the National headquarters for the club chairman in charge of the local tree week observance. Attractive banners have also been printed and will be available to local clubs.

The tree week program has been endorsed by several other national organizations since its introduction by MGCA at the suggestion of Dr. O'Rourke. Last October, the observance was given a tremendous push when the American Horticultural Society, with 23,000 members, endorsed it. Earlier the American Association of Nurserymen approved the project.

**HERSEY BAND INVITED TO ROSE PARADE**

**HON. PHILIP M. CRANE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, these are days of anticipation and great expectation at John Hersey High School in Arlington Heights, Ill. An honor of great distinction has been bestowed on the Hersey High School Marching Band by the Pasadena Tournament of Roses Association of Pasadena, Calif. This organization of outstanding young musicians has received a special invitation to participate in the New Year's Day, 1975, parade in Pasadena.

The following is a quote from the letter of invitation from the chairman of the Tournament of Roses Music Committee:

On rare occasions we have believed a band to be so outstanding that we decided to initiate the selection process ourselves. I would like to extend an official invitation to the John Hersey High School Band to participate in our parade on New Year's Day, 1975. We would be greatly honored to receive your acceptance of this invitation and welcome you to our "Heritage of America" celebration on January 1.

This honor is the first to a high school of School District No. 214 of the northwest suburban area. The director of bands, Don Caneva, the Hersey Administration and the Hersey Instrumental Association are making plans for this big event in Illinois history. A tremendous amount of effort, planning, and financial backing are required for an undertaking of this magnitude.

In the past 25 years a high school band

June 20, 1974

from the State of Illinois has not participated in the Tournament of Roses Parade. It is with great honor that these young people and outstanding musicians look forward to representing the State of Illinois in addition to their local community and the Chicagoland area. In August, the president of the Tournament of Roses Association will be in the Chicago area to meet with the Hersey representatives and the city of Chicago and WGN—Continental Broadcasting Co. These two organizations are planning on having floats in the 1975 Rose Parade. Illinois will certainly be well represented in this prestigious event.

This Rose Parade performance is another in the many outstanding events in the Hersey Band history. In winning many honors in competition, performing before large audiences at major sporting events and on national TV and performing with famous guest conductors and soloists in concert, these young people have dedicated themselves to hard work, giving their best, and bringing acclaim to their school and community. In the months ahead, the parents and friends of the Hersey Instrumental Association will be working toward bringing these plans and objectives to fulfillment in the lives of these young people.

**NOW THE "SHORT-COUNTERS"**

**HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, we are well aware that some unscrupulous people in the business world still operate on the idea that anything goes—that the old rule of *caveat emptor*—"Let the Buyer Beware"—remains in force even in this regulated and consumer-oriented era.

But I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we have come up against the most venal of all in what Sylvia Porter, the business writer, now terms "the short-counters." They are the firms which cheat customers by furnishing fewer items than are listed on the bottle and package labels.

Miss Porter came across these cheaters when she heard of a program on a Miami radio station in which listeners phone in their complaints. Vitamin bottles, in some cases, contained as much as 10 percent fewer capsules than promised. One cough drop box had only 6 rather than 15 drops. A box of "100" screws contained only 60. A package of paper clips was 30 percent short.

Miss Porter writes:

Products sold by weight, the food counters found, usually contained the advertised amount of the product, but the short-counting in products sold by number was widespread.

Miss Porter, alerted by the Miami campaign, checked across the country and found the cheating was in no way confined to Florida. There have been many instances of it in New York where consumer organizations are busy combating it. San Francisco has had inspectors checking certain stores. Miss Porter reports:

Throughout the nation, there have been serious variations on this theme.

And what can be done about it. Miss Porter warns:

Either the manufacturers and packagers clamp much more stringent "quantity controls" on themselves to eliminate the short-counts or state and federal regulators will move in and do it for them.

I agree, of course, and hope Federal regulators have read Miss Porter's nationally syndicated column and have heard of the Miami complaints. The American consumer is suffering enough with rocketing prices and, in some cases, shoddy workmanship without being forced to take a "short-count" too. If he buys a bottle of 100 vitamins, then he should have his 100 capsules, and it is up to the Government these days to see that he gets them and to see also that the "short-counter" is punished for the fraud attempted.

#### REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE SILVIO O. CONTE AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ARTHRITIS FOUNDATION

#### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, has long been a leader in the health field, and a champion of the cause of the good health of Americans in his position as a member of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CONTE's experience in and concern for the field of health were evidenced in his recent remarks before the recent meeting of the Arthritis Foundation in New York City. I believe Mr. CONTE's remarks should be most helpful to the Members of the House in putting the Federal health effort into perspective as we act on health authorizations and appropriations during the coming week. I insert Mr. CONTE's remarks in the RECORD at this point.

#### REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE SILVIO O. CONTE AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ARTHRITIS FOUNDATION

All of us are here tonight because we share a commitment which stated most generally is to the relief of human suffering from illness and disease and to better health and health care for all Americans. And all of us here tonight know that we are in the midst of a period of questioning, reexamining, and rethinking the means by which we have tried and will carry out that commitment.

No one has this brought home to him more forcibly than a member of a Congressional Appropriations Committee. As the House Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee, on which I serve, has worked these past weeks on drafting the appropriations bill for fiscal year 1975, we have had to deal with the fact that major pieces of health legislation expire at the end of this month and that their future form is still undefined, that the deepest philosophical differences about the Federal health role exist in both the Executive and Legislative Branches of government, and that there are compelling arguments put forth for divert-

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ing our attention and resources in different directions.

While I do intend to talk a little bit later about this year's Federal health budget, and especially about how it affects programs of special interest to you, I want to consider with you first some of the great health issues that both you and I face now and the decisions we will have to make. For every specific piece of health legislation, every line item in a health budget, is going to be considered in the light of these larger issues.

I want to emphasize the joint responsibility we share. While there is a constituency for every kind and piece of legislation, in no other field that I can think of has there evolved the kind and quality of partnership that exists in the field of health among the Federal Government, the committed public, the health professions, and the academic scientific community.

It was that partnership that built for us the world's greatest biomedical research programs. It is that partnership that is now forging new health care delivery systems and seeking new ways of financing health care. It is that partnership that must now determine the future direction of our health programs and decide how we will allocate our resources, both intellectual and financial. I am proud to be joined with you in these efforts.

Legislation in other areas provides more daily drama and so receives more headlines. But there is no field in which this Congress will have worked on so much major legislation or faced so many basic and far-reaching issues as in that of health.

There are a good many reasons for this. One is the sheer size of our total health care expenditures in this country—in 1973 \$94.1 billion, or almost eight percent of the gross national product—and of the Federal health budget itself—the request now pending in Congress for the next fiscal year is \$26 billion.

Another is that after a quarter of a century of increasing Federal support for basic biomedical research, there are now demands that results of research be incorporated in medical practice and that we find new ways to bring health care to those who are inadequately served or not served at all.

A third is that the very nature of the Federal Government's health role, and of the relative roles of the Executive and Legislative Branches, has been questioned.

The coming together of all of these issues at one time has brought us near to chaos in some of our Federal programs and left great uncertainty in others. It is largely through the efforts of the Arthritis Foundation, and your colleagues in other fields, that the core of our research and research training programs has survived.

In the first session of this Congress, action centered on the health budget itself and on the appropriation process. The Executive and Legislative Branches had their sharpest and most prolonged encounter over the issue of impoundment and Executive attempts to bypass the legislative process and redefine the Federal health role through the mechanism of the Federal budget.

Congress rejected that effort to abbreviate the all-important process of hearings, discussion, questioning, and debate by which the public and its elected representatives mold legislation. Funds were restored for ongoing health programs, public and professional groups brought over 30 court cases to enforce that restoration, and the action of the Congress was upheld by the Courts in every case.

In the present, or second Congressional session, the focus of attention has shifted to the extension, redefinition, and reformulation of many of our major health programs. The legislative authorization for over 20 of them expires at the end of this month. Only legislation to extend our alcoholism preven-

tion and treatment programs has passed the Congress and been enacted into law.

There are several pieces of health legislation well along in the pipeline, including bills to extend the special cancer programs, to continue support for research on health services delivery and health statistics, to provide support for medical libraries, and to provide specific legislative authorization for biomedical research training and fellowships programs.

The next major bill to come before the House of Representatives will probably be the massive Health Revenue Sharing Act which includes bloc grants to states for health services programs and the extensions of our community mental health centers, population research, and family planning programs. Between now and the end of this Session, almost every week will see major health legislation on the floor of either the House or Senate.

For the most part, these bills do not represent simple extensions of present programs. We are at one of those critical turning points where decisions are to be made about the shape of health programs for many years to come. To get some perspective, let's look back very briefly.

In the last 1940's and early 1950's, Federal efforts in the health field went mainly into building the programs of support for basic biomedical research and the training of research personnel. We evolved some basic principles on which those programs have rested: the notion that we should support the very best work by the very best people across the whole spectrum of medical research, the deliberate attraction to medical research of our brightest young people, reliance on research scientists themselves for decisions as to what research merits Federal support.

In the 1960's and the first year or two of the 1970's, the Federal Government's commitment to fund biomedical research was greatly increased. But other health needs began to claim our attention and our resources. Two massive health financing programs—Medicare and Medicaid—were enacted. With the Community Mental Health Centers Act we ventured into the provision of health services at the community level and the attempt to tie research to services. We began to experiment with new ways of delivering health services to more people. And we initiated massive efforts to increase our trained health service personnel.

Now we are confronted with new demands and new and harder questions.

Perhaps the most complex question we face is how we will finance health care, what form national health insurance legislation will take. I do not think that there is any longer much of a question about whether or not there will be some kind of national health insurance program soon. There are very real questions about its coverage, its financing, and its administration—what they should be, and what they can be.

I have not made a bill-by-bill count, but over two dozen pieces of health insurance legislation have been introduced in this Congress. They range from those proposals to cover catastrophic illness only to coverage of a full range of health care benefits for every resident of the United States.

In the House of Representatives, the Ways and Means Committee, which has jurisdiction for health insurance legislation, is holding hearings on the newer major bills. Quite frankly, right now it is hard to foresee what kind of bill that Committee will bring out. When Mr. Mills, the Chairman of Ways and Means, and Senator Kennedy, co-author of the most comprehensive plan pending, introduced a new bill with benefits very similar to the Administration's program, hopes were raised that we now had grounds for a constructive compromise and enactment of a basic program this year. The announced op-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

position to a compromise bill by the groups that helped draft and supported the original, comprehensive Kennedy-Griffiths bill, has raised serious doubts about passage of health insurance legislation this year.

Any bill that comes before the House for a vote is going to be scrutinized on some basic grounds. Cost is one. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I know only too well how fragile any cost estimates are when we have no way of knowing what increase in use of health services will take place. The availability of health manpower and administrative capability to manage a new system are critical. And for all of us here tonight, the coverage for chronic, long-term illness—the kind of illness that wears away at a family's economic stability and that requires continuous care and medication at ever increasing prices—is critical. One promise I can make to you, is that this is one criterion by which I will judge any bill on which I have to vote.

Along with the issue of financing health care, we have the crucial problem of bringing increasing health care costs under some kind of control. Some of that increase results, no doubt, from the advances in medical technology that have come from our research programs. We have to find ways to incorporate these advances into our health care systems in a fiscally responsible way. The enactment last year, and initial funding this year, of health maintenance organizations is another attempt to control health costs by providing alternative delivery systems that incorporate the sharing of expensive resources and cost control features. And the direct review of service utilization under Federally-financed programs through Professional Service Review Organizations is the newest Federal effort to meet this problem.

The expiration of all of our health manpower programs has raised the twin issues of what our needs are and whether or not we have the responsibility, and the right, to use Federal support to redistribute health manpower into areas that are underserved and to require some return in service from those whose training is financed by public funds. There are four major bills under consideration in the Congress. All require, to some degree, a commitment on the part of the trainee to pay back the public for that training by service in a medically underserved area.

The Federal policy of offering special incentives and support to bring our best young people into medical research has been under strong attack within the Executive Branch. As you know so well, since you had to provide extra resources for research training in areas related to arthritis, attempts have been made for three years now to phase out the research training and fellowships programs of the National Institutes of Health. The court-ordered release of funds impounded from the 1973 appropriation is only now being implemented. Last year, the Congress again restored funds for these programs and directed that they be continued on an active basis.

I can tell you tonight, that the renewed effort in the 1975 budget request to again abolish these programs is being rejected. In less than two weeks, the Appropriations Committee will bring to the floor of the House a bill that will include funds for the NIH research training programs as well as the new program of post-doctoral research fellowships administratively initiated this past year. We are not demanding that training programs be restored at precisely their former levels or in precisely their former manner. What we are saying is that the Congress remains committed to strong research training programs, that specific legislation will determine the new direction of those programs, and that in the meantime our research training efforts are not to be terminated.

I can also tell you that within the next few days, a Conference of House and Senate members will report out the new biomedical

research training bill that the Congress has been working on for almost a year.

As regards research itself, the most serious questions confronting us are whether we should target our resources on one or two of the major killing diseases and support other research at only a minimal level, and who should make decisions about how we allocate our research resources, the Congress in concert with the scientific-medical community or the bureaucratic budget analysts.

Last year, the Congress indicated clearly that making a special effort against some diseases did not preclude a balanced, basic effort to understand and conquer others. While the special legislative commitments in the field of cancer and heart and lung disease were recognized, funds were restored to the other NIH Institutes for what we intended to be actively pursued research programs not only on the other diseases and families of diseases, but on the basic biological processes that we must understand if we are ever to make real progress. We restored the general research support program of the NIH, which has given stability and flexibility to those institutions which are making significant commitments to biomedical research.

Unfortunately, we have found that our intentions were thwarted by a combination of rising costs of research, conflicting administrative policies, and the lack of direction that resulted from the twice-vetoed 1973 health appropriation and the long effort to bring out a 1974 appropriation bill that could be enacted into law.

Once again, the Appropriations Committee has had to move vigorously against the policy of attrition for research other than that on cancer and heart disease. On June 27, the House Appropriations Committee will bring to the floor the largest appropriation in history for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Disease. It is not ideal, in your terms or mine, but it is substantial and it indicates our commitment to pursue research on the causes and treatment of the ten major diseases of concern to that Institute, diseases afflicting some 76 million persons and costing at least \$15 billion a year to the economy. I can also assure you that that appropriations bill carries substantial increases for the other NIH Institutes whose work is of so much importance to the understanding and treatment of arthritis, the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, the National Institute of General Medical Sciences, and the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke. I can further assure you of my continued strong support of those budgets on the floor of the House and when House and Senate conferees meet to resolve any differences they have.

To assure attention to those diseases that cripple rather than kill, to assess where we are and where we must go from here, and to provide for concentrated research-training-treatment efforts, the Congress is also working on special legislation. A very modest bill to give impetus and direction to our work on the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, or crib death, has been enacted and will receive initial funding in the 1975 appropriation. A bill to survey our needs, map our strategy, and initiate a focused research-training program on diabetes will shortly be sent to the President.

Of most importance to us tonight, is the introduction on May 21 of this year of the Arthritis, Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1974. I am very proud to be a cosponsor of that legislation.

The bill has some important features. First, it builds on what we have already at the National Institutes of Health instead of setting up new and competing structures. It requires coordination of the work of the various institutes. It requires the participation in developing a national plan against arthritis of those actually suffering from that disease. It requires a thorough survey of where we are now in our knowledge of the

June 20, 1974

causes, course, extent, and treatment of this disease, and it provides for specific efforts to apply the results of what we know now in prevention, treatment, rehabilitation and education. It requires the prompt transmission to the relevant Committees of the Congress of estimates of budget needs for the Institutes concerned with arthritis and the report to Congress, without clearance by the Office of Management and Budget, of a long-range plan to attack. In the bill's provision for development and support of multi-purpose centers, combining research, training, education, and community consultative services we have the mechanism for bridging the gap between the laboratory and the practitioner and his patient. And in the provision for detection, prevention and control programs we have practical efforts to begin now to bring hope and help to the 20 million men, women, and children who suffer from one of the diseases subsumed under the term "arthritis." I know the Foundation has played a key role in the formulation of this important legislation, and I congratulate you on it.

I cannot promise you immediate action on the bill. What I can promise you are my efforts to move it as quickly as possible, to support it in every way I can, and when it is enacted, as it will and must be, to work in the Appropriations Committee for its quick and adequate funding.

I know that I have raised with you tonight a great many questions, none of them amenable to quick or easy solutions. They are questions that go to the heart of citizen-profession-government relations, and as such they deserve and demand our thoughtful and deliberate attention. I know that that is what they are receiving from you and I pledge you that that is what they will receive from me.

BICENTENNIAL INDEPENDENCE DAYS: A 4-DAY HOLIDAY IN 1976

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform my colleagues and the American people that I have today introduced House Concurrent Resolution 548, requesting the President to declare July 2 through 5, 1976, as a legal public holiday in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of our Nation.

This would provide a 4-day weekend, Friday through Monday, to be known as "Bicentennial Independence Days." Legal holidays, of course, directly apply only to Federal Government workers, but I hope that most private employers will see fit to follow suit.

Our Nation's Bicentennial is an extraordinary event in our history, and its celebration should be special as well—more than the regular Fourth of July. I envision an outpouring of community spirit with parades, fairs, contests, speeches, and the like. But more importantly, I see the Bicentennial Independence Days as an opportunity for all Americans to rededicate themselves to the principles for which the Founding Fathers fought nearly 200 years ago. A time for joy, but also a time for introspection, a time for a return to ethical values, a time to renew our determination to work for the individual liberties of all our citizens, for a cleaner environment,

and for elimination of hunger and poverty in a land of plenty.

Bicentennial commissions throughout the country are already beginning to plan for 1976, so it is important that this legislation be enacted by the 93d Congress. I invite the cosponsorship of other Members and will shortly circulate a "Dear Colleague" letter to that effect. It is my sincere hope that the Judiciary Committee will take a few minutes out from its busy schedule to bring this to the floor promptly and allow our communities ample time to plan.

SENATOR KENNEDY IN  
PHILADELPHIA

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the following address by Senator EDWARD KENNEDY. The Senator spoke yesterday to 2,000 persons at a meeting of the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia's Soviet Jewish Solidarity Assembly. Representatives of 34 Jewish groups were in attendance.

I join Senator KENNEDY in saluting the moral strength and courage of the Israeli people, and I also join him in urging President Nixon to recognize the plight of the Soviet Jews and to make their freedom a top priority in his upcoming summit talks with the Soviet leaders.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY TO THE JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCIL CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

I appreciate the opportunity to join with you this morning at this conference on Soviet Jewry sponsored by the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia.

I want to thank Judge Charles Weiner and your current President Benjamin Lowenstein for the invitation to be here with you. And I particularly want to express my appreciation to your President-elect, Esther Polen, for her kind words of introduction.

It is an honor to join together with Stanley Lowell, Chairman of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry. He not only has been one of the leading forces on the national scene in communicating to the country the plight of Soviet Jews, but he also has been a valued advisor to me and to the Senate Refugee Subcommittee which I chair and in my efforts to assist Soviet emigration.

Throughout its 35-year history, JCRC has achieved nationwide recognition as a spokesman not only of the Jewish community of Philadelphia, but of Jews around the world. At the same time, JCRC has been a critical factor in promoting the civil rights and civil liberties of all Americans and of strengthening the Constitutional protections of the First Amendment.

So I am particularly pleased to be here with you this morning.

Even as we meet here today, our eyes are turned to the Middle East. So much has occurred in the past few weeks that it is virtually impossible to predict where new events will lead.

Only a few days ago, the world drew a breath of relief as the persistent and determined efforts of Secretary of State Henry

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Kissinger produced an agreement to still the guns on the Golan Heights.

The return of prisoners of war and the sight of airport reunions carried a vision of hope and a prayer that the course toward a permanent peace had been charted.

Yet in the short time since those days of optimism and hope, we have witnessed again the senseless and savage violence of terrorism, leaving in its tragic wake new martyrs, new mourners, new sorrow.

There have been too many martyrs already, too many martyrs for a nation so young—at Suez, at Golan, at Maalot. And they are not nameless martyrs. As Israeli writer Moshe Shamir noted: "We have no unknown soldiers. When we pray for the safety . . . of our army, each of us is thinking of some particular soldier. On his lips or in his heart he adds the name of his son, his brother, his father or his friend. . . ."

"We have no unknown soldiers. . . ."

And despite the tumultuous reception and the welcome signs of friendship, many of us now watch with growing concern some of the results of the ceremonial visit of President Nixon to the Middle East. The announcement of plans to aid Egypt in obtaining nuclear reactors and nuclear fuel was both unexpected and disquieting. The lesson of India is a compelling one, and the Congress should demand, and I believe will demand, a full explanation.

For whatever safeguards may be placed on the transfer of nuclear materials, whatever the importance of improved United States-Egyptian relations, the potential for abuse of nuclear energy in the Middle East is all too clear.

At a time when the delicate balance of Middle East diplomacy seems to be stabilizing, I seriously question this latest action. It would sow fresh doubt and misunderstanding and might set in motion an even more frightening spiral of events than those the world already has witnessed.

Yet for all of the uncertainty surrounding the present, of one thing I am confident.

I am confident that Israel will survive.

I am confident that Israel will withstand these new challenges as she has every challenge for the past quarter century.

I am confident that Israel will secure a future of peace and happiness for its people.

For Israel is like the United States in many ways—both won bitter fights for independence; both acknowledge the supremacy of moral law; both believe in individual as well as national liberty—and both will fight to maintain that liberty.

For Israel, the years since 1948 have been a time of fulfilling ancient prophecies, a time of turning dreams into reality. The new flowering of the desert, the network of pipes and pumps that carry the water of the sea of Galilee to the sands of the Negev, the immigrants from a hundred different lands who come together in the Holy Land—these are part of the miracle.

Ben Gurion said: "In Israel, in order to be a realist, you must believe in miracles." And in each of my three visits to Israel, it has been apparent that the people believe in miracles, and it is that belief that stirs the admiration of free peoples everywhere.

It is not only the physical dimensions of the rebirth of Israel that inspires admiration. It is the spiritual power, the faith and conviction of the people themselves, the belief in the prophecy of Isaiah, the prophecy that "a little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation."

We often remember only what we have given to Israel and forget what Israel has given to the world—evidence of the power of faith, evidence of the preservation of human values, evidence that dreams—even the most distant and difficult dreams—can be realized if we have the courage to do what is necessary to make them come true.

The people of Israel have shown the courage, the commitment and the determination

to bring forth miracles and to give substance to dreams.

The strength of their resolve has been tested not once but four times in war in this brief quarter century of independence—and they have not yielded.

I have seen that courage, and I have come to understand the valor and the dedication that is expressed in a poem that Israeli school children recite.

It was written one night in 1944 by Hannah Zenes, hours before she and 32 other young immigrant Jews parachuted back into Nazi-occupied territory to link the allies with the underground.

She wrote:

"Blessed is that match that is consumed in kindling flame."

"Blessed is the flame that burns in the secret fastness of the heart."

"Blessed is the heart with strength to stop its beating for honor's sake."

"Blessed is that match that is consumed in kindling flame."

Hannah Zenes was caught in Hungary. She was tortured and killed.

Her bravery and the inspiration of her life have immortalized those words. And those simple lines reflect the character of the Sabras and the spirit of the immigrants who have come together to build the nation of Israel.

The streams of peoples that have flowed into the promised land have had their beginnings in every corner of the globe.

Coming together, they have vindicated the faith of centuries. They have justified the religious conviction that has kept the people of Israel alive through a thousand programs, a thousand expulsions and through the holocaust itself.

They have fulfilled the Biblical prophecy, the prophecy that: "I will bring them out from the peoples and gather them from the countries and bring them again into their own land."

Some have come with plans and preparations. And some have come with nothing but the clothes they wore. But all carry with them an uncompromising faith and a yearning to be free.

Less than eight weeks ago, I met with Jews who share that faith and that yearning, Jews whose dreams of becoming part of the redemption of Israel remain cloistered within the Soviet Union.

I went to the apartment of Professor Alexander Lerner after midnight and stayed until nearly 3:00 a.m.

While their names are known to you and they have a well-deserved worldwide reputation for courage, let me say to you that I also found them remarkably gentle, remarkably calm, remarkably dedicated.

They knew that security men would be arriving with me. They said that this was expected and that they assumed that every word we spoke would have been overheard in any case.

They told me their individual stories. They were scientists and mathematicians, physicists and scholars, men of 25 and men of 60, with wives and children—all with visa applications on file for two years and more, all denied—not once but several times.

They told of their telephones being cut off, of their academic posts being withdrawn, of being barred from their work and their studies, of their sons being called to military service.

Government harassment and repression was the answer to their request to emigrate.

Yet, after listening to them, I bring you a message: They remain committed to their ideal. They remain firm in their faith. They remain determined to live in Israel in freedom.

That was their message to me. And that was the message I took to the Soviet leaders, the message that these men and women desire only to be free to live in Israel, the mes-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sage that this issue of human rights is vitally important to Americans, to Jew and gentile alike. For respect for human rights springs from the Judao-Christian tradition and from our democratic tradition as well.

I believe that I spoke for all Americans when I urged that human rights be respected. I believe that I spoke for the Congress when I urged that human rights be respected. And I believe that I spoke for this Council, when I urged that human rights be respected and that barriers to the emigration of Soviet Jews be brought down once and for all.

The Soviet Jews want something so very simple. They want to end the separation of centuries and to rejoin Eretz Israel.

They want to be a part of the new beginning in that ancient land. They want to be a part of the promise of the Torah, that "The desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose . . . that they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength. . . ."

For the Jews I met, the Passover Seder benediction—"Next year in Jerusalem"—is more than a ritual, it is a prayer for freedom, a prayer for life. And it is a prayer that they have a right to see fulfilled.

With you here today, I share the hope that Alexander Lerner, Victor Polksky, Alexander Luntz, Benjamin Levich, Vladimir Kozlovsky, Vladimir Slepak, Alexander Vorosnel, Victor Faermark, and Vitaly Rubin—that all of them and their families—and the 120,000 or more Soviet Jews who share their desires—will soon be allowed to follow David Asper and the Panovs to freedom and to Israel.

And in private and in public, I shall continue to work to see that this occurs.

The statement this Council joined in a few weeks ago is one that I share, the statement, that ". . . we welcome and endorse all efforts to secure global détente. However, we strongly believe that cooperation between our two peoples must be extended to include freedom for Soviet Jews, especially the right to leave.

"In the name of humanity and justice, we voice our hope that the government of the USSR will respond to this call."

I join you, as I did in Moscow, in urging Soviet leaders to respond to this call. And that is the message that I hope that President Nixon will carry with him as well when he goes to the Soviet Union.

While we can take comfort in the 33,500 Soviet Jews who emigrated in 1973, we must protest the reduced number of visas extended this year and the added barriers that have been placed in way of other Jews who seek to emigrate.

We must add our voices as well to the world appeal for freedom for those Soviet Jews who have been imprisoned for seeking to emigrate to join their families abroad or for seeking to exercise fully their right to live in the Soviet Union in accord with Jewish culture and Jewish religious heritage.

At the end of the Second World War, a quarter of a million Jewish refugees were packed into displaced persons camps. The newspaper they passed from hand to hand carried these lines: "Dispersed and separated during those terrible years, we learned one thing: Tenacity! . . . Are we the last to drag ourselves out alive, are there others who await our sign? Like the Biblical Noah we are sending out the first dove . . ."

May this be the year when the Jews of the Soviet Union are able to follow the flight of the dove and to take their place with the people of Israel.

And may this 26th year of Israel's independence be "A time to be born . . . a time to plant . . . a time to heal . . . a time to build . . . a time to laugh . . . a time to love . . . and a time of peace."

## THE SIXTH PAN-AFRICAN CONGRESS

## HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today is the opening of the Sixth Pan-African Congress, the first gathering of its kind in almost 30 years. The Congress is described in its official document the Call, as a forum for: First, increasing the political unity between African people in the West and African people on the continent; second, a way of exploring strategies for increasing our support for the liberation wars in southern Africa; third, creating independent mechanisms of intercommunication and exchange of information among African people; fourth, mobilizing and organizing our manpower and skills for the betterment of African people; and fifth, encouraging a need for self-reliance and self-determination among the masses of African people wherever we may find ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a statement issued by the Congressional Black Caucus at the opening ceremonies of the Congress in Dar Es Salaam University, Tanzania. This statement is followed by an article written by Courtland Cox, recently published in the Black Scholar, a magazine noted for its incisive articles on the African liberation movement:

JUNE 18, 1974.

MWALIMU NYERERE,  
The State House,  
Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: On this, the occasion of the Sixth Pan-African Congress, I send greetings from the Congressional Black Caucus and extend our sincere hope that this will be the most successful congress ever.

Since the first international meeting in 1919, the Pan-African Congress has been a means of sharing ideas and developing common strategies in the struggle for African liberation. When the fifth congress was held in 1945 only Ethiopia and Liberia were independent African Nations. That congress, set the stage for the movement which liberated Black people from colonial rule on the continent and sowed the seeds which took root in the civil rights movement in the United States. Since that time, many of the goals of the participants have been realized—political independence and self-determination have been won by much of the continent. Yet, as we all know, Africa is far from free. While continuing the struggle for independence, our efforts should also be directed towards attaining complete economic self-sufficiency for Africa, and fully developing her natural and human resources in order to meet the vital needs of our people.

Finally, we in America especially see the congress as a means of encouraging the development of much needed communication and cooperation between Africans on the continent and people of African descent throughout the world. With these goals in mind, my colleagues and I wholeheartedly support the Sixth Pan-African Congress as an effort to obtain independence and self-sufficiency for all Africans wherever they may be.

CHARLES B. RANGEL,  
Chairman, Congressional Black Caucus.

June 20, 1974

## SIXTH PAN-AFRICAN CONGRESS

(By Courtland Cox)

The Sixth Pan African Congress will be a political forum which takes an international perspective of problems facing African people. The emphasis will be not only on restating and defining the problems, as has been done through many other vehicles, but also on how we can act cooperatively, to effect long-range change. Delegates to the Congress will come primarily from Africa, and also the Caribbean and South America, North America, Europe, and the Pacific Islands. They will include representatives of political parties, governments (African and Caribbean only), liberation movements, organizations as well as some individuals. The Congress has as its objectives to discuss:

1. Broadening the international African community's understanding of the issues involved in the struggle in southern Africa, and methods of increasing the concrete base of support for the liberation movements.

2. Economic dependency and exploitation, and how to end them; including questions of self-reliance, systems of economic production and distribution, purposes of development, applications of science and technology, and economic cooperation among African states and communities.

3. Fulfillment of the potential of political independence; including the issues of African unity, federation of Caribbean states, broadening mass participation in African political life, and political cooperation between African states and communities.

The last few decades of our struggle have seen a heightening of the total struggle for liberation, including that for political freedom and material well-being. In particular, since the Fifth Congress at Manchester (1945) there began an end to the paralysis of, among other oppressed peoples, the people of Africa and of African descent. We began to de-mystify the workings of racism, imperialism, and capitalism, gradually understanding them as international, total systems which were the immediate cause of our not being liberated. We began to define our own objective reality, seeing that we are all victims of the same global system of oppression, with only a few individuals among us benefiting from the operation of that system.

While the definition and analysis of that system is necessary for our own political growth, it is time all African forums, including the Sixth Pan African Congress, discuss what we are going to do about our situation, and how we are going to do it. In other words, what politics do we develop, what plans and mechanisms can we enact, what infrastructure must we develop, what new mentalities and attitudes must be nurtured?

Several questions come immediately to mind. One has been posed by Mwalimu Julius Nyerere, Chairman of the political party, TANU, which is hosting the Congress. He has asked whether the units of African peoples (existing nation-states) are worth preserving, whether these "pieces inherited from colonialism" are now independent, whether they should not now be used as instruments of a true liberation.

The Call to the Sixth Pan African Congress speaks of another critical question. It states in part "We believe that the future of Africans lies in the fullest utilization of our own human resources instead of continued dependency on loans and gifts from abroad . . . if we do not control the means of survival and protection in the context of the 20th century, we will continue to be colonized." In other words, it is not sufficient to denounce imperialism and the effects of its economic and political infrastructure. We must also commit ourselves to building our own system using our physical resources and

human energy, to guarantee our future development as free people.

It is apparent that our problems do not exist in isolation. Yet Africans are politically fragmented, by nation-state, linguistic differences, by ideology. We do not have an effective, unified base of power to deal with the problems; we have not even reached the point of accepting a certain operational unity as necessary in order to combat them. But if we take one example of a critical issue, the liberation of southern Africa, we can see how a total answer is required.

The situation in southern Africa is not just a question of apartheid or majority rule. The labor, land and resources of Mozambique, Angola, Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa are presently used for the development of the few white settlers there. But these same resources (e.g., oil, gold, uranium) and labor also contribute to the worldwide maintenance of the system of capitalism. World capitalism (in the main, European) in turn helps support the status quo in southern Africa from the military might of NATO, to the investments of American, European and Japanese companies, to the propaganda machines of Europe which churn out their distorted analysis of the situation. In other words, the communications network, military forces, economic structures, technology, and bodies politic of the imperialist world support the maintenance of a racist and capitalist enclave in southern Africa.

Africans cannot combat this infrastructure on a piece-meal, fragmented basis. The brunt of the struggle is borne by our people who live there, many of whom have taken up arms, while at the same time laying the foundations of a new social, economic, and political order in their liberated territories. Meanwhile, recent moves of the British vis-a-vis Zimbabwe and the Portuguese vis-a-vis Angola, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique point to an electoral politics strategy to be foisted on Africa, to take the place of a defeated military policy. Where do the rest of us stand on these issues, and how do we act?

Are we planning to use technology and resources in the manufacture and supplying of arms and other needed material for the benefit of our people? Are we building our own communications network which could propagate an African analysis of the situation in southern Africa? Are we supporting the liberation forces in all political bodies to which we have access? Are we considering an alternative system of production and distribution of goods and services? Are we creating efficient alternative economic structures and organizations, to replace those of capitalism, and having both a different purpose and material effect?

For Africa, then, total answers are required, and unified action is a necessary step on the long road to victory. The *Sixth Pan African Congress* has been called to look not only at why, but how, we can be the instruments of our own development and liberation. The important questions facing a *Sixth Pan African Congress* are not about personalities or individuals, but about issues and possible concrete solutions. The Congress will necessarily involve representatives from both those who have state power in the African world and those who have energies and commitment without that power, because we are dealing with the realities of the world as it exists for African people in 1974.

If the Congress can help generate a renewal of commitment to a unified struggle on the part of Africa, and African people everywhere, the *Sixth Pan African Congress* will be a success.

(NOTE.—Courtland Cox is International Secretary-General of the *Sixth Pan African Congress*. Brother Cox has long been active

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

in the black liberation struggle, first with the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and later with the Center for Black Education in Washington, D.C. For many months he has been working on preparations for the Sixth Pan African Congress—the first gathering of its kind in almost 30 years—which will take place June 3-13, 1974, at the University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania. The Congress is being hosted by the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU).)

could, knowing it was getting late. In my confusion I think I left out seven presidents I have known. But I guess the memory of Mussolini helped me shorten it. I was received by him after he came into power and complimented him on the draining of the Pontine marshes at some length. He seemed to be fascinated by what I had to say about the marshes and the political situation. It became a monologue. But then he put his hands on the arms of his office chair and half rose from it.

"When are you leaving Rome?", Mussolini said.

"I took the hint."

## AUTHORIZATION AND LIMITATION OF EMPLOYMENT OF WHITE HOUSE PERSONNEL

### HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I thought that Members would enjoy seeing this article on the Hon. James A. Farley, one of the most respected men in government in our history.

[From the San Antonio Light, May 23, 1974]

#### ON THE LINE WITH CONSIDINE

James A. Farley, 1974 winner of Notre Dame's treasured Laetare Medal, enthralled his audience at the Waldorf with an account of his life in politics and his 35 post-political years with Coca-Cola. It was a feat of total recall, a remarkable summation of the times, lives, triumphs and disasters of a vast tapestry of Americana. It's a pity that his response to the conferring upon him by Fr. Theodore Hesburgh of the award, which dates back to 1883, could not be heard by history scholars across the land.

Big Jim, perhaps the last honest politician, breathed life into the images of presidents, popes, kings, king-makers, dictators, tycoons and common folk he met along the way. He thanked the long-gone constituents (Farley will be 86 "and holding," as he says in this space age, on May 30) who launched him on his political career by electing him town clerk of Stony Point, N.Y. in 1912. And he especially thanked a man who moved him into the big leagues of politics, Jimmy Walker.

#### PICTURE IN PARIS

He told of a meeting he had with Walker in Paris during the latter's troubles with New York's imperious Judge Samuel Seabury. A New York Times correspondent asked the two to pose. Walker, perhaps the most photographed politician of that time, demurred. He didn't think it would be a good thing for Farley, who was responsible for making Franklin Delano Roosevelt the President of the United States. Farley said nonsense, and the picture was taken. It appeared on the front page of the Times.

Seabury had some harsh things to say about Farley for consorting with a man who had fled the country, and when he returned by ship Farley was questioned about the Seabury blast by reporters who had "gone down the bay." One of them, Jim recalled the other night, was Jimmy Duffy of the N.Y. Telegram.

#### FRIENDLESS JUDGE

"I knew Jimmy well," Farley reminisced at the Waldorf. "He was the dean of that crowd. So I said to him, 'Jimmy, it's apparent that Judge Seabury doesn't know what it means to have a friend.'

Farley apologized about the length of his accepting speech.

"I've gone to so many banquets that I've become sensitive about the time the average speaker takes to get over a point. I tried to wrap mine up as quickly as I

## HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I support passage of H.R. 14715, a bill to authorize and limit employment of White House personnel.

In one sense, I am reluctant to approve any authorization for the White House staff. I cannot help but wonder if I will be paying the salary of yet another Egil Krogh, John Dean, John Erlichman, Bob Haldeman, and even Tony Ulasewitz, none of whom in my opinion were among the greatest public officials ever to serve this country.

Nevertheless, I am aware that in dealing with the abuses of the Nixon administration, Congress must not place undue restrictions on the office of the Presidency and future Presidents. Clearly, the President needs competent staff to help him perform his duties. However, H.R. 14715 places needed limitations for the first time on the growth of the President's office that began almost from its inception and which has accelerated out of control in the Nixon administration. Under the Nixon administration, the growth of the Executive Office of the President has increased almost 400 percent over the last part of the Johnson administration.

While there is nothing inherently wrong with the concept of growth in itself, when in the wrong place and at the wrong rate, uncontrolled growth must be controlled. For at least two reasons the growth of the Executive Office must be halted. First, because of President Nixon's highly original but constitutionally questionable doctrine of executive privilege extending over the entire executive staff, each new executive position results in one more policymaking individual refusing any accountability to Congress or to the public at large. This extension of secrecy in Government must be stopped today in order that it may be reversed tomorrow. Second, the expansion of the Executive Office staff has led to needless duplication of efforts with the existing Government agencies.

H.R. 14715 is not going to end secrecy in the Nixon administration or eliminate duplication between the Executive Office and the executive agencies. However, it is a step in the right direction. Through

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the bill, Congress for the first time authorizes employment of White House personnel rather than simply leaving White House staffing questions to the appropriation process. In addition the bill will limit the number of professionals who can work in the White House office. The bill also stops the President from hiring top-level executives in ungraded positions not subject to normal civil service controls. While the President has long had the authority to hire ungraded employees to enable the hiring of specialists, such as groundskeepers and French chefs, not falling within normal civil service classifications, President Nixon has distorted this authority to hire 70 top-level officials in ungraded positions. Finally, the bill will put a limit on the length of time the White House may detail any single individual from another executive agency to work in the White House.

Despite my support for the bill, in many ways I think the bill should go further. While the bill restricts staffing of the White House office, it fails to restrict staffing of the proliferating number of councils and miniature bureaucracies within the Executive Office of the President. From 1970 to 1972 alone, nine new satellite offices, many of whose functions previously had been performed by staff assistants, were created in the Executive Office of the President. Some of these offices—such as the Office of Telecommunications Policy which apparently attempts to influence the Federal Communications Commission—seem to have no legitimate function at all.

The bill also fails to restrict the number of employees who can be detailed from executive agencies to the White House. While the bill does restrict the length of time that such employees may be detailed, it does not restrict the total number of employees who may be so detailed. Given that in 1971 the Nixon administration acknowledged detailing 273 employees from other agencies to the White House, this is a matter of considerable concern. In a related matter, the bill does not deal with the problem of what I call laundered people. The White House must be prevented from placing high-level policymakers at the White House on the payrolls of outside executive agencies when these individuals have never even served a day in the agency from which they are being paid.

Another shortcoming of the bill is its failure to take precautions against the possibility of the spending of White House funds for transitional activities after the resignation or impeachment of a President or Vice President. When Vice President Agnew resigned, he remained on the White House payroll sorting out his papers for 6 months. This situation must be prevented from recurring in the future.

In fact, while the bill does restrict to some extent the number of staff that the White House can hire, the bill places no restrictions on the type of activities that the White House must fund. Serious consideration must be given to restricting the White House from using the tax-

payer's funds for anything other than governmental functions. Certainly, it is questionable as to whether Government funds should be used to defend the President from his alleged criminal activities.

In conclusion, H.R. 14715 is a good bill as far as it goes. But the bill must be kept in perspective as only a beginning in controlling the expansion of the White House staff; considerably more must be done in the future.

"DEAR COLLEAGUE" LETTER SENT  
ON PEANUT PROGRAM

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a "Dear Colleague" letter was delivered to each office on Wednesday morning headed "It's Time We Said Nuts to The Peanut Lobby."

The cosigners intend to offer an amendment to the agriculture, environmental and consumer protection appropriations bill which would prohibit the use of any funds provided therein for the purpose of carrying out a price support program for peanuts.

Not only is the amendment ill-advised, but the cost figures cited in the letter are sheer exaggeration. To say that the peanut program will cost the American taxpayer \$1,188,000,000 between 1975 and 1979 shows a complete lack of knowledge of the program.

To set the record straight, the entire cost of the 1973 peanut crop to the Department of Agriculture was \$3.9 million. This is a true figure.

The original GAO estimate on this 1973 crop ranged in the vicinity of \$50-\$60 million. This alone proves how correct GAO estimates are and this is what the sponsors of this proposed amendment are basing their figures on. It is also felt that in the next few years, the cost of the program could conceivably be zero because the exports of peanuts are being sold at the same price that the Commodity Credit Corp. buys them.

I would also like to remind the Members who are sponsoring this amendment that they know very well that the peanut industry representatives have been diligently negotiating with the Department on ways to legislatively make the program even more effective. They also know that many committee hearings have been held with both the Department of Agriculture and peanut industry personnel participating. Any attempt to destroy this program by attaching an amendment to an appropriations bill would seriously damage any on-going negotiations between the parties involved.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope the Members of this House will see through this facade and not destroy a program that has worked so well for so many years.

June 20, 1974

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE  
JOHN E. MOSS REGARDING THE  
AGRICULTURE, ENVIRONMENTAL  
AND CONSUMER PROTECTION AP-  
PROPRIATIONS BILL—H.R. 15472

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will vote on several important amendments to the Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriations bill on Friday, June 21, 1974. These amendments will deal with the Appropriations Committee's treatment of the funding and programs of the Federal Trade Commission.

The Federal Trade Commission is, in this era of continuing substantial inflation, one of the most important Federal agencies from the point of view of the consumer. Through its power to investigate monopoly and unfair and deceptive practices and through its power to prosecute violations of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the antitrust laws, the FTC is a governmental agency which can have a significant impact on the prices consumers pay for goods and services.

It was therefore surprising to me and many other Members that the Appropriations Committee in H.R. 15472 severely limited the ability of the FTC to protect the consumer.

I have great admiration for the Appropriations Committee and each member on the committee. Unfortunately in this situation, the committee seems to have acted somewhat hastily and without full consideration of the legislative and policy implications of its budgetary decisions.

The Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriations bill includes the following inadequate or restrictive provisions regarding the Federal Trade Commission:

First, fails to appropriate \$650,000 to assist in the preparation for trial of the FTC's antitrust action against the eight major oil companies;

Second, fails to appropriate \$364,000 needed by the FTC to complete the energy study of the coal, gas, and nuclear industries mandated by the Congress last year—fiscal year 1974—Special Energy Appropriations.

Third, limits the appropriation for the collection of line of business economic data to 250 firms, to be selected at random, apparently from the 200,000 manufacturing companies in the United States;

Fourth, legislates restrictions regarding the use of data obtained in line of business questionnaires by prohibiting any use other than the "statistical purposes for which it is supplied"; and

Fifth, unduly restricts the legislative powers vested in the FTC by law by requiring that funds provided in the act "shall be available only for the purposes for which they are appropriated." Apparently this provision of the bill would

require each agency subject to its terms to obtain the express approval of the Appropriations Committee before reprogramming any funds for which any purpose had been specified in communications with the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday myself and several other Members wrote to all of the Members of the House of Representatives describing the shortcomings of the appropriations bill. The Members signing the letter are: Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Representatives JOHN D. DINGELL, PAUL G. ROGERS, BOB ECKHARDT, JOHN MELCHER, BROCK ADAMS, CHARLES A. VANIK, EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, THOMAS A. LUKENS, and SILVIO O. CONTE. The text of that letter is as follows:

RE: FTC 1974 APPROPRIATIONS BILL

We write you concerning a matter of great urgency. Recent changes in the programs and budget of the Federal Trade Commission made by the Appropriations Committee raise the gravest problems. These changes will reach the floor Friday, June 21, 1974 embodied within H.R. 15472, the Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriations bill. The effect of these changes will be the hobbling of litigation against the eight major oil companies, the halting of a previously mandated study of the gas, coal, nuclear power industries, the effective cancellation of the F.T.C. line of business study of the nation's 500 largest manufacturing companies and the usurpation of oversight juries by the Appropriations Committee. We believe these programs are essential. We will, therefore, be offering the following amendments to H.R. 15472 on Friday.

First, we will ask that the \$650,000 request of the F.T.C. for a computer based data retrieval system for use in antitrust litigation against the eight major oil companies be honored. The F.T.C. expects to receive 3 million documents, an estimated 25 million pages, during the discovery process. Recent experience in the private sector indicates that a litigant not using such a system functions with a severe and potentially decisive disadvantage. In a year which has seen explosive increases in oil prices, such a hobbling of the consumer's representatives is outrageous.

Second, we will offer an amendment to appropriate \$364,000 needed by the F.T.C. to complete the Energy Study mandated by Congress last year. (F.Y. 1974 Special Energy Appropriations) This is a study of the coal, gas, and nuclear industries in America. We are asked daily to legislate in these areas. We feel it is irresponsible to do so without hard data on the industries affected.

Third, amendments will be offered to restore the original purpose of the F.T.C. line of business investigation of the nation's 500 largest manufacturing companies. Presently, companies report in one of 31 different categories in the Quarterly Financial Report. This yields such results as ITT's "Wonder Bread" operations being grouped under the communications category.

The F.T.C. would gain basic data about the most important economic institutions in America, data that the consumer's representative should have and which the F.T.C. has the right to have under § 6(b) of the F.T.C. Act.

The Appropriations Committee has effectively cancelled this program by limiting the study to 250 firms and by requiring that the 250 be chosen *at random* from the same 200,000 manufacturing companies in America. This change will render the study mean-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ingless and will according to statistical estimates yield data primarily on *small* firms, firms which do not possess the requisite information.

Fourth, an amendment will be offered to strike the limits on FTC use of the line of business data. (p. 47 lines 13-24) This is already covered by 18 U.S.C. 1905. Any further limits should come only after full hearings in the appropriate legislative committee.

Fifth, an amendment to strike § 511 of H.R. 14572 (p. 52) will be offered. This section effectively places day to day oversight power in the Appropriations committee. This usurpation of traditional legislative function by the Appropriations committee presents a grave threat to the legislative process.

We urge your support for these important amendments.

One of the most important amendments which the House will consider would eliminate the improper restrictions imposed by the Appropriations Committee on the collection of economic data by the Federal Trade Commission. The elimination of these restrictions is supported by the Consumer Federation of America and many other consumer organizations. On May 22, 1974, Carol Tucker Foreman, Executive Director of CFA, and Elizabeth Langer, Legislative Director of CFA, circulated a comprehensive memorandum discussing some of the arguments against restricting the FTC's collection of economic data and effectively refuting them. For the enlightenment of the Members of the House, I am incorporating a copy of that memorandum in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FTC'S LINE OF BUSINESS REPORTING PROGRAM:  
ANSWERS TO SOME FREQUENTLY ASKED  
QUESTIONS

It has come to the attention of CFA that a prohibition against the use of funds authorized by Congress for FTC's Line of Business reporting system may be introduced during the upcoming Appropriations Committee mark-up. Line of Business reporting would provide numerous benefits for consumers, legislators, small businesses, government and economists, and CFA urges support for full funding of this program.

Question: Does the Line of Business reporting requirement violate the confidentiality of this data?

Line of Business reporting has been compared with the highly objectionable Executive Order (since rescinded) giving the Department of Agriculture access to farmers' income tax returns. There are numerous distinctions between the two. First, income tax returns are essentially private documents, and the USDA was singling out one group, farmers, and invading their privacy. On the other hand, line of business reporting requires conglomerates to report profits on each product separately, which is presently required of all non-conglomerates. Secondly, the reports to FTC involve statistical measures of past economic performance, and do not deal with the details of ongoing business operations. Third, the smallest of the 500 reporting firms will have at least \$240 million in annual sales and revenues and the largest over \$30 billion, while the typical farm operation has sales of less than \$100,000. Lastly, most of the 500 firms covered by the line of business reporting requirement are publicly owned corporations, unlike the family owned farm enterprise.

Question: Why do we need a new FTC reporting program when SEC already collects "line of business" data?

SEC's purpose in collecting so called "line

of business" data is primarily for the benefit of shareholders. The FTC program, on the other hand, is designed to stimulate competition, provide Members of Congress with the information vital to legislating in this area, and furnish academicians and economists important facts necessary to studying our economy and spiraling inflation.

At present SEC permits each reporting firm to determine which line of business classification it will use for each product. This method of reporting does not lend itself to comparisons of data among various firms manufacturing a given product. An FTC staff study of 19 firms reporting to the FTC on a line of business basis showed that they had an average of more than 30 operating divisions but only an average of five different lines of business reported on the comparable SEC form, 10K. Some of these lines as reported by individual firms included more than 40 separate product lines as defined in OMB's standard individual classification manual. Such data do not permit economists to get a statistically reliable view of individual product markets.

FTC would collect line of business data from some firms which are privately held and not subject to jurisdiction of SEC. The inclusion of these firms is necessary to get reliable data on an aggregated industry by industry basis.

In 1946 the Quarterly Financial Report program was transferred from SEC to FTC and the FTC has handled the program very successfully within the limits of the program's usefulness.

Question: Why doesn't the Census Bureau collect line of business data, rather than establishing a new program in the FTC?

The Census Bureau has no authority to collect data under compulsory process, and only compulsory process assures the accuracy of the data.

Data needed for FTC purposes, e.g., to measure profitability and the extent of competition, cannot be efficiently ascertained and collected by the Census Bureau, whose existence performs a very different function. Furthermore the experience gained by FTC in gathering and using the information will aid the FTC in future revisions of the reporting forms.

The major purpose for collecting data is to provide this information to the Congress. Since the Census Bureau is a part of the Commerce Department and the Executive Branch it is subject to political pressures from this branch.

Question: Won't compliance with this program constitute an unreasonable financial burden for industry?

The line of business reporting program applies only to the largest 500 firms in the U.S. The smallest of these will have annual revenues of at least \$240,000,000. The largest will have revenues of over \$35,000,000,000. Such firms already have very large and highly competent accounting departments for meeting the company's accounting needs for tax, SEC and management purposes. During the past two years they have submitted quarterly reports to the Cost of Living Council on a product line basis and although these reports are substantially more limited than the line of business program, they do provide a good basis for estimating actual costs of compliance with line of business reporting requirements. The FTC has estimated the cost of compliance to be approximately \$800. Industry has claimed that the cost will be far higher, however no firm raising cost objections has submitted a certified accounting statement showing the costs of their present accounting programs and the incremental costs attributable to the line of business program on an empirical basis. The actual line of business cost projection must be measured as an incremental cost and as a portion of

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the reporting firm's total accounting department budget, as overhead costs will undoubtedly remain the same.

Even if it is felt that the costs of compliance with the line of business program are significant, it is necessary to measure these costs against the anticipated benefits of increased accounting activity and the availability of this information to the FTC, the Congress and the public. The availability of various performance data to potential market entrants for identifying market items with high profitability can also be expected to have substantial direct and indirect benefits to the economy.

Question: Is the reporting method chosen the best method?

While there are some criticisms that the information sought is not sufficiently specific, the program is extremely well designed for the FTC's purposes. Minor adjustment of product class definitions and the addition of some bookkeeping entries would improve the reporting system.

Question: Why not begin with a scaled down experimental program?

Any experimental approach would necessitate a reduced number of product categories rather than a reduced number of reporting firms, for with fewer firms the picture would not be accurate. Inclusion of only the largest firms in the top 500 would not be likely to produce reliable information with regard to any but a very few product lines. The reasons for collecting information for all manufacturing categories initially are because the Congress and the public may be interested in a great variety of products and the FTC, in utilizing the aggregated data for economic purposes, needs to compare the data for any given product category with the data for all other product categories.

## VOTERS TAKE THE INITIATIVE

## HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, reform of the political process is an issue of universal concern in the age of Watergate. Democracy has been pushed to the limit; internal weaknesses have been revealed. How much influence do the American people actually have in the Halls of Congress, or in the corridors of the White House? Does legislation reflect the will of the people, or the will of organized special interest groups and lobbyists? We must begin to streamline the system, to make it responsive to our constituents, to return the reins of power to those who will promote the public interest. Such a movement has already begun on the local level, and is represented by the instrument of "initiative," which enables voters in 23 States to transform their views into laws without a legislative middleman. I hope WCBS' May 28 editorial, which describes initiative, will be of interest to my colleagues:

## TAKING THE INITIATIVE

Democracy, the textbooks say, is that form of government in which the supreme power is vested in the people. But how do the people exercise that power? Well, in America the people elect representatives to various legislative bodies and these representatives are supposed to pass laws that reflect the will of the people who elected them. Only sometimes it doesn't work that way. Sometimes the will

of the people and will of their elected representatives aren't the same, sometimes their interests actually conflict.

What happened this year in California is a case in point. The Sacramento legislature had passed campaign reform laws that many Californians believed were too weak. Of course, the unhappy voters could vote against the legislators to show their disapproval. But Californians have another option. They can use their "initiative".

The initiative is a tool of democracy designed to give people a more direct voice in lawmaking. It was first used in the United States in South Dakota in 1898. And now 23 states have it in their constitutions. Essentially it works this way: If a fair proportion of the voters in a state, say 15 per cent, sign a petition they can initiate legislation themselves and have it placed on the ballot for people to vote on in the next election. In California this year 325,000 voters signed petitions to place strong campaign reform legislation on the ballot. That way the people will be able to vote directly for laws their state legislators refuse to pass.

After the inadequate campaign reform legislation that New York State lawmakers passed this year, we can't help wishing that New Yorkers had the initiative to fall back on. As a matter of fact neither New York, New Jersey nor Connecticut has provision for popular initiative in their state constitutions and we think they should.

The cure for the evils of democracy, it has been wisely said, is more democracy.

## CREATING EMPLOYMENT IN RURAL AREAS

## HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I was recently gratified to attend a very special loan closing ceremony in Greens Fork, Ind., in the 10th Congressional District which I have the honor to represent. The ceremony took place on May 24, 1974. The loan, to enlarge the Dynamic Precision Controls Corp. at Greens Fork and to create new employment, was made through the rural development program with a guarantee provided by the Farmers Home Administration.

The occasion was special and unique because this is the first Farmers Home Administration loan of this kind in my district and only the second one in Indiana. Under this program, the Department of Agriculture can provide loan guarantee authority to help arrange private bank financing of rural businesses, thus benefiting the rural community in many ways.

This loan will increase the Dynamic Precision Control Corp.'s production of precision control instruments and other devices, including automobile cruise control units and gasoline mileage testers. The corporation's plant occupies a former school building in Greens Fork, with production lines set up in what was once the gymnasium. With the expansion made possible by the loan, the company expects to increase its working force from about 20 to 70 people, with both women and men employed on the production lines.

As I toured the plant after loan clos-

June 20, 1974

ing, I was impressed with the good cause that has been made of the abandoned school building, in contrast to the many that are being razed or standing idle throughout the country. I congratulate the president of Dynamic Precision Controls, Vern C. Vanderbilt, and the school board for their wise and creative decision.

## JUNE 15, 34TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET ANNEXATION OF LITHUANIA

## HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, June 15 is a date we should mark, as it represents one of the most tragic events in the annals of world history, the 34th anniversary of the forcible annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. This event led to the subsequent subjugation of these people to a rigid system of political persecution, which when defied only brought the deportation of thousands of Lithuanians to Siberian concentration camps.

Even now more than three decades later, we hear of the continued struggle of the Lithuanian people to regain the religious and political self determination which has eluded them for so long, under the oppressive rule of the Soviet Union.

Yet despite the adversities of the previous 34 years, the freedom loving spirit of the Lithuanian people has remained undaunted and strong, and has served as an inspiration to all those who cherish the fundamental rights of freedom for all men.

The tragic plight of the Lithuanian nation should point up with stark clarity the fact that the Soviet Union even today, while actively pursuing a policy of detente with this Nation, has yet to recognize the fundamental principle of self-determination for the millions of people who live under their rule.

As we enter into substantial agreements with the Soviets, we should keep these facts in mind, and must never forget that it will be impossible for the Soviets to be meaningful partners in international agreements unless they release their stranglehold on the nations of Eastern Europe.

There is more we can learn from commemorating this day. It can be an opportunity for this nation to reaffirm our beliefs in the rights of all oppressed persons in the world. Just as we have championed the cause of the Soviet Jew, and the citizens of Northern Ireland, so must we extend our commitment to the cause of all the peoples of Eastern Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people have endured 34 years of oppression and ruthless rule. Yet they have far from abandoned their struggle. They look to us, the greatest free nation in the world to support them in their efforts. We must not shrink from the challenge, but rather welcome it and thus strive for the

day when we can instead celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day.

**FPC DECISION ON THE BLUE RIDGE PROJECT**

**HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, on June 14, 1974, the Federal Power Commission rendered a favorable decision on the Blue Ridge project after almost 10 years of intensive study. The Blue Ridge project, a two-dam, combination pumped-storage, and hydroelectric facility on the New River in southwest Virginia, would provide vitally needed additional energy resources to a large portion of the East Central United States.

The FPC found after a thorough review of the 7,400 pages of testimony that the project would be in the public interest. In addition, substantial flood control and recreational benefits will be realized by its completion.

The Roanoke, Va., Times noted editorially on June 18, 1974, that—

Important decisions are best made by competent people who have spent plenty of time studying the subject.

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

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

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times, June 18, 1974]

**BEST DAM DECISIONS**

If important decisions are best made by competent people who have spent plenty of time studying the subject, the Federal Power Commission has reached the best decision on the Appalachian Power Company's proposal for a Blue Ridge Dams project. The commission ruled unanimously; its administrative judge had recommended the project firmly. The question now is whether the House of Representatives will substitute its sudden judgment on yet another slick device by which North Carolina Congressmen have sought to stop the project. The FPC granted the license but made the effective date January 2, which gives Congress time to interpose.

The device used this time is a bill providing that the area involved be studied for possible inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers system. The Senate has already passed the bill which would halt dam construction for a two-year study; and, if the study recommended inclusion, would enable the Congress to study the question for two more years before acting.

If those sponsoring this plan had organized many years ago to bring it about, and pled with Congress to put federal controls on the use of their wild and scenic land, the effort could be accepted as one made in good faith. It might even be worth applause. But it fits too completely the old pattern of delay by legislative trickery. Advocates of the dam are justified in figuring that if the power company finally gives up and goes away, the "study" provided will find plenty

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

of opposition even from those who wanted the study to use as a tool.

The FPC opinion made these notable points: The project from a power standpoint will benefit not just Virginia but North Carolina and all electric utility customers on the Eastern seaboard. The grid system enables one utility to come to the help of another under great demand. The project will provide great recreational benefits to the areas dammed—something which those who visit a similar project at Smith Mountain Lake can attest to.

The House of Representatives should see through this maneuver; it should not substitute its own judgment, arrived at in a few fleeting weeks, for that of the commission which has spent 12 years on it.

**MEAT IMPORTS MUST NOT BE RESTRICTED**

**HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent a telegram to the President urging him to resist cattle industry demands that meat imports be ended or restricted.

The plight of the cattlemen is due to their own withholding action during last year's price freeze and the failure of retail prices to reflect the decline of meat prices at the producer and wholesale levels.

A reimposition of the quotas would penalize consumers for the imprudent actions of the cattlemen and the profiteering of some middlemen and supermarket retailers. It would be like jailing the victim of a purse snatching instead of the perpetrator.

Consumers were excluded from recent White House discussions of the cattle price situation and it would be ironic, indeed, if the President acceded to the anticonsumer demands of the cattlemen at a time when his consumer adviser, Mrs. Virginia Knauer, was hosting a meeting in Washington for State and local consumer officials from across the Nation.

What is needed is for the Government to force middlemen and retailers to bring their meat prices into line with producer prices and to end the trend toward increased economic concentration in the food industry.

My telegram to the President follows:

HON. RICHARD NIXON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I respectfully urge you not to reinstate quotas under the Meat Import Quota Act. Consumers continue to pay unreasonably high prices for meat even though farm prices have declined in recent months. Lifting the suspension on meat quotas would penalize consumers for the profiteering of certain middlemen and supermarket retailers. Action to force retail food prices into line with farm prices would seem to be indicated.

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,  
Member of Congress.

**UNION LETTER IN FAVOR OF JACKSON-VANIK AMENDMENT**

**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as the President prepares for his trip to Moscow and the Senate continues consideration of the trade bill, I feel that it is important Members of Congress be aware of the strong and constantly growing support that exists for the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the trade bill.

An excellent statement, covering the economic and moral sides of this question, was written by Thomas W. Gleason, president, International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO, and vice president, AFL-CIO, in a letter to Chairman LONG of the Senate Finance Committee. I would like to share this letter with my colleagues at this point in the RECORD.

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION,  
New York, N.Y., June 17, 1974.

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG,  
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: We view with grave concern the drive by the Soviet Union to gain favored nation status under the Trade Bill. Assuredly, this nation, the bulwark of world democracy, can scarce afford to betray our fundamental principals in return for questionable economic considerations. History has provided us with too many poignant experiences at the hands of dictatorial nations, to now again, permit ourselves to be maneuvered into even believing that a truly harmonious relationship can flourish between nations.

In too many instances, the readiness of the United States to salvage the woes of the communist and fascist countries has but enabled those governments to sow and nourish their antagonistic and hostile philosophies.

Labor, in this country, is undergoing a serious crisis; the competition from cheap foreign labor has created critical unemployment problems, and to further promote difficulties for the domestic labor and consumer markets would be intolerable.

If Russia desires, in good faith, to express and demonstrate its friendship for this nation and the free countries of the world, let it first release its populace from political slavery; and provide its people with the absolute right of freedom of worship, freedom of expression, freedom of emigration and those other freedoms for which our boys have sacrificed to make this a better world in which to live.

We respectfully submit, that until Russia can sit at the bargaining table with "clean hands" and with good conscience it should not be afforded favorable consideration by the President and Congress.

Accordingly, we fully support, endorse and urge the passage of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment to the Trade Bill.

With every best wish.  
Very truly yours,

THOMAS W. GLEASON,  
President, International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO, and Vice President, AFL-CIO.

## THIRD MEMBER OF FAMILY RECEIVES LIFE SAVING AWARD

## HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1974

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor Mr. Herman Zimmerman of Dyersburg, Tenn., who was awarded the Red Cross Certificate of Merit for Lifesaving on June 18, 1974, in ceremonies at Dyersburg State Community College.

Mr. Zimmerman, an engineer with Heckethorn Manufacturing Co., Inc., of Dyersburg received the highest award made by the Red Cross for saving a person's life through the use of first aid.

Mr. Zimmerman, 58, is the third member of his family to receive such a citation.

Zimmerman successfully administered mouth-to-mouth resuscitation to W. Marvin Early, a Heckethorn employee, who had collapsed at the Dyersburg plant from a heart attack. Mr. Zimmerman accompanied the heart seizure victim to the hospital and assisted in transferring him to the emergency room. Mr. Early later recovered and has since returned to work.

Mrs. Jan Zimmerman, his wife, was the first to receive the Red Cross Certificate of Merit. In 1963 she and her husband came upon an automobile accident near Lebanon, Ill. Stopping at the crash scene Mrs. Zimmerman identified herself as a first aid instructor and offered to assist. Police at the scene gave her permission and Mrs. Zimmerman crawled through

the window of the disabled vehicle and began administering mouth-to-mouth resuscitation to the accident victim, continuing until units from the Lebanon Fire Department arrived.

Their daughter, Mrs. Lynn Mann, was in her kitchen in an east Memphis apartment in 1970, when neighbors came to ask her if she could help with a 7-year-old boy who had been rescued from the complex's pool. She ran to the poolside and immediately applied artificial respiration and revived the child by the time an ambulance arrived. The youngster was taken to a hospital and later was pronounced in good condition.

Mr. and Mrs. Zimmerman are both Red Cross first aid instructors and Mrs. Mann has received Red Cross first aid training and is a Red Cross water safety and swimming instructor volunteer.

## SENATE—Friday, June 21, 1974

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, a Senator from the State of Ohio.

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank Thee that where the spirit of the Lord is there is liberty. May Thy spirit pervade the life of this Nation that we may be kept by Thy grace. Keep us captive only to Thy spirit—that we may be free from bondage—to self, to things, to position, to power. Hold us firmly and guide us clearly that we may pursue only what is good and true and just. Help us all to live the God-centered life we profess, to obey Thy laws, to love Thy ways, to keep Thy covenant.

And to Thee shall be all thanksgiving and praise. Amen.

## APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,

President pro tempore,  
Washington, D.C., June 21, 1974.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, a Senator from the State of Ohio, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. METZENBAUM thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled

bill (H.R. 13839) to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METZENBAUM) subsequently signed the enrolled bill.

## THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 20, 1974, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

## THE JUDICIARY

The assistant legislative clerk read the nominations in the judiciary as follows:

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

Henry F. Werker, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations

are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN ITEMS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendars Nos. 913, 914, and 918.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

The bill (S. 3389) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American University," approved February 24, 1893, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the American University", approved February 24, 1893 (27 Stat. 476), as amended, is amended (1) by deleting "three-fifths of whom" and inserting in lieu thereof "at least one-fourth of whose duly elected number"; (2) by deleting "the Methodist Church" and inserting in lieu thereof "The United Methodist Church"; (3) by inserting immediately after "required for" the words "carrying out", and (4) by deleting "eleven of whom" and inserting in lieu thereof "at least eleven or more of whom, as determined by duly adopted by-laws".*

*(b) Section 2 of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:*

*"Sec. 2. After the date of the enactment of this section—*