

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Brown, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chambers, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Etienne, Harry B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Laurel, Santiago, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pumarejo, Ramon A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Todd, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx

In the Air Force

The following officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Carlo M. Talbott, xxx-xx-xxxx FR
 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. James C. Sherrill, xxx-xx-xxxx FR
 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MARIANO LUCCA RECEIVES SPAIN'S HIGHEST CIVILIAN HONOR: LA CROCE DE ISABELLA LA CATOLICA

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, each citizen of the Nation is aware of the historical significance of Christopher Columbus. When in the 15th century, King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella finally acquiesced to the pleas of Columbus to embark on a voyage to the edge of the world, no one could have known the profound effect the trip would have on this land and the entire world.

It was only in 1968 that the United States finally accorded Genoa's Christopher Columbus, who sailed under the Spanish flag, his due and established Columbus Day.

The man who chaired and founded the National Columbus Day Committee was Mr. Mariano A. Lucca of Buffalo, N.Y. On Sunday, June 23, 1974, Mr. Lucca received one of the Spanish Government's highest civilian decorations—La Croce de Isabella la Catolica. The tribute was particularly timely because Mr. Lucca and his lovely wife simultaneously celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary.

On behalf of all western New Yorkers, it is a privilege to salute Mr. and Mrs. Mariano Lucca and their wonderful family.

The Buffalo Courier-Express carried a timely article on Mr. Lucca's achievements which I share with my colleagues as one means by which we can say thanks Mariano for your lifetime of dedicated service to our community, our country and our Italian American heritage. I believe a museum in Washington, D.C., dedicated to Columbus would be a great and fitting tribute to all those Americans of Italian descent who contributed so much to our Nation. The article follows:

SPAIN TO CITE BUFFALONIAN M. A. LUCCA

Mariano A. Lucca of Buffalo will receive one of the Spanish government's highest civilian decorations when he and his wife celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary Sunday evening at the Hotel Statler Hilton.

Ramon Cercos, information officer at the Spanish Embassy in Washington, D.C., will present "La Croce de Isabella La Catolica," or the Cross of Queen Isabella the Catholic, to Lucca for his efforts to make Columbus Day a U.S. national holiday.

Lucca is chairman and founder of the National Columbus Day Committee, which helped institute the national holiday in 1968. He is now active in establishing a museum in Washington devoted to Columbus.

Lucca married the former Clara L. Gugino on June 24, 1924, in Holy Cross Church on Maryland St. The ceremony was performed by the Rev. Donato G. Valante, who will officiate at a 5:30 Mass Sunday evening as the Luccas repeat their wedding vows in St. Anthony of Padua Church on Court St., where both were baptized.

The dinner will be given at 7:30 p.m. by their son, Francis S. Lucca of Buffalo. The Luccas have nine grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren.

THE MANY TALENTS OF CORA HARRIS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Pictorial Press of Bryan, Tex., there was a photo article about a friend of mine, Mrs. John Harris. Mrs. Cora Harris has been blind since birth, but her disability has never dampened her spirits. She is the most delightful person I have ever met.

I only wish that every Member of Congress had the opportunity to meet this wonderful woman and her fine husband, John. I commend the article to you and my fellow Members of Congress and I only regret that the photographs that accompanied it in the Pictorial Press can not be reproduced here.

The article follows:

THE MANY TALENTS OF CORA HARRIS (By Kandy Rose)

Cora Harris is the kind of person who makes you ashamed for ever feeling gloomy or depressed, or out of sorts with your fellow man.

Blind since birth, Cora and her husband John live in modest surroundings on West 19th street in Bryan.

When she was 11 Cora was admitted to the State School for the Blind in Austin, and finished her education at age 22. While at the school, she showed an aptitude for music and learned to play the piano with proficiency.

When she returned to Bryan members of the congregation at College Hills Baptist Church heard her play and asked her to provide the music for their Sunday services on a regular basis, and she did so for 16 years.

Roan's Chapel also asked her to play sacred music for them, and she obliged for many years.

She says she's retired from playing the piano now. Her hearing is not what it used to be, so she just plays for friends on days when her hearing is better than normal.

Cora keeps her hands busy by weaving beautifully colored hot dish mats. The mats are 10 strands of rug yarn thick, and are hand tied to provide a quilted effect. She has made many mats for gifts and has sent them

to public officials including Representative Olin Teague, who was so taken with them he asked her to make him 12 additional sets to present as gifts.

Cora's looms are getting worn now, and she's been trying to find someone who could make her some new ones. The new "store-bought" types are more expensive than she can afford right now.

Cora and her husband John's courtship is a story in itself. John's first wife died, and after a period of loneliness he thought he'd like someone to write to. He applied to the same group Cora had for a "correspondence friend."

Cora and John began writing, and after a year of this courtship by letter John came to Bryan from Virginia for a visit. His impression of Cora's personality by letter was confirmed, and the two were married in 1953.

John has been employed as sexton by St. Andrew's Church for many years, and has been retained as an administrator while a younger man does the more physical work.

Cora also works with the Retired Senior Volunteer Program as a volunteer, and is an enthusiastic member of the program. But then, if you know Cora you wouldn't expect anything any different. She bubbles over with love for others.

NUCLEAR TESTING: TIME FOR A HALT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the urgency of the question concerning a comprehensive test ban treaty—CTBT—was accentuated by the recent nuclear explosion by India. A CTBT would end a major phase of the qualitative development of nuclear arms. Perhaps even more significant would be the effects of a CTBT in reducing international tension and increasing the chances of worldwide acceptance of the Nonproliferation Treaty.

There is a critical dependence of the development of new nuclear weapons on continued testing. A ban on such testing would inhibit qualitative improvements in nuclear weapons systems that are beyond the calculated margin of safety. A CTBT would help stabilize the nuclear arms race and encourage further agreement on other qualitative and quantitative arms control measures.

Many countries have not signed the Nonproliferation Treaty that was established in 1970. The reason given by the nonsignatory countries vary, but some are directly linked to the failure of the United States and U.S.S.R. to achieve a CTBT. For instance, in 1965 India said that it would not sign the Nonproliferation

tion Treaty until there was tangible progress toward disarmament, including a CTBT.

Depending on the number of participating countries, a CTBT would limit the adverse environmental effects of nuclear testing. Such a treaty could also result in significant long-term savings in nuclear defense expenditures.

The continuing proliferation of nuclear weapons is a serious threat to international security. I believe a CTBT would be a crucial turning point in the procurement of world peace. I am entering into the RECORD an article by Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, discussing the merits of a comprehensive test ban as opposed to a threshold test ban. The article, as it appeared in the May 1974 issue of Arms Control Today, follows:

NUCLEAR TESTING: TIME FOR A HALT

(By Edward M. Kennedy)

On May 17, India exploded a nuclear device, the sixth country to do so. And even if India does not make a true bomb—as it has promised not to do—we must now face with greater urgency the critical issue of a “world of many nuclear powers.” For that reason among others, I strongly support the negotiation now of a comprehensive ban on all nuclear testing.

The Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963 is now almost 11 years old. Since then, there has been little progress in extending the ban on testing that was then agreed for the atmosphere, space, and underwater. In the intervening years, the pace of underground testing was actually stepped up periodically by both the United States and the Soviet Union.

Now interest has been revived in further limits on nuclear testing. I believe a Comprehensive Test Ban treaty is particularly important and attractive at this time, when the immediate prospects for revising the 1972 Interim Agreement on offensive strategic weapons are so bleak.

CTB ADVANTAGES

CTB has several attractions. First, a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty would complement the agreements reached at SALT I, by making it more difficult for either superpower to make major qualitative improvements in their nuclear arsenals. If all testing were stopped, at least this would dampen fears on either side that the other would gain a high degree of confidence in some new generation of first-strike weapons.

Second, there is the matter of political will itself. The atmosphere surrounding both détente and the possibilities for arms control would be helped if there were some agreement at the forthcoming Moscow summit. I believe that promoting that atmosphere, so hard won, is particularly important at this time, when there is widespread questioning in the United States (and apparently in the Soviet Union, as well) about the real basis for improved Soviet-American relations. In addition to its own merits, therefore, a CTB would demonstrate that the United States and the Soviet Union are both still committed to real limits on arms. In fact, it might then be easier to break the log-jam at SALT II on revising the Interim Agreement.

This reasoning may explain the strong support for a CTB which Soviet leaders expressed to me during my recent trip to Moscow—about which I will say more later.

Third, a Comprehensive Test Ban would reinforce the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which is due for review next year. Many non-nuclear nations have branded the NPT as unfair to them. They have given up nuclear weapons, along with whatever political and military benefits these weapons seem to confer, while the superpowers forge ahead in their own arms race.

A CTB would be a major indicator of the good faith of the major powers, if they are determined to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. Such a demonstration of good faith is particularly important now that India has become the sixth power to explode a nuclear device. Will there be more? In part, the answer to this question will depend on what the superpowers do to show restraint—whether or not India, China, or other countries continue to test.

The continuation of underground testing also weakens the efforts of the United States and Soviet Union to bring France and China into real discussions on arms control. A CTB on its own would not prevent proliferation or lead to broader arms control talks; but it could be a significant step on the way.

Finally, a CTB would permit some savings in the nuclear weapons programs of both superpowers, to be applied to other uses, and end the remaining environmental hazards from underground testing. While such hazards are not the overriding reason for banning all tests, about one-fifth of our tests have vented, sending radioactive particles into the air. In addition, the side effects of massive explosions deep within the earth's crust are still not fully known—as concluded by the Pitzer Panel, appointed by the President's Office of Science and Technology.

Many of these arguments for a Comprehensive Test Ban treaty were reflected in talks I had with Soviet leaders in Moscow during April. In these talks, they shifted their position on an important point. They are no longer insisting that France and China join a CTB at the outset. Rather they are prepared to reach agreement with us now, and then seek the support of other nations. To be sure, Soviet leaders told me they want an escape clause, in the event that France and China do not respond. (Such clauses have become standard in most arms control agreements.) And it is important for us not to allow a CTB to be used as a weapon in the diplomatic conflict between the Soviet Union and China. But Soviet leaders also agreed that a CTB could be an important step forward, symbolizing our shared concern to limit the race in nuclear arms.

VERIFICATION CAPABILITIES IMPROVE

Yet what assurance is there that the Soviet Union would not test nuclear weapons in secret? To begin with, our ability to detect nuclear weapons tests underground has improved considerably during the past decade (and the Soviet Union has frequently expressed a willingness to rely on national means of verification). In fact, testimony before the Senate Arms Control Subcommittee—from a variety of sources—has supported the conclusion that we have a greater capacity now to detect and identify nuclear explosions through national means alone than we would have had in 1963, even with the seven on-site inspections a year that we then demanded. There is widespread belief that current developments in seismology alone would enable us to detect and identify explosions having a yield of only a few kilotons. And this does not take into account satellite reconnaissance and other techniques to gather information.

In addition, the Soviet Union would always be uncertain of our capabilities. And, being uncertain, Soviet leaders would have to calculate the risks—and the consequences—of being caught at cheating. With so much else at stake in arms control and in our bilateral relations, these risks and consequences would weigh heavily on them. This would be especially so since the benefits to be gained from cheating—some improvements in low-yield weapons—are most unlikely to bring any marked advantage in the nuclear arms balance.

I believe, therefore, that the issue of verification no longer need stand in the way of further limits on nuclear testing by the superpowers. Consequently, I have introduced

a Senate resolution calling for a mutual moratorium on all nuclear testing by the United States and the Soviet Union, followed by a conclusion of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, hopefully to be negotiated in time for the Moscow summit this summer. At time of writing, this resolution has 36 co-sponsors, and has been cleared for Senate action by the Foreign Relations Committee.

“THRESHOLD” TEST BAN INADEQUATE

Press reports on preparations for the forthcoming summit, however, indicate that the Administration is seeking only a “threshold” test ban—that is, a limit on tests producing a seismic signal above a given magnitude. Of course, for the political and psychological reasons I have advanced above, even a threshold treaty which genuinely ruled out major changes in strategic weaponry could still be valuable.

But even a threshold treaty set at a low level would be less desirable than a complete ban on testing by the superpowers. First, it is not clear that a threshold treaty would be enough to demonstrate the commitment of the superpowers to end their arms race. Would India have tested a nuclear device if Washington and Moscow had signed a CTB? We cannot know, although India long demanded this progress as the price of its own forbearance. Its recent action, therefore, should increase our desire to regulate the superpower arms race—with a comprehensive, rather than another partial, test ban agreement.

Second, a threshold treaty would be even more difficult to monitor than a CTB, since it would require a precision in seismic detection that is not needed when the issue is one of verifying whether or not there has been a nuclear explosion of any size at all. Disagreements on such technicalities could very well lead to more political tension, not less.

Third, the level of the threshold would tend to be set by arms developers rather than by arms controllers. As long as some level of testing is permitted, there will be strong pressures to test up to the limits (as happened with the Partial Test Ban Treaty)—even if quotas were imposed on the number of tests each power could make each year. There would also be a tendency to refine nuclear weapons arsenals even further—especially in the area of tactical weapons. This could lead to a blurring of the distinction between nuclear and non-nuclear weapons.

Finally, will the Soviet Union accept a threshold ban that would be a real improvement on the present Partial Test-Ban Treaty? Since the Soviet Union generally tests weapons larger than ours, a threshold ban would tend to favor U.S. weapons developments, and could raise doubts in Soviet minds about our sincerity in wanting to advance mutual interests in this area.

For all these reasons, I believe that a threshold ban would be far from the best answer in the area of controlling nuclear testing. I have urged the Administration to pursue a Comprehensive Test Ban to the limits of negotiation, before turning to a less desirable alternative. And I believe that CTB can be negotiated this year.

CRISPIN GARNEZ PRODUCES COUNTRY'S FIRST BALE OF COTTON THIS YEAR

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, early in June the Nation's first bale of cotton for this year was ginned in Hidalgo Coun-

ty in the 15th Congressional District of Texas.

Crispin Garnez produced the cotton on his farm near the town of Pharr. And this is the third time in the last 4 years that Mr. Garnez had the first bale. Winning the honor has become a habit with him.

This year's bale is no skimpy affair. It weighed in at 518 pounds—a healthy bale, as any cotton man knows.

I am proud of this opportunity to let my colleagues know how we do things in south Texas. And I convey my congratulations to Mr. Garnez, who, in addition to the honor of being first, collected \$1,445 in cash prizes for the first bale.

INCREASED BENEFITS FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED VETERANS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate our distinguished chairman and Chairman Boland and the members of his Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for expediting this legislation. House Joint Resolution 1061 will provide funds necessary to implement legislation recently passed by the Congress and signed by the President to increase compensation benefits to our service-connected veterans, and their families.

During the current fiscal year, \$100,000,000 is required to implement Public Law 93-295 that became effective May 1, 1974. It provides a 15- to 18-percent increase in disability compensation benefits for service-connected disabled veterans; a 15-percent increase in allowances for dependents of veterans who are 50 percent or more disabled; a 17-percent increase for dependency and indemnity compensation for widows and children; and a 17-percent increase in aid and attendance allowances. This new legislation passed by our Committee on Veterans Affairs earlier this year will benefit some 2.2 million veterans receiving compensation benefits and approximately 375,000 widows, children and parent cases receiving death compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation benefits in fiscal year 1974.

Approximately \$77,000,000 is needed by the Veterans' Administration to implement Public Law 93-293 that became effective May 31, 1974. You will recall we recently passed a 30-day emergency extension of the time during which veterans must complete their training under the GI bill. Enactment of this legislation averted a hardship for some veterans whose time was due to expire May 31, 1974. We are now considering a comprehensive education bill that will include a 2-year extension and we continue to hope final passage will come about before June 30.

I have continued to be concerned about unreasonable delays encountered by many veterans in receiving their educational benefits checks. This has caused

undue hardships on thousands of veterans and many have had to drop out of school due to these delays. In an attempt to resolve these serious problems, the Veterans' Administration has asked for funds to implement its "Man on Campus" program. This program is being established by administrative action and \$2,000,000 is being appropriated to the Agency for the initial funding during this fiscal year. The Appropriations Committee has taken note that these funds are not to be used to duplicate the efforts of the Veterans' cost of instruction program of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I share the concern of the committee and take this time to assure the committee that we plan to monitor the "man on campus" program to see that the services provided on campus by the Agency does not overlap the scope of services provided by representatives of the veterans' cost of instruction program already established on some campuses.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to express my appreciation for the prompt action taken by the Appropriations Committee in bringing this legislation to the House. It again shows the committee is sensitive to the needs of veterans of our country and its commitment to see that these needs are met.

ATOMIC POWER SPREAD? TRY TO STOP IT

HON. E. G. SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, many of us are deeply concerned over the prospects of spreading nuclear power to the Middle East and beyond. I am still wrestling with the question myself. The following article from the June 23 Pittsburgh Press by Prof. Lawrence Lee of the University of Pittsburgh offers a perspective which deserves inclusion in the national debate on this issue:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, June 23, 1974]

A-POWER SPREAD? TRY TO STOP IT

(By Lawrence Lee)

Everyone wants atomic power.

Everyone will have atomic power.

Such knowledge, once gained, cannot be kept secret. Such techniques, once mastered will not remain the permanent monopoly of one society. They will sometime be universally possessed.

It was shallow not to have perceived this from the beginning.

About the year 1950, this view was stated in an informal discussion with a bureaucrat appearing at the University of Pittsburgh under sponsorship of Dr. Herbert Longenecker, then dean of graduate studies.

It was suggested that, with a proper quid pro quo from Russia, our knowledge of the fission of the atom be revealed to the Soviet Union to ease an almost universal international fear and tension.

There was shocked response.

Now, about two decades later, Russia is an ominous rival for atomic hegemony.

China has exploded more than one nuclear device, in spite of the rumored threat of preventive attack by the Soviet Union in its continuing tension with the Chinese regime over

territory and Communist ideological dominance.

India, also disputing territory with China, has recently exploded a nuclear device while its starving millions cheer in national pride.

The United States, for presumed oil concessions and in our desire to prevent too strong an influence by Russia in the Arab world, has agreed to export atomic capability and aid to Egypt.

And the resignation of a major figure of the United States delegation from the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) because of the present attitude of Washington officials...

All this brings us up to the current and ticking second in atomic questions and international diplomacy. Time has no stop in these issues and in the fate of nations.

What man decides and does, man must live with—in rejoicing or in despair.

India declares that she will never use atomic force for warfare.

If this is true, and if her atomic capability is to be devoted to the production of energy for peaceful uses, for the development of creative power, India will indeed have given her starving masses cause for more than mere nationalistic pride.

Their lives will be less imperiled. Their future survival will be more hopeful.

If she fails to keep or cannot keep the pledges of peaceful usage, India will not be the first nation to promise more than she intends to or can fulfill.

All national entities declare their peaceful intentions. All repeat that their armaments are for defense against the potential enemy.

And budgets for defense expand while weapons that are perilous become obsolete and are replaced by even more destructive ones.

Only the wisest statesmanship on select occasions can act in compassion. Diplomacy must act most often with realism.

It is realistic to see that nuclear knowledge will become universal. It is statesman-like to seek with enduring tenacity a system in which all nations, large and small, can feel secure.

11500 BANANAS ON PIKE'S PEAK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the backers of H.R. 11500, the bill to bury the surface coal mining industry, are fond of claiming that it would simply enact the Pennsylvania surface mining law for the whole Nation, and would make possible nationwide the use of the modified block-cut mining method employed in Pennsylvania.

In fact, one member of the House Interior Committee and three staff members went up to see some of the mines which operate by the block-cut method on steep slopes. One of the staff wrote a glowing report on the trip, saying that the mining method seemed to be a successful way of reclaiming steep slopes, and implying that these mines were in compliance with H.R. 11500.

It all sounded wonderful until the owner of one of the mines got a look at H.R. 11500. He is Edward Mears, president of the Mears Coal Co., a small operation near Marion Center, Pa. What Mr. Mears saw in this bill sent him running to a typewriter. He wrote to members of the Interior Committee:

I am afraid if it passes, it will stop me from using my block-cut method and will put me out of business. I find a number of proposed requirements in that bill that will stop not only my kind of operations but many others like it here in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Mears is not some rapacious coal operator despoiling the landscape. By the account of the Environment Subcommittee staff members who saw his mine, he is doing a good job of reclamation. They apparently want a bill that would allow other operators to use the same methods—in fact, that would require them to do so.

Beautiful—but Mr. Mears says this will not be possible under H.R. 11500.

In other words, the supposed textbook example of H.R. 11500 says it would put him out of business.

What better testimony do we need to prove that H.R. 11500 is a crazy, mixed-up bill? It is as silly as trying to raise bananas on Pike's Peak. If it would stop operations at an acknowledged model mine, that is a pretty good sign it would shut down a major portion of the coal industry—and right now, the Nation cannot afford to let that happen.

LESS POSTAL SERVICE

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster General E. T. Klassen recently announced that he was bringing his Southern Regional Postmaster General, Mr. Carl C. Ulsaker, to Washington to serve as a Senior Assistant Postmaster General for the prime purpose of "developing and implementing servicewide cost reduction programs."

For my colleagues who have seen postal service deteriorate at an increasing rate over the past 3 years, this announcement of the Postmaster General should serve as an ominous warning that there are more service cuts to come.

As General Klassen puts it in his press release:

The U.S. Postal Service faces now and in the coming fiscal year a serious financial problem. Due mainly to inflationary pressures, our costs are considerably in excess of our revenues.

The Postmaster General goes on to say—

It is absolutely imperative that we develop, implement and follow through on programs to contain and curtail our costs for labor, transportation, supplies and other services. Of necessity, such programs must be national in scope with significant flexibility for implementation at the local level.

For an agency which is almost totally labor-oriented, an agency which spends more than 80 percent of its budget to meet its payroll, unless the Postal Service abandons some of its management policies, the Klassen announcement can only mean one thing: less service to the public.

I will remind my colleagues that American taxpayers are already paying through the nose for postal service they

do not receive. For fiscal year 1974 the Congress appropriated nearly \$2 billion from the Federal Treasury to pay for public service costs and subsidies. This money, coupled with the postal revenues that go directly to the Postal Service, should be enough to provide consistent and adequate postal service to the American public. Apparently, it is not.

The reasons why postal costs vastly exceed revenues and subsidies are many. But it is interesting to note that the press release of the Klassen statement was sandwiched between two other general releases from the Postal Service which illustrate one of the basic reasons: the Postal Service management is more interested in the image of service rather than the substance.

Preceding the Klassen economy statement was a press release which announced that Henry Aaron, the Atlanta Braves homerun king, was named America's No. 1 recipient of fan mail in 1973 by the U.S. Postal Service.

It seems the Postal Service asked professional sports organizations, the three major television networks, motion picture companies, television production companies, and fan mail organizations to submit the approximate amounts of mail their top personalities each received.

I am sure the public was thrilled to learn that its tax money produced a fan mail survey which showed Aaron outdraws Dinah Shore, Johnny Carson, Alan Alda, Randolph Mantooth, and Joe Namath combined.

Immediately following the Klassen economy statement was a press release which announced a \$5 million nationwide advertising campaign to promote stamp collecting.

The press release proudly announced:

It is the first time that the Postal Service has ever purchased national television advertising.

The firm handling this campaign is Needham, Harper & Steers, Inc., which last year was given a \$3.8 million account to promote the public image of the Postal Service through newspaper ads.

And last, but not least, Mr. Speaker, in this same batch of press releases was one which announced that the Postal Service had agreed to purchase a 45-acre site for approximately \$1.3 million, 3½ miles east of the San Antonio, Tex., airport.

This purchase, which works out to about \$29,000 per acre—so it must be pretty choice land—was made in anticipation of a general mail facility construction project now in the initial planning stages.

The press release says that the initial planning is scheduled to be completed early next year. At that time, the release says—

If the project then meets service, economic and operating criteria and favorable review, an architect and engineer will be selected during the spring of 1975.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, what if the project does not meet the economic criteria? Then, of course, the American taxpayer is left holding the bag for this high priced Texas desert.

I suggest that Mr. Klassen read some of the press releases that come out of

his office if he wants to understand why the Postal Service faces a "serious financial problem."

A GOOD WORD FOR LAWYERS

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, in the April-May 1974 issue of the Journal of the Missouri Bar, Mr. Wade F. Baker, executive director of the Missouri Bar, wrote a timely article on lawyer-legislators which I would commend to the attention of my colleagues.

There is little doubt that in the wake of the political scandals which have wracked government at all levels, lawyers have suffered an undue loss of reputation due to the actions of a few fellow professionals. Surely, an entire profession, composed in vast part of honest and dedicated men and women of integrity, should not be degraded for the misguided actions of a few of its members, and I believe that it is time that we finally hear a good word for the lawyers. Mr. Baker's well-taken comments afford a needed perspective on the vital and necessary role that lawyers play in our society, and I should like to take this opportunity to share them with my distinguished colleagues.

The article follows:

BENCHMARKS FOR YOUR PRACTICE

(By Wade F. Baker)

LAWYER-LEGISLATORS

Today in the 77th Missouri General Assembly there are twenty-nine lawyers in the House and twenty-one in the Senate, a total of fifty lawyer-legislators. Rumor indicates that perhaps twenty-five percent of the lawyers in the legislature will not seek re-election.

By the time this is published, the deadline for filing will have passed. But the reasons for their leaving the legislature are pertinent and ought to be examined. Some say they are tired of the constant harassment legislators must endure, no matter how hard they try. Others are weary of the criticism of lawyers and the key role they occupy in the legislative process. Nearly all mention economics as a base reason for leaving the legislature.

While a few legislators may not earn their salary, most do. The public is unaware (as we who work with them know) of the long hours spent in hearings, the frequent special sessions and the annual sessions they must attend. Add to that the interruptions of constituents between sessions and the time (and money) spent for campaigning, and little time is left for them to engage in business or professional pursuits.

Although no one suggests that legislators be paid full time salaries, we should not overlook the heavy responsibilities imposed upon them by their official duties. As the body of men and women to which we entrust our most difficult and essential public problems for decisions, legislators, in my opinion, deserve more compensation than they now receive. Less than three percent of the State budget is appropriated to the Legislative Branch of government. This should demonstrate that legislators and the supportive help they need are not overpaid—and it's about time those of us who work closely with them should speak out on their behalf.

Lawyers should be commended for their efforts in the legislature. They are willing to

sacrifice income and time away from their families to serve as our representatives in our Assembly. They are distressed by the criticism that lawyers have too much power in the legislature. After all, the voters who selected them thought they were more qualified than their opponents. Voters apparently were impressed with the fact that they were lawyers. Then they were elected or appointed by other legislators to key positions they hold because of their legal training and their skill in negotiation and debate. Lawyers have shown adeptness at moving bills along the intricate route to enactment.

We need the skill and training of lawyers in the Missouri General Assembly, and we would hope many will change their minds and file for re-election before the deadline for filing passes.

Experienced legislators are needed in Missouri now as much as when the State was admitted into the Union. Because of the skills of lawyers and the significant role they occupy in the legislative process, we encourage them to continue to serve in the legislature and to give Missouri the leadership the State so acutely needs.

PUERTO RICO CELEBRATES THE FEAST OF SAN JUAN BAUTISTA

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 23, celebrations were held in many places in commemoration of the feast of Saint John the Baptist. While this occasion is widely observed in many countries with a predominantly Christian population, nowhere is it more enthusiastically celebrated than in Puerto Rico.

The island of Puerto Rico was discovered by Columbus on his second voyage to the New World. In early November of 1493, he and his crew stopped at the small Caribbean island of Guadeloupe for water. It was there that they met a group of Arawak Indians who had been taken into slavery by the Carib Indians. The Arawaks begged Columbus to take them home to their neighboring island of Boriquén, and Columbus agreed to do so.

On November 19, the Spanish fleet reached Boriquén, and Columbus was so impressed with the beauty of the island that he took possession of it in the name of the King and Queen of Spain, calling it San Juan Bautista after Saint John the Baptist. After spending 3 days on the island, the Spanish fleet continued its voyage on to the original destination of Hispaniola.

For the next 15 years the island of San Juan Bautista remained largely ignored by Spain, but finally in 1508 Ponce de Leon took a crew of 50 men to carry out further explorations in the area. It is said that upon discovering a large, well-protected bay on the north coast of the island, Ponce de Leon praised the area as a "puerto rico"—a rich port—and that that name eventually came to be applied to the entire island. The port and now capital city retained the name of San Juan.

Thus it is that the feast of Saint John the Baptist has special significance both

for the residents of Puerto Rico and for those of our community who have come to the mainland to make our homes. In many areas the Puerto Rican community organizes picnics, special religious observances, entertainment, and so forth, in honor of this important day.

The Spanish-speaking community has in recent years made a special effort to demonstrate the pride we have in our own unique heritage, and Puerto Ricans are happy to have this opportunity to share with the rest of society our joy in celebrating the feast of San Juan Bautista.

AMNESTY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, few issues have prompted so bitter a controversy or weighed so heavily upon the minds of the American people as has the complex issue of amnesty. Today I would like to share my thoughts on this sensitive matter with my colleagues.

First, it must be understood that in every case, these young men living in exile are doing so voluntarily. The law does not provide exile as a penalty for either draft evasion or desertion. Most of these young men have chosen this course because they felt the alternative of criminal prosecution was too onerous or unjust.

In addition to those who refused to serve because of their strong objections to the U.S. policy in Vietnam, there are others who felt they were unfairly treated by the Selective Service or by the military, and who saw exile as the only means of escaping the snare of bureaucratic injustice. In still other cases, young men, some of whom feared prosecution for crimes unrelated to Vietnam or the draft, left the country or deserted their military units.

Because of the diversity of the people and circumstances involved in the amnesty question, I feel strongly that a case-by-case examination is the only proper way of determining when repatriation should be granted, and the circumstances under which criminal prosecution could be waived.

Under my proposal, an administrative board would be established in each Federal region. This board would review each case of a young man desiring to return to the United States, determine the conditions of his repatriation, perhaps waive all conditions, or deny repatriation without criminal prosecution.

The conditions of repatriation, if any, would be clear to the young man before he irrevocably determines to return to the United States. Legislative guidelines might be necessary to insure the equitability of conditions throughout the country. An effective national service program would have to be guaranteed to allow these young men to serve their Nation in a way compatible with their convictions and with the interests of the country.

Millions of men did serve their country during the Vietnam conflict. Tens of thousands gave their lives, and hundreds endured imprisonment by the enemy. At this time, more than 1,300 of our servicemen in Indochina are still unaccounted for. In light of these facts, I firmly believe a blanket amnesty would be inappropriate. Although history has shown us various examples of limited Presidential amnesties, our Vietnamese involvement did not conform to any of our previous military commitments. The absence of a formal declaration of war, the unparalleled opposition to our involvement, the number of young men who refused service, and the lack of a clear victory, all are factors which differentiate this war from others.

I believe it would be a grave mistake for the Congress to allow the sensitivity and complexity of this issue to prevent it from carefully moving toward resolving the fates of those who refused to serve militarily during the Vietnam conflict. I am hopeful that the Judiciary Committee will proceed to draft legislation which is responsive to the individual circumstances of each case of repatriation.

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD FOR GEORGE CHAPLIN OF HAWAII

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that Mr. George Chaplin, the editor in chief of the Honolulu Advertiser, of Honolulu, Hawaii, has been chosen to receive the distinguished service award of Clemson University.

Mr. Chaplin graduated from Clemson in 1935 with a B.S. degree in textile chemistry. Since then he has entered the newspaper field, where he has achieved great distinction as the editor in chief of one of our leading daily newspapers.

As editor, Mr. Chaplin has taken a strong interest in nearly every subject affecting the public in Hawaii. The topics covered in the editorial pages span a diverse spectrum ranging from local government issues to the status of Micronesia, a subject in which Mr. Chaplin has much expertise. His contributions to a more enlightened and informed public have been of great merit.

Mr. Chaplin has also participated in a wide range of community activities, which attests to his involvement going beyond commentary in the editorial pages of his newspaper.

Each year, the Clemson University alumni association chooses five persons to receive the distinguished alumni award from among persons who may be nominated by anybody. This year's awards were conferred at Clemson's annual alumni banquet on June 8 during reunion week. They were presented in the name of the entire Clemson University alumni family.

The award given to Mr. Chaplin reads—

The Clemson Alumni Association of Clemson University presents the Distinguished Service Award to George Chaplin, Class of 1935, whose personal life, professional achievements, community service, and loyalty to Clemson exemplify the objectives of Clemson University.

I congratulate Mr. Chaplin on receiving this award, which is most deserved.

AN EXPERIMENT IN COED CORRECTIONS SUCCEEDING

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the stagnant, stifling atmosphere of American prisons is only one of the many problems facing prisoners, corrections officers, and those of us in Congress charged with meeting the crisis of the corrections system. The struggle for penal reform continues to be painfully slow in both the Federal and States' systems. It is encouraging, therefore, to find that an innovative experiment in coed correctional training is succeeding in relieving some of the tensions, frustrations, and alienation that have consistently been a large part of prison life in this country.

I call the Members' attention to an article in the June 20 New York Times on the Massachusetts Correctional Institution at Framingham. The State authorities, the prisoners, and the superintendent of the facility, Mrs. Dorothy Chase, are to be commended for their continuing efforts to improve prison life. Sadly, stories such as Framingham's are the exception rather than the rule and serve only to remind us that the struggle for a sensible National corrections policy is far from complete.

The article follows:

MEN AND WOMEN IN ONE PRISON: "REALISTIC" IDEA IS GIVEN A TRY
(By Judy Klemesrud)

FRAMINGHAM, MASS.—At a large, enclosed complex of buildings near here, men and women residents stroll hand-in-hand through the grassy courtyard, dine together, play cards together, watch movies together, and swim in the outdoor pool together.

And recently, to the surprise of almost everyone, two couples who met at the complex were united in marriage. And rumor has it that at least two more marriages are in the offing.

No, this isn't one of those "swinging singles" complexes that are so popular on the West Coast. It is a coed prison, believed to be the only state prison in the nation where men and women prisoners are allowed to mingle. (A Federal prison in Fort Worth has also gone coed, and a coed state prison is scheduled to open in Connecticut in 1976.)

For a little more than a year now, minimum-security inmates from other state prisons in Massachusetts have been able to request transfer to this former women's prison, officially known as M.C.I., Framingham (the initials stand for Massachusetts Correctional Institution). At present there are 85 women and 57 men in this picturesque, tree-lined, minimum security facility. About 50 per cent are black.

"If you've got to be in prison, this is the place to be," said Thomas O'Keefe, 45 years old, a blue-eyed, dark-haired convict from Peabody, Mass., who recently transferred here after spending 14 years at Walpole state prison for armed robbery.

"I mean, you wake up in the morning and you see trees," he added, "and you walk down the walk with a chick. You can't beat it!"

PROTESTS ARE MINIMAL

Despite charges from some conservative politicians that the prison has a "country club" atmosphere, most Massachusetts citizens have accepted the prison's transition calmly. Either they aren't aware of it, prison officials believe, or else they regard it as the lesser of two evils at a time when the issue of homosexuality in sex-segregated prisons has been thrust into the national spotlight.

"The argument against homosexuality is the one that appeals to most of the people," said Mrs. Dorothy Chase, the prison's 40-year-old superintendent, as she sat in her spacious office overlooking the prison's swimming pool. The pool was paid for by "residents," as they are known, with the proceeds from one of their annual Christmas fairs.

The argument that appeals to Mrs. Chase the most, however, is that the coed concept is just more "realistic." She reasons that the residents are going to have to cope with a man-woman world when they get out, and that learning to get along with the opposite sex inside the four walls will help with their adjustment to society once they are released.

Sexual contact at the prison is supposedly limited to handholding. "Don't let me see any mouth-to-mouth resuscitation," Mrs. Chase has told her charges. "No one is drowning here."

But at the same time, she is realistic.

"There has always been sex in prisons," she said evenly. "If you don't have homosexuality, you have heterosexuality. We don't condone it, but it goes on."

Residents said these moments of private passion take place in empty rooms and broom closets, and during the residents' "furloughs," or trips away from the prison. Indeed, it was during a furlough that the two married couples exchanged vows, in violation of a rule that they could not marry without the permission of prison officials.

"It's a stupid rule," said Mrs. Chase, a dark-haired, tiny (she's 4-feet 11-inches tall) woman. She added, however, that the married couples do not live together inside the prison, but in sex-segregated cottages with other residents. Curfew is 9:30 P.M.

The prison has four of these cottages, two for men and two for women, each housing 35 prisoners. When there is an overflow, there are special housing facilities above the infirmary and in a halfway house in Dorchester, Mass. The dining room is in the large main building, which also houses recreational and educational facilities.

HALF HOLD JOBS

About half of the residents hold jobs in nearby cities as part of the prison's work-release program. Most of the others are employed inside the prison in "cadre" positions. Neither group wears uniforms; instead, such items as cut-off jeans, halter tops, T-shirts, safari jackets, flared pants, sandals and sneakers are prevalent.

Despite the mixing of the sexes, homosexuality is still noticeable at the prison as some residents—especially women—openly display affection for each other.

"That's the one thing that bugs me," said Larry Stanton, 25, of Waltham, Mass., who is serving six years for assault and battery. "If two women are together, the guards don't bother them. But if a man and a woman sit together on the grass for more than a few minutes, they break it up."

Mr. Stanton, who has long blondish hair and a matching moustache, was sitting in the dining room the other day, holding hands with his newly acquired girlfriend, Judy Bregoli, 28, of Boston, a parole violator.

"I just love having the men here," she said, over coffee. "They really help us a lot, especially with our court cases. They know a lot more about it, because they've usually done harder time than we have."

The women residents are generally in their early 20's, and are serving time for such things as prostitution and drug offenses. The men, mostly in their 20's and 30's, have generally committed more serious crimes, such as armed robbery, assault and manslaughter.

Almost all of the prisoners will be eligible for parole within a year to 18 months. One woman resident has been eligible for parole three times, a friend said, but purposely "aggravated" her situation so her parole was turned down. The reason: She didn't want to leave her boyfriend.

Things were not so chummy between the two sexes in the beginning. The women were at first afraid that the men might try to take over the prison, which is still the only correctional facility for women in Massachusetts.

Their fears were apparently groundless. "Both sexes are totally equal here," Mrs. Chase said, a statement that none of the women prisoners challenged.

So far, only one spouse has complained about the prison's coed nature: a wife was worried about her husband being an inmate there. As a result, Mrs. Chase told the man that she would support any request that he might make for transfer.

"He subsequently escaped," she said, drolly.

According to prison officials, there is a steady stream of visitors here, many of them correction authorities who are thinking about suggesting the coed concept in their own state prisons.

It is an idea that is gaining support as prisoners and jailers alike demand more bearable institutions (two years ago, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals recommended that "serious consideration" be given to coed facilities).

Officials say it is too soon yet to study recidivism rates here but add that they are heartened by the apparent success encountered at the Federal prison in Fort Worth, which started its coed program about a year earlier.

"There is no question in my mind that coed prisons are the answer," said Murdoch MacDonald, 48, of Boston, a former printer who has been in various prisons for 22 years for double murder. "Just being around women eases all the tensions and the fantasies."

STAGE A FASHION SHOW

Like most prisons, M.C.I., Framingham, has its share of special events, including the recent commencement exercises for prisoners who received their high school diplomas, followed by a formal dinner dance. They also staged a coed fashion show starring prisoners as models.

The show, which climaxed a two-month grooming and modeling course taught by outside volunteers, bore little resemblance to those stuffy little shows that go on in New York salons. Here, the residents greeted the models with standing ovations, shouts of encouragement, cheers, whistles. It was a very joyous affair, especially whenever a model struck an exaggerated Fifth Avenue pose. The fashions were supplied by The Lobo Look, a boutique in Belmont, Mass.

A swimming pool . . . a formal dance . . . a fashion show . . . Is it a prison? Or a country club? Talk like that often causes Mrs. Chase to react sharply.

"Anybody who thinks it's a country club

ought to come here and get incarcerated here and work here," she said. "This is tough living."

REV. M. MORAN WESTON

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend M. Moran Weston is a leader in Harlem's community affairs. Under his leadership, St. Philip's Episcopal Church has undertaken a vigorous, badly needed housing program in central Harlem. From the just-opened senior citizen apartments in a new 14-story building to future plans for additional building and renovation in the neighborhood, Reverend Weston has shown what an active, community-minded church can do. It is activities like these which can reveal a church's social conscience and commitment.

I am pleased to include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article on Reverend Weston by Sandra Satterwhite which appeared in the New York Post on June 19, 1974.

GOING BEYOND WORSHIP

(By Sandra Satterwhite)

Believing that as a pastor his concern for parishioners should go beyond the weekly worship service, the Rev. M. Moran Weston has gotten involved in the nonprofit housing arena.

He said that he has a "waiting list from here to Jerusalem" for the St. Phillips, Senior House, which had its grand opening this week.

Dr. Weston is the rector of the 164-year-old St. Philip's Episcopal Church in Harlem, which set up a subsidiary to sponsor the 200-unit, 14-story building at 220-260 W. 133d St.

"If you'd gone through this neighborhood when I first came here, you wouldn't recognize it now," he said, bemoaning the steady deterioration of the area near the church at West 134th Street and Seventh Av.

He said that older people, particularly women, needed a decent place to live, and that he initiated the housing program because "I made a commitment to demonstrate that black people could provide some of the answers as well as complain about the problems."

When he became rector of St. Philip's in 1957, the church had a 400-member congregation. It is now half that as people have moved away, the young have forsaken the church, and the neighborhood has shown the resultant decay, he said.

Weston was able to construct the \$6.3 million home for the elderly with financing under the state's Mitchell-Lama program, and with federal rent subsidies and city tax abatements, he's able to set rents at prices residents can afford.

He said that the church is also sponsoring a federally and city-subsidized 260-unit, 19-story apartment building now under construction for low- and moderate-income families. Its expected cost is \$10.4 million.

And St. Philip's is seeking city money to rehabilitate 13 tenements now owned by the church.

"I've always had a philosophy that you shouldn't do things for people, but with them," said Weston. Members of his congregation sit on the boards of the various housing subsidiaries.

And he stresses that it's a public service effort by the church, which won't own anything until after the 30-year mortgages are paid.

Weston was in his office at Community Center-Parish House complex, next door to the church, a \$2.5 million, four-story building completed four years ago, and used mostly for preschool, after-school and youth programs.

"This was my first major undertaking. People thought I was out of my mind. This started with the grass roots," he said. The church members had raised an initial \$275,000 before private foundations helped out with the rest.

M. Moran Weston is a third generation Episcopal minister whose maternal grandfather founded St. Luke's Episcopal Church in Tarboro, N.C., Weston's birthplace. ("We live in a society that's already made a fetish of age.")

His father, also M. M. Weston, pastored that church while his mother, Catherine, taught in the family's parochial school, later in a public high school. "Those were the ugly days of segregation."

There were five children.

Leaving the South after two years of junior college at St. Augustine in his home state (he's now chairman of the board there), he earned his bachelor's in English and chemistry from Columbia in 1930, his doctorate in social history there in 1954. He's been a Columbia trustee for the past five years.

He received his bachelor of divinity degree from Union Theological Seminary in 1934 and his doctorate of divinity from Virginia Theological Seminary in 1964.

His professional activities now run the gamut from clergyman, to college professor and banker.

A cofounder in 1948 of Harlem's Carver Federal Savings and Loan Assn., he now serves as chairman of the board. And for five years he has also been a professor of social history at the State University of New York.

His "full load" at SUNY includes a course in planned social change. "I'm trying to develop new insights into the nature and workings of power in a society," he said.

In his office at the parish complex, there's an oil painting just above his desk by his daughter, KarAnn, 21, an artist and recent graduate of Sarah Lawrence College.

"I told her that I wanted something that's symbolic of creative energy." She's now heading for Yale's School of Architecture. His son, Gregory, almost 17, is a senior in high school. "He's making rumbles about law—we don't know what he'll do, but it'll be something."

The "we" includes his wife Miriam, a practicing clinical psychologist, who has a doctorate in the field from Columbia. They live in New Rochelle.

"We read a great deal, obviously, and I play tennis every moment I can."

LET THESE PEOPLE GO

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the President prepares to leave for Moscow, the Soviets are preparing for his arrival with sweeping arrests and imprisonments of Soviet Jewish activists. Reports reaching the West indicate that more than 50 Jews in Moscow have been forcibly taken from their homes and thrown

into prison, with many more barely able to avoid the Russian police by going into hiding. Many of those arrested are prominent scientists whose only offenses have been the submission of requests for emigration permits.

These dragnet tactics may seem appropriate to the Soviet authorities, since they apparently will go to any lengths to prevent demonstrations during President Nixon's visit by Jewish activists who have been trying unsuccessfully to leave the U.S.S.R.

One might have assumed that the President would not consider them appropriate, but his recent remarks at Annapolis indicate that he considers the emigration question an internal Soviet matter in which the United States must not interfere. It is quite likely that those remarks encouraged Soviet authorities to step up their harassment of Soviet Jews seeking to emigrate and further reduce the number actually allowed to leave the country.

Mr. Speaker, it should be painful to the President to know that his visit is the excuse for wholesale arrest and intimidation of Soviet citizens who mean him no harm. I have today sent a letter to the President urging him to protest this dragnet. I propose that upon his arrival he should immediately ask not only that these arrested Soviet Jews be released but also that they be allowed to meet with him during his visit. Perhaps such a meeting might convince the President that the right to emigrate is a legitimate concern of our foreign policy and that hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews need our help if that right is to become a reality.

PLANNING THE WORLD'S CITIES

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Wilfred Owen's article Planning the World's Cities which appeared Saturday, June 22, in the Washington Post in my opinion correctly diagnoses what must be done if the world's communities are to be made more satisfactory for its inhabitants.

The article follows:

PLANNING THE WORLD'S CITIES

(By Wilfred Owen)

By the end of this century, developing nations will have to build new housing and services equivalent to 1,500 cities of a million people each. In addition, they must catch up with a great backlog of needs in the existing cities. So they are going to require an enormous commitment of resources for this aspect of their economic development.

But it is a mistake to believe that money, by itself, will resolve these urban problems—after all, the U.S., with all its wealth, is still plagued by slums, poor housing, inadequate services, blighted landscapes and insufficient municipal budgets. What will also be needed in ample measure is a vision, commitment and compassion and advanced technology if the disorder of accidental cities is

to be replaced by planned cities, designed and built to suit human needs.

This approach to city-building was first advanced in England at the beginning of the century by Ebenezer Howard. His book, "A Peaceful Path to Real Reform," called for combining urban and rural development in a regional city of many centers. It proposed clusters of residential, industrial, commercial and cultural activity, small enough to create a human environment, but connected with other clusters to make possible the economies of a large metropolitan scale.

The methods Howard proposed are still relevant. He recommended the creation of corporations that would borrow money, acquire large tracts of undeveloped land, plan and build the city, charge rentals to industry and residents, and plow the profits from rising land values back into the community to help pay for public services.

Three-quarters of a century later, most cities have shown little inclination to adopt anything resembling a peaceful path to real reform. Instead, they have followed a planless path to real regret. Rather than being instruments of development, cities have become the instrument of their own destruction.

Singapore is one of the few exceptions. It decided 15 years ago to house its squatters and slum dwellers in satellite cities to clear the way for comprehensive renewal of the old cities. In the first decade 600,000 people moved into new satellite communities, vacating slums that are now being renewed. In the current five-year plan period, another 600,000 people are being housed.

The amount of capital needed to finance this undertaking was kept modest because the buildings were rapidly constructed and promptly rented to accelerate cash flows. Thousands of workers were trained and employed in the construction industry. And, rather than encounter financial difficulties, Singapore doubled its real per capita income in a decade.

Other planned cities include Brasilia, Shah Alam in Malaysia, Makati in the Philippines, five satellite cities around Paris, the satellites of Stockholm, Britain's 26 "new towns," and 16 new communities in the U.S. A planned city for 1.6 million people—Cuauhtitlan Izcalli—is under construction near Mexico City. There is also Japan's Tama, Ghana's Tema, Chandigarh, Canberra and Bombay's Twin City for a million inhabitants. Karachi's proposed satellites for 40,000 to 50,000 people are to be called "metrovilles."

Planned communities are experimental and have their share of problems as well as achievements. Some have earned high marks in the quality of their housing and neighborhoods, social services, well designed industrial parks and commercial centers, open space for recreation, separation of people from traffic and convenient integration of homes, schools, shops, and work places. The financial record has also been good. Costs have been reduced by economies of scale, careful land use and the capture of increased land values. The hope is that performance can continue to be improved as a means of guiding urban growth and improving existing cities. The design of complex clusters of urban activity in new regional patterns may well be aided by new developments in transportation technology.

What is now needed is a cooperative effort for the exchange of information and experience among the world's urban centers. Here are some basic requirements for a rapidly urbanizing world:

1) Newly created city-building organizations, either public or private or a combination of the two, that embody the best features of the British New Town Corporations, the Singapore Housing and Development Board, the New York State Urban Development Corporation and others.

2) Extension of present financial assistance for urban planning by the U.N. Development program, World Bank and Asian Development Bank to include entire urban systems.

3) A worldwide cooperative research and development program to include innovations in urban design, social services in housing and transportation, energy supply and conservation.

4) Energy-conserving designs for urban settlements, public transportation and changes in the design and operation of the automobile.

5) Inclusion of land use and physical planning in the formulation of national plans, which are now largely economic.

6) Manpower organization to make the unemployed or underemployed available for building construction, self-help housing and the maintenance and operation of cities.

7) Urban land reform which places land for urban development under one management and re-invests profits from increased land values in improved community services.

8) Greater flexibility and variety in city design and construction to increase people's choice and allow for spontaneous development.

9) National economic reforms, training and job creation to raise the income of the majority who are poor.

10) An international alliance of cities to launch a cooperative strategy for planned urbanization and rebuilding of whole cities. In some respects the world's future may depend not so much on the United Nations as on the United Cities.

SOVIET SAID TO SEIZE JEWS AS NIXON VISIT APPROACHES

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, for several days the media have carried accounts of arrests and detentions in the Soviet Union of Russian Jews who have applied for permission to emigrate to Israel. The reason they are being rounded up is to prevent them from demonstrating during the visit of President Nixon to the Soviet Union.

These mass arrests are not being made because these people present a threat to the President's life or safety, but because the Soviets are afraid to let the President and the world see just how many people want to leave Russia for Israel and how much they are willing to sacrifice to get there.

At this time the Congress is considering legislation which would prevent the administration from granting most-favored-nation status to the Soviet Union because that government has refused to allow free emigration. The Russians have claimed this is an internal matter and should not be tied to matters of international trade. If this is true, why are they afraid to allow the President to even see these people from a great distance?

The administration, time and again, has protested that this legislation is not necessary and is actually a detriment because it is placing a strain on Soviet-American détente. Administration spokesmen claim that Russian Jews are

being permitted to leave and that this legislation can only make matters worse for them. If this is true, why do Jews who get out of Russia and those who are forced to remain continue to press for the Mills, Vanik, Jackson proposal?

The truth is, the Russians regard this as a serious political matter and although invariably in the past they have demanded political concessions from us when trade and other agreements are made, they have never been forced to make such concessions.

And, the truth is that the détente between the Soviet Union and the United States is an agreement between nations and powers, not between peoples, and until these agreements begin to benefit people directly they will carry no great weight and will be ignored whenever it is expedient for either side to do so. Until the people see concrete evidence that détente is providing benefits for people there will be no great pressure on the governments to honor these pacts.

At this time I enter into the RECORD an article from the New York Times, June 22, 1974, describing the campaign of arrests and detentions in the Soviet Union:

SOVIET SAID TO SEIZE JEWS AS NIXON VISIT APPROACHES

(By Christopher S. Wren)

Moscow.—The Soviet authorities are rounding up Jewish activists here, apparently to forestall demonstrations during President Nixon's visit next week.

More than 30 people, some of them well-known scientists, have been arrested in Moscow and other Soviet cities, Jewish sources reported today. In at least two cases the police smashed down apartment doors to make the arrests.

Other Jews have reportedly blockaded themselves in their apartments or have gone into hiding, among them one who escaped across roofs. Still other Jews have been summoned by the authorities and warned of criminal prosecution or have been beaten up, the sources reported.

"In Moscow there's a real hunt on for Jews," asserted Aleksandr Goldfarb, a 27-year-old biochemist who said he had evaded several police traps. "We are on the run. We are under siege. It is not a very pleasant feeling to hide away like a rat."

In most of the arrests, the sources said, the police presented no warrants or formal charges. Agents who came searching for one man yesterday reportedly told his brother that they had an order to hold him for 15 days, which would cover Mr. Nixon's visit, which is to last from June 27 to July 3.

The roundup appears to be more sweeping than the similar precautions taken during Mr. Nixon's first Presidential visit here two years ago. All the Jews arrested or called in so far are believed to have applied for and to have been refused permission to emigrate to Israel.

Privately, some Jewish activists maintain that Mr. Nixon's recent statement that emigration was an internal Soviet affair has given authorities a free hand to launch such a crackdown. The Soviet press gave lavish attention to Mr. Nixon's remarks, which were made at Naval Academy graduation exercises at Annapolis.

Jews here have also been upset by suggestions that the United States might settle for a quota of 45,000 Jewish emigrants a year as a substitute for a more fundamental settlement of the emigration issue. They also want an amnesty for Jews now serving long prison terms, permission to emigrate for the "many thousands" they say have been turned

down and firm official pledges that harassment will end.

The concept of an emigration quota has been discussed here for many months, and some Jews consider that it already exists. Jews said today that they had learned through foreign radio broadcasts of a 45,000 figure suggested to Secretary of State Kissinger. It was reported in Washington yesterday that Mr. Kissinger had told senators that Moscow was ready to guarantee that it would permit 45,000 Jews to emigrate annually.

"They can find 45,000 a year from Georgia, Dagestan and Bukhara," said Maria Slepak, a 47-year-old physician. "They'll have enough for 10 years without Jews from Moscow and Leningrad. The quota does not decide anything."

BREAK INTO BEDROOM

At 8 A.M. she said, a squad of 15 uniformed policemen and plainclothes agents smashed down the front door and bedroom door to seize her husband, Vladimir, who, 47, who was in bed. One officer, who wore a padded coat to handle the Sepaks' big dog, gestured that he would kill the dog if it was not taken to another room.

"They said 'Good morning'" Mrs. Slepak recalled. "I felt like telling them it wasn't a good morning."

Mr. Slepak, a radio electronics engineer and a leading Jewish activist, was taken off to jail. The officers took the battered doors to waiting repairmen, who within an hour fixed them and even repainted and installed them.

Also arrested today were the three principal organizers of a seminar planned by unemployed Jewish scientists for July 1. Dr. Viktor L. Brailovsky, a cyberneticist, and Dr. Mark Azbel, a theoretical physicist, were picked up by three officers at Mr. Azbel's country cottage outside Moscow.

"We don't know where they have taken them," said Dr. Brailovsky's wife, Irina.

The third organizer, Prof. Aleksandr Voronel, a physicist, was hiding in a friend's apartment. He surrendered tonight after security agents who had staked out the apartment telephoned to tell him it would be worse for his host if they had to force their way in.

The police also threatened to break down the door of another seminar organizer, Dr. Aleksandr Lunts, a mathematician, when they came to arrest him yesterday.

Today, his relatives asked the local police where he had been taken. The police disclaimed knowledge and told them to bring in his picture.

Two other scientists, Aleksandr Lerner, a cyberneticist, and Viktor Pelsky, a physicist, were described as under siege in their apartments. The police reportedly prohibited the physicist's 16-year-old daughter from leaving the Pelsky apartment.

Others were able to escape arrest, such as Vladimir Prestin, who was warned by his wife that the police were outside. Lev Gendin, a 32-year-old engineer, evaded pursuers by crossing his apartment house roof.

Besides those mentioned above, Jews reported arrested today included Dimitri Ram, a scientist; Leonid Tsepin, a hospital assistant, and Yuli Kasharovsky, a radio-electronics engineer.

Those arrested yesterday included Leonid Kogan, an engineer; Boris Tsetlenok, a factory worker, Mikhail Goldblatt, an engineer, and Zakhar Teskir, a soccer player.

Two days ago, the sources said, Ilya Koltunov was beaten up by plainclothesmen in the presence of uniformed policemen and then released. Leonid Korshevoi, an engineer, was arrested today and then released unharmed.

Jewish sources also reported today that 17 Jews had been arrested in Kishinev and that some had started a hunger strike. They also reported arrests in Leningrad and Odessa

as well as interrogations in the Ukrainian cities of Kiev and Vinnitsa, but they offered few details.

Today two Kishinev Jews, identified as Sander Levinzom and Anatole Starkmann, went to the Ministry of Internal Affairs in Moscow to present an appeal on behalf of those jailed in Kishinev. Jewish sources here contended they had not been seen since.

In Moscow, five other Jews who lost jobs after they applied to emigrate have reportedly been called in and told they will face charges of parasitism, which carries a jail sentence, if they do not find jobs.

One of them, Vitaly Rubin, a 50-year-old, expert on China, was told yesterday that if he helped arrange the unofficial seminar he could be prosecuted for treason under Article 64 of the Soviet criminal code, which carries a maximum penalty of death.

Earlier this week 80 Soviet Jews signed an open letter to Mr. Nixon asking that his visit here not help "make our difficult situation an unbearable one." Some of the signers, including Mr. Slepak, were among those arrested.

SAVE THE SENIOR CITIZEN'S HOME

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it sounds unbelievable, but there are hundreds of thousands of Americans today who face the prospect of losing the one real asset they still possess—their homes.

Those are not young homeowners, with a 20- to 25-year mortgage. They are the over-65 homeowner; people "retired" from earning a living, but still forced to pay their own way in the high-priced world in which we live. It is estimated that 70 percent of the Nation's senior citizens fit this category.

Each year more of them, particularly those on low, fixed incomes, lose the economic struggle. Battered by the increased cost of living and escalating real estate taxes, they find the expense of keeping their home outracing their ability to pay. They watch their "life's dream," their "something to leave the children" go on the block for nonpayment of taxes. The dream is shattered. The legacy lost.

I find this intolerable. I believe the elderly, who have bought and paid for their homes are entitled to keep them. Therefore, I am cosponsoring legislation in Congress which will provide the elderly homeowner with direct financial aid from the Federal Treasury to reimburse him for property taxes paid to local and State governments.

Under provisions of the bill, the senior citizen homeowner, with a household income of less than \$5,000 a year, and whose real estate taxes are \$480 or more per year would receive monthly payments of \$40. If his real estate taxes were less than \$480 per year, he would receive a monthly payment equal to one-twelfth of his yearly tax bill. The claims of eligible individuals would be handled by the existing machinery of the Internal Revenue Service, eliminating any addition to the sprawling bureaucracy which now exists in Washington.

I know local and State governments

need the property tax revenue to pay for educational systems and public projects. But I also know that when you limit a person's income, you limit his ability to pay the going price of living, especially in times of rampant inflation.

Many elderly homeowners cannot keep up in today's tax race. They did in the past when they were active wage earners. They bought homes, paid their taxes and by so doing helped educate their children—and others. They helped pay for new or improved community services. Now they are retired, no longer earning a living. Their children are grown and, as they should, carrying their share of the tax load.

In the suburbs, the influx of young families triggers a boom. More schools, more streets, more services are needed. Real estate prices skyrocket, forcing property taxes upward. The retired homeowners watch their tax bills go up and their savings, if any, go down.

There is another factor which should be considered in relation to this problem. If the senior citizen loses his home, what happens? In all probability, the Federal Government will be required to provide housing for him. Usually, this means stripping property from local tax roles for public housing projects. To make up the loss in tax revenue, the local government has no alternative but to increase the tax burden on the remaining homeowners, young and old.

My tax relief bill is not a cure-all for all the problems of all senior citizens. I know it does not help those who live in rented apartments or houses. I know it does not help those who live with relatives. But, it does help the largest segment of our Nation's senior citizen population, who have helped us in the past.

It is an expensive program, costing an estimated \$4 billion. But, you know and I know the Federal Government spends much more on less worthy causes. If just a few of the useless, unnecessary programs were eliminated or trimmed, there would be more than enough saved to help our elderly keep their homes.

The threat they face today should never have been allowed to happen. It certainly must not be permitted to remain over their heads. America owes those who have paid their way over the years more than just a notice their home is up for grabs at a sheriff's sale.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1061

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished chairman and the entire Appropriations Committee for your expeditious action in bringing to the floor House Joint Resolution 1061.

The joint resolution would appropriate a total of \$179 million for the Veterans' Administration for compensation, DIC, and readjustment benefits. Public Law

93-295 that became effective May 1, 1974, will require \$100,000 for compensation and DIC payments during the current fiscal year. This new legislation will benefit some 2.2 million veterans and 375,000 widows, children, and other dependents.

The 30-day emergency extension we provided for veterans to complete their education and training under the GI bill will require \$77 million during fiscal year 1974.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, \$2 million will go to the initial implementation of the Veterans' Administration's man on campus program. The agency, by administrative action, is seeking to eliminate unreasonable delays many veterans experienced last year in receiving their educational benefits checks. I share the Appropriations Committee's concern that there be no duplication of effort between the VA's man on campus program and the veterans' cost of instruction program. The Veterans' Affairs Committee has been assured that the scope of service to be provided by its representatives would in no way conflict with that of VIC representatives already on campus. Our committee will closely monitor the program to see that it is properly coordinated.

Again, I commend the committee for its swift action and hope the Senate acts promptly to get the legislation to the President.

PRESIDENT NIXON WILL DEPART FOR EUROPE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the President will be departing for Europe and a meeting with the leaders of the Soviet Union. It is my hope that the President will bear in mind the mounting concern by large numbers of Americans over the plight of the Soviet Jews. I would like to share with my colleagues an excellent statement indicating the concern of one group, the Jewish Lawyers Association of Nassau County. At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert a letter sent to the President by the chairman of that group's social action committee, Martin N. Kroll. The letter follows:

JEWISH LAWYERS ASSOCIATION
OF NASSAU COUNTY,
Great Neck, N.Y., June 10, 1974.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your statement of June 5, 1974, delivered at the Naval Academy commencement exercises, relating to the policy of the Soviet Union concerning the freedom of Soviet Jews to emigrate, was a frightening example of the dilution of morality from American foreign policy.

While you did not specifically condone the actions of the Soviet Union in relation to the treatment of its Jewish Citizens, you stated that the situation was an internal matter of the Soviet Union in which the United States could not exercise influence.

If any country in the world were to attempt to physically or otherwise exterminate a specific segment of its population, would this be a concern of the United States of America? Do you draw the line at physical extermination as opposed to religious and

cultural extermination? Was Germany's slaughter of Jews merely an internal matter of the Third Reich which the United States looked upon with moral displeasure?

The improvement, modest as it may be, in the treatment by the Soviet Union of its Jewish Citizens, I suggest is almost exclusively the result of the pressure of various members of Congress in refusing to grant economic concessions to the Soviet Union and not a matter of private discussions between the State Department and its Soviet counterpart.

If the pressure of the Congress as expressed by members such as Senators Jackson, Javits and Buckley were not uppermost in the minds of Soviet officials, there would be no relaxation whatever in the Soviet emigration policy, and, if this pressure were removed, it is my sincere belief that the Soviet Union would revert to its former policies of permitting little or no immigration of Soviet Jews. This cannot be permitted to happen.

The right to freely emigrate is one granted by the Charter of the United Nations and is one of the basic principles of human freedom which is fundamental to the dignity of all men; it is their God-given right.

Let me point out to you that the world Jewish population in 1939 was approximately 16 million persons. Today it stands at 13 million.

The Soviet Union has the second largest Jewish population in the world; second only to that of the United States. If the Jews of this country who, I assure you, are intimately concerned with the welfare of their fellow Jews in the Soviet Union as well as the welfare of all peoples throughout the world, were to accept your posture to the effect that the treatment of Soviet Jews is a purely internal Soviet matter, then we would be placed in a position of having to sit back and tacitly condone the gradual extermination of the second most significant block of Jews in the world.

We cannot do this. We are the only significant group of people in the world who today are fewer in number than we were forty years ago. Our survival, in part, depends upon the freedom to practice our religion, no matter where we may be and the freedom to live as Jews.

This freedom which Jews have always enjoyed in America, has permitted us, as a people, to make a valuable contribution to American society.

American neutrality on this point is nothing less than American immorality. There can be no division of opinion between that of the Congress and the executive branches of Government on a matter of such vital concern as that involving the basic human dignity of six million citizens of another country who have been culturally and religiously oppressed for a period of more than fifty years.

I urge you to reconsider your position.

Very truly yours,

MARTIN N. KROLL,
Chairman, Social Action Committee,
Jewish Lawyers Association of Nassau
County.

LAND-USE PLANNING LEGISLATION

HON. RICHARD F. VANDER VEEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. VANDER VEEN. Mr. Speaker, I have begun a series of regular weekly columns which I have been sending back to newspapers and constituents in Mich-

igan's Fifth District. Among the issues I have discussed is the need for land-use planning assistance for States to run their own planning programs. I should like to share this column with my colleagues and include it at this point in the RECORD:

THE VANDER VEEN REPORT—CONGRESSMAN DICK VANDER VEEN

By the year 2000, Americans will have to build more buildings than the Nation has constructed in the past 300 years. Population will be about 300 million, and even with zero-population growth we will have to wait 50 years for our population to stabilize. By the turn of the century about 85 percent of Americans will be living in metropolitan areas. We are chewing up available land now at the rate of 3,000,000 acres a year. Much of our development is occurring in the wrong place—housing is being built in flood plains, cities are suffering from overcrowding, mountains are being gouged away, highways and airports are being located in unsuitable places and other areas, needing airports and highways, are being bypassed. A few speculators and wealthy developers may be getting richer but all Americans are being made poorer in the quality of life.

Development and growth in most of the United States have neither direction nor vision. We have not been looking ahead to the time when populations of certain cities will be doubled, when present-day suburbs will be considered part of the inner-city, and when every week in the United States, we will be building a city of 27,000 homes—a city the size of our near neighbor, Kalamazoo.

We are facing right now an environmental-energy crisis, and we will continue to face it in the days and years ahead. The increasing cost of all types of energy, and the decreasing supplies of fossil fuels make serious "energy planning" essential.

A study released last month by the Council on Environmental Quality has calculated the various costs of urban sprawl in terms of environment, energy, money and inconvenience. The study illustrates that a well planned high-density community is far superior to unplanned suburban sprawl—using 44% less in capital costs, 43% less in land costs, 43% less in energy consumption, 50% less in auto emissions and 35% less in water consumption.

I'm not saying that this type of development is the answer to all our planning and environmental-energy problems. But I am suggesting that if savings on this scale can be achieved by just a little planning forethought: location of jobs near residential areas, location of shopping facilities near homes, then encouraging all States and localities to engage in land-use planning could provide this Nation with vast dividends in lowered consumption of raw materials and lowered costs in protecting and enhancing the quality of our air and water.

I raise these questions because about two weeks ago the House of Representatives did not permit a comprehensive land-use planning bill to get to the floor of the House for a vote. This bill would have encouraged rational land-use planning, would have helped conserve energy, and provided strong support for environmental protection. I voted to bring this bill to the floor of the House for consideration but we were defeated by seven votes—204-211.

The bill is evidence that we are confronted with a massive problem in the areas of population growth and distribution, and land-use planning. The figures I have quoted indicates the problem is going to get worse and not better.

While I regret failure of the bill to reach the floor so Congressmen could vote for or against it, I am even more concerned with the politics I think were involved in defeating probably the single most important piece

of environmental legislation this Congress will consider.

The bill was supported by the National Governors' Conference, The National Legislative Conference, the National League of Cities/Conference of Mayors and the National Association of Counties—all units of State and local government who would be most affected by this legislation.

Governor Millikin, shortly before House debate, publicly stated his support for this bill. "The time for land use reform is now. In Michigan, our State program is being accelerated with the enactment of the Farm Land and Open Spaces Preservation Act, which I signed into law last week. Passage of a national land use bill will give added impetus to our efforts."

All these organizations of local and State government and our own Governor called for passage of this legislation, but we still lost by seven votes. These are leaders in local government and they did not think that Washington was going to control everything a city, county or state does in the planning field. All this bill does is provide states with planning grants to assist them in preparing their own land use and protection programs. That is what Gov. Millikin saw in this bill and he was right.

President Nixon, in his environmental message to Congress in February of 1973, stated, "Our greatest need is for comprehensive new legislation to stimulate state land use controls. We especially need a National Land Use Policy act authorizing federal assistance to encourage the states in cooperation with local governments to protect lands of critical environmental concern and to regulate the siting of key facilities such as airports, highways, and major private developments . . ."

How could such a bill fail? This is a fair question. The answer to this question, as it is to so many political ills this country is suffering, is Watergate. The President, in order to secure possible conservative votes against his impeachment by the House, is catering to the political beliefs of the men he hopes will save him when the time comes to vote on impeachment. The President is trying to buy votes in the House by using political power to kill or weaken legislation which this conservative bloc does not favor.

White House pressure killed this Land-Use planning legislation. President Nixon, as he has on mass transit, campaign reform, and oil and gas price legislation, bowed to the wishes of that geographic and political group which is most likely to support him during impeachment and trial proceedings in the Congress.

CONCERN OVER PRIVACY ABUSE

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and the Senate Government Operations Committee and Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights have been holding hearings on the individual's right to privacy, and Government data collecting procedures. Public reaction to the excesses and abuses of Watergate have made it an imperative that we press for passage of privacy legislation during this Congress.

I would like to append for the in-

formation of our colleagues, three excellent articles which have appeared in the last week in the Christian Science Monitor, the Washington Post, and the New York Times. The articles follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 21, 1974]

ANGER BUILDS OVER PRIVACY ABUSE—BLACKLISTS, ILLEGAL PROCEDURES REELED OFF IN SURVEY DISCLOSURES

(By Louise Sweeney)

WASHINGTON.—Bills to protect Americans' rights to privacy from the electric eyes of governmental data banks were backed vigorously by congressmen, former attorney general Elliot L. Richardson, and data collection experts as Senate hearings opened on the subject.

Sen. Sam J. Ervin, Jr., chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee, noted, "In my 20 years as a United States Senator, I have watched with wonder and dismay as ever more advanced technological tools, such as computers, have increasingly been used to accelerate this process of collecting, storing, and using personal information all of us without adequate legal safeguards."

He told the hearing that there are 858 federal data banks containing more than 1¼ billion records involving personal information about individuals and that more than 86 percent of them are computerized.

Only 10 percent of them are authorized by law. Twenty-nine of these banks contain derogatory "blacklist" information. Forty percent of them do not tell citizens that records are kept on them; half of the banks do not allow subjects to review or correct their files, and more than one-third do not allow file subjects access to their own records.

INFORMATION DISTRIBUTED

More than 60 percent regularly share their files with other agencies, and some agencies, among them the Internal Revenue Service and Selective Service, distribute information to other parts of the government despite pledges of confidentiality.

That information comes from a just-released, four-year survey which Senator Ervin ordered conducted by the Senate Constitutional Rights subcommittee. Although a summary was timed for release as the hearings began, the full report, "Federal Data Banks and Constitutional Rights," a 4,000-page, six-volume study, will be printed later this month.

The opening of the hearings focused on several bills "aimed at safeguarding the rights of privacy of individuals who are the subjects of these information systems," as Senator Ervin put it.

Among those testifying were Reps. Barry M. Goldwater Jr. (R) of California and Edward I. Koch (D) of New York, co-sponsors of a "right to privacy" bill.

Mr. Koch said he was optimistic about passage of some kind of privacy legislation this year because of "the public reaction to the excesses and abuses of Watergate."

"We have been forcefully reminded that we must counter the mentality in all branches of the federal establishment that intentionally or unintentionally makes government the master rather than the servant of the American people," Mr. Koch said.

"RESTORATION OF TRUST"

Mr. Goldwater urged the passage of provisions in their privacy bill prohibiting the indiscriminate use of the social security number, the distribution of census information by ZIP code, and a provision allowing individuals to have their names removed from mailing lists.

Urging the passage of privacy legislation, former attorney general Richardson said

that after Watergate "it is important to do some things that are affirmative for the restoration of trust."

When he was secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Richardson instituted the HEW Advisory Committee on Automated Personal Data Systems, considered a landmark federal effort in principles for fair personal information practices.

FBI TAGS STUDENT

Mr. Richardson told the hearing he also had planned to institute an "oversight" committee at the Justice Department dealing with privacy and trust in government. He endorsed the idea of a federal privacy board, as suggested by a bill co-sponsored by Senator Ervin, Sens. Charles H. Percy (R) of Illinois and Edmund S. Muskie (D) of Maine. But he noted such a board should be an independent one, not a division of the Justice Department or any other government agency, and that it should deal only with federal information systems, not private ones.

Senator Percy, stating that "invasions of privacy are fast becoming the rule—not the exception in American life," mentioned Lori Paton, the Mendham, N.J., high school student who to fulfill a school assignment wrote for information on the Young Socialist Alliance, was investigated by the FBI as a result of a "mail watch" of that organization, and has as a result become the subject of an FBI file which may shadow her through life.

The bill providing for a federal privacy board would provide her with access to that file, an opportunity to prove the incorrectness of anything in it, and have it corrected, Senator Percy said.

Dr. Alan Westin of Columbia University, an expert on privacy and data collection, underlined the importance of immediate passage of privacy legislation, saying "any delay would be extremely dangerous." He noted that Watergate had underlined the necessity of that legislation.

[From the Washington Post, June 18, 1974]

A FIGHT OVER DATA BANKS

Back in the mid-sixties, Congress blocked studies of a national data center because many feared that such a project would facilitate the collection and exchange of dossiers on millions of Americans. Now the same apprehensions have sparked a lively battle over FEDNET, a massive \$100-million computer network which the General Services Administration has been planning, without consulting Congress, for about two years. The system's possible implications for personal privacy were first spelled out eight weeks ago by Rep. John E. Moss (D-Calif.) and reported by Seth Kantor in a series of articles in the Detroit News. Since then, GSA's plan has also been challenged by Vice President Ford; Sens. Sam J. Ervin (D-N.C.), Barry M. Goldwater (R-Ariz.) and Roman Hruska (R-Neb.); Rep. William S. Moorhead (D-Pa.); the Office of Management and Budget, and the House and Senate appropriations subcommittees which control GSA's budget.

GSA officials profess astonishment at all the fuss. They claim that in developing FEDNET—which the agency prefers to call its "new equipment projects"—GSA is just doing its statutory job of promoting more efficient and economical government computer services. The new system is intended, GSA maintains, simply to provide the most modern nationwide data communications facilities for itself and the Agriculture Department. Critics charge, however, that the agency has much larger long-range plans. They note that FEDNET, with its network of remote terminals and sophisticated equipment, would be modular in design and therefore capable of infinite enlargement. Several legislators have received reports that GSA has

already urged other agencies, including the VA, the Bureau of Customs and the Social Security Administration, to plan to add their vast files of sensitive personal data to the network when it has been set up. Moreover, critics reject GSA's claim that technological safeguards exist to keep the various files in such a system separate and secure against improper use.

The most ominous aspect of FEDNET is that GSA has been preparing to procure all of this electronic hardware without paying much, if any, attention to what information the system might include or what kinds of privacy problems might be raised. GSA spokesmen say, essentially, that privacy isn't their department—and they are right, in the same that basic federal data-bank policies ought to be set by Congress. But this underscores the dangers of letting the system get so far ahead that an enormous nationwide network of this type can be on the verge of procurement before Congress even discovers it.

Under pressure, GSA has backed off part way. The agency still wants to go ahead with purchasing the new computers now but has decided to postpone the telecommunications part of the project until next year. That isn't good enough. The entire FEDNET scheme ought to be shelved until Congress has developed strict policies and tough controls for governmental data banks to insure that citizens' rights will be protected. House hearings have already been held on comprehensive legislation sponsored by Reps. Edward I. Koch (D-N.Y.) and Barry M. Goldwater Jr. (R-Calif.). Meanwhile, the Vice President's committee on privacy is studying the subject, and Sen. Ervin is starting hearings on several bills today. Among other things, those hearings may clarify the many aspects of FEDNET which are still too murky and mysterious. What is clear is the importance of congressional action to regain control over the use to which such advanced technology is to be put.

[From the New York Times, June 24, 1974]

PROTECTING PRIVACY

The American capacity to collect and to store information about individuals and the American tendency to express ineffectual alarm at that development have grown enormously in the last decade and a half. Unfortunately, Congress's ability to develop legislation safeguarding the individual's right to privacy has lagged far behind computer technology. The nation is left with a vague sense that information monsters inevitably threaten to transform the society in which we live.

The threat is real. The size and the extent of the data banks and information systems now in existence serving Federal, state, local and private organizations are staggering. A survey done for the Senate Judiciary Committee shows that there are 858 Federal data banks operated by 54 agencies of Government. At least 29 of those are primarily concerned with collecting derogatory information on individuals.

The initiation of new information-keeping systems is rarely inhibited by concern over their potential for invasion of privacy because they are usually established as aids to achievement of some private or governmental goal which is deemed desirable in itself. The massive \$100-million FEDNET system now being planned by the General Services Administration is a case in point. G.S.A. views it simply as part of its responsibility to establish efficient and economical computer services for the Government. The threat to privacy was apparently a minimal part of the programming decision, if it was ever considered at all.

As Congress has stood by bemused at such developments, its legislative plate has be-

gun to overflow. It now has before it general legislation on privacy, covering such issues as providing individuals with access to the information being held about them, giving them the right to review and correct that information, and developing rules limiting access to and dissemination of such stored information. In addition to general privacy legislation, a number of specific bills are pending, including measures to curb army surveillance of civilians, limit police "no knock" authority, enlarge the civil rights of Government employees, define student and parental rights to school information and more carefully limit the uses of criminal justice data bank information.

Perhaps because of Watergate, these issues that have languished for so long are receiving strong bipartisan attention. This is a hopeful sign, for if this latest round of legislative activity is to be more than an exercise in futility, national concern will have to be sustained. Heretofore, Congress has exuded the sense that the privacy problem has been too complex to handle. If it doesn't act now, that soon may be the case.

CITY PLANNING MANDATED IN AN URBANIZED WORLD

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the necessity for intensified city planning in a world rapidly becoming urbanized is most effectively advocated in the books and articles of Wilfred Owen, an authority on urban affairs with the Brookings Institution in Washington.

In a June 22 article in the Washington Post, Mr. Owen discusses some of the prominent planned cities around the world, and he emphasizes the urgent necessity for formation of Government, private, or combined public-private corporations to assume the responsibility for assuring that the cities of the future will not be characterized by the chaotic urban sprawl endemic to our cities today.

Mr. Owen makes a strong case for foresight and planning to avoid the social dislocation that threatens contemporary city dwellers caught in an aimless proliferation of uncoordinated development projects. His prospectus includes not only making cities livable by offering variety and choice, but also alleviating unemployment and poverty by putting the people to work on construction and maintenance of the planned cities he envisions.

I commend the article to my colleagues for its thought-provoking outline of some major concerns we should be facing up to in our legislative priorities over the coming months and years:

PLANNING THE WORLD'S CITIES

(By Wilfred Owen)

By the end of this century, developing nations will have to build new housing and services equivalent to 1,500 cities of a million people each. In addition, they must catch up with a great backlog of needs in the existing cities. So they are going to require an enormous commitment of resources for this aspect of their economic development.

But it is a mistake to believe that money, by itself, will resolve these urban problems—after all, the U.S., with all its wealth, is still plagued by slums, poor housing, inadequate services, blighted landscapes and insufficient municipal budgets. What will also be needed in ample measure is a vision, commitment and compassion and advanced technology if the disorder of accidental cities is to be replaced by planned cities, designed and built to suit human needs.

This approach to city-building was first advanced in England at the beginning of the century by Ebenezer Howard. His book, "A Peaceful Path to Real Reform," called for combining urban and rural development in a regional city of many centers. It proposed clusters of residential, industrial, commercial and cultural activity, small enough to create a human environment, but connected with other clusters to make possible the economies of a large metropolitan scale.

The methods Howard proposed are still relevant. He recommended the creation of corporations that would borrow money, acquire large tracts of undeveloped land, plan and build the city, charge rentals to industry and residents, and plow the profits from rising land values back into the community to help pay for public services.

Three-quarters of a century later, most cities have shown little inclination to adopt anything resembling a peaceful path to real reform. Instead, they have followed a planless path to real reform. Rather than being instruments of development, cities have become the instrument of their own destruction.

Singapore is one of the few exceptions. It decided 15 years ago to house its squatters and slum dwellers in satellite cities to clear the way for the comprehensive renewal of the old cities. In the first decade 600,000 people moved into new satellite communities, vacating slums that are now being renewed. In the current five-year plan period, another 600,000 people are being housed.

The amount of capital needed to finance this undertaking was kept modest because the buildings were rapidly constructed and promptly rented to accelerate cash flows. Thousands of workers were trained and employed in the construction industry. And, rather than encounter financial difficulties, Singapore doubled its real per capita in a decade.

Other planned cities include Brasilia, Shah Alam in Malaysia, Makati in the Philippines, five satellite cities around Paris, the satellites of Stockholm, Britain's 26 "new towns," and 16 new communities in the U.S. A planned city for 1.6 million people—Cuautitlan Izcalli—is under construction near Mexico City. There is also Japan's Tama, Ghana's Tema, Chandigarh, Canberra and Bombay's Twin City for a million inhabitants. Karachi's proposed satellites for 40,000 to 50,000 people are to be called "metrovilles."

Planned communities are experimental and have their share of problems as well as achievements. Some have earned high marks in the quality of their housing and neighborhoods, social services, well designed industrial parks and commercial centers, open space for recreation, separation of people from traffic and convenient integration of homes, schools, shops and work places. The financial record has also been good. Costs have been reduced by economies of scale, careful land use and the capture of increased land values. The hope is that performance can continue to be improved as a means of guiding urban growth and improving existing cities. The design of complex clusters of urban activity in new regional patterns may well be aided by new developments in transportation technology.

What is now needed is a cooperative effort for the exchange of information and experience among the world's urban centers. Here

are some basic requirements for a rapidly urbanizing world:

- 1) Newly created city-building organizations, either public or private or a combination of the two, that embody the best features of the British New Town Corporations, the Singapore Housing and Development Board, the New York State Urban Development Corporation and others.
- 2) Extension of present financial assistance for urban planning by the U.N. Developing Program, World Bank and Asian Development Bank to include entire urban systems.
- 3) A worldwide cooperative research and development program to include innovations in urban design, social services in housing and transportation, energy supply and conservation.
- 4) Energy-conserving designs for urban settlements, public transportation and changes in the design and operation of the automobile.
- 5) Inclusion of land use and physical planning in the formulation of national plans, which are now largely economic.
- 6) Manpower organization to make the unemployed or underemployed available for building construction, self-help housing and the maintenance and operation of cities.
- 7) Urban land reform which places land for urban development under one management and re-invests profits from increased land values in improved community services.
- 8) Greater flexibility and variety in city design and construction to increase people's choice and allow for spontaneous development.
- 9) National economic reforms, training and job creation to raise the income of the majority who are poor.
- 10) An international alliance of cities to launch a cooperative strategy for planned urbanization and rebuilding of whole cities. In some respects the world's future may depend not so much on the United Nations as on the United Cities.

THE FUTURE FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HOUSING

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the housing industry is presently in a very nebulous state. The Federal subsidization programs for low-income housing construction are being dismantled; in their place, responsibility is being placed upon the private market for the production of this housing. We must, at this time, evaluate all the implications of this change. One very important consideration is the fact that the antidiscrimination provisions of the Civil Rights Act will no longer be under strict Federal supervision. Compliance to these laws must somehow be guaranteed.

The following article by Dr. Gloria Toote, Assistant Secretary for Housing of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, appeared in the May edition of the Sacramento Observer. It addresses itself to this problem. The program of evaluation which it discusses is vital if adequate housing is to be provided in a nondiscriminatory manner. I hope that my colleagues will examine and support the field tests initiated under the leadership of Dr. Toote which are outlined below:

[From the Sacramento Observer, May 2-8]

THE U IN HOUSING CHANGING TIMES

(By Dr. Gloria E. A. Toote)

In the past, data was collected and used to discriminate against minorities, while quotas were a frequent tool to increase minority participation.

But that was in the past, and times have changed. Today quotas are no longer permissible as they "create" reverse discrimination against non-minorities, while data has become the tool of civil rights sophisticates in discovering and identifying disparate practices designed to enable discrimination.

On April 1, the Federal government announced a pilot program to collect racial, ethnic and sex information to determine the prevalence of discrimination practiced by Federally regulated lending institutions.

In May, the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (HUD) will conduct an Administrative Meeting in Hartford, Connecticut to gather facts and testimony from the public on the same issue.

This combined Federal effort will prove meaningful to minority America, as the commercial market place has become increasingly significant with the reduction of federally subsidized housing construction.

Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, the Federal Fair Housing Law, prohibits financial institutions from denying a residential real estate loan to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin, and sets forth a comprehensive statutory plan for eliminating and preventing discrimination in the sale and rental of housing.

Financing of housing is expressly covered by Title VIII, which requires all Federal agencies to administer their programs that relate to housing in an affirmative manner.

The four principal Federal financial regulatory agencies that insure home loans or supervise lending institutions, announced a six month trial program that requires lending institutions to collect information from all real estate loan applicants. The person applying for the loan must voluntarily complete a questionnaire.

The Federal regulatory agencies involved are: Federal Reserve System, Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Three procedures have been adopted for trial, in specific, designated areas. Supervised lending institutions must submit the received information from all applicants, and indicate which loans were granted for the purchase, construction, improvement, repair or maintenance of dwellings.

The field test begins on June 1, and extends through November 30. The 18 designated metropolitan areas are: Atlanta, Georgia; Baltimore, Maryland; Cleveland, Ohio; Galveston-Texas City, Texas; Jackson, Mississippi; Jersey City, New Jersey; Memphis, Tennessee; Montgomery, Alabama; San Antonio, Texas; San Diego, California; Tampa-St. Petersburg, Florida; Topeka, Kansas; Tucson, Arizona; Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa, California; and Washington, D. C.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development acts as the lead Federal agency in assuring Federal fair housing objectives. My office works closely with Federal financial regulatory agencies and urges them to take affirmative action in implementation of Title VIII. Fair Housing racial data has been collected by the Office of Equal Opportunity (HUD) since 1971 to enable the Department to carry out its responsibilities under Title VIII.

Disparate practices by lending institutions relative to minority applicants has taken many forms and is difficult to prove in the absence of positive evidence.

The opportunity will soon exist to document discrimination when it occurs during the test period. We may also find as a result

of our pilot Federal program, a new deterrent tool to limit lending discrimination.

The data secured must be evaluated with great sensitivity, and all citizens who experience financial discrimination, particularly while the program is in operation, should immediately file complaints with my office.

Failure to do so will allow an interpretation from the collected data that discrimination in financing is no longer nationally prevalent.

The risk involved in this experiment for women and minority America, will be that failure to become involved, or complacency, will assuredly result in the compilation of inadequate data that may have impact on future Federal programs.

JAMES A. FARLEY

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are few men who despite increasing years do not slow down in their effort and accomplishments. One of those rare men, however, is James A. Farley, a former Postmaster General during the Roosevelt administration who at age 85 is still going strong as honorary chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

For those of us fortunate enough to know Jim Farley, we never cease to be amazed at his zeal for life and his success in dealing with whatever situation confronts him. His pleasant manner and his amazing ability to remember all those people he meets, moreover, has given him the nickname of "Gentleman Jim."

I recently had the good fortune to attend a dinner at which Jim received the Laetare Medal—or Notre Dame University's highest award for his outstanding contribution to society.

Father Hesburgh's words on that occasion were deeply touching as was the tremendous warmth with which Jim Farley was received by those attending this memorable evening. I therefore would like to extend my remarks today to include in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues Father Hesburgh's touching words that evening, as well as several clippings which tell about amazing James A. Farley, a man truly deserving of this coveted award.

The material follows:

HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

SIR: The strength and vitality of our country can be attributed in large measure to the genius of our political system, to the vigor of our free economy and, above all, to the spiritual values which we as a nation espouse. To a remarkable degree, in your life and your work, you, perhaps more than any other man of our time, symbolize our national commitment to these values and to the proposition that honorable competition, whether in politics or business, best serves the American people.

Who could foretell that the lad of twelve who stood trackside to hear William Jennings Bryan would become Chairman of the Democratic National Committee? Who would have predicted that the Town Clerk of Stony Point, New York, would become the mentor of the President of the United States and the Postmaster General in his Cabinet? Who

could have foreseen that the young book-keeping student at Packard Commercial School would some day be Board Chairman of an American corporation operating in every corner of the world? Who, indeed, had the prescience to predict that this affable Irishman would become as familiar a figure at the Papal apartments as he was at the White House?

In retrospect, Sir, it is easier to see how your own character and Providence have combined to bring you this day. Throughout your life, you have honored the God-given dignity of every man and woman, and because of this no American has more friends. Yours has been the world of precinct committeemen and prelates, of salesmen and presidents, but you have neither been awed by the powerful nor unmindful of the powerless. You have never forgotten your friends. Your opponents and competitors hold you in the highest regard.

In politics and in business, where it is often easier to do the expedient thing, you have been a man of principle. Without losing Franklin Roosevelt's friendship or lessening your allegiance to your political party, you opposed more than two four-year presidential terms because you believed such was not in the national interest. Today, when America's faith in its political institutions and personalities is challenged as never before, you stand as a beacon of integrity.

Your public life, as well as your business career, are on record for all to see. Not so well-known is your edifying private life which you cherished with your beloved Elizabeth, your son and daughters, and now with your grandchildren. The gentility, the courage, the compassion which we have admired at a distance have been theirs to cherish close up. Yours, Sir, is the special charisma of the Catholic layman. Your influence in secular society was great at a time when the impact of Catholics generally was small. A man of faith in a world of fact, born closer to the First Vatican Council than to Vatican Council II, you anticipated by several decades the role of the layman in a church which is ever old and yet ever new.

For what you have achieved, then, but even more for what you are, the University of Notre Dame presents to you its most prized symbol of esteem and affection. As we seek to honor you, you surely honor the Medal and the University in accepting it. For your lifelong dedication to your family, to your country, and to your Church, for the decency and integrity which you have always exemplified, for the leadership you have given in countless good causes, it is my honor, as President of the University of Notre Dame, to confer upon you its Laetare Medal.

THE LAETARE MEDAL

"The Laetare Medal has been worn only by men and women whose genius has ennobled the arts and sciences, illustrated the ideals of the Church, and enriched the heritage of humanity."

These are the exacting criteria employed by the University of Notre Dame in awarding its Laetare Medal each year. Established in 1883, the medal was restricted to lay persons until 1968, when it was announced that henceforth priests and religious would also be eligible. Over the years the Laetare Medal has been presented to 74 men and 19 women—soldiers and statesmen, artists and industrialists, diplomats and philanthropists, educators and scientists.

The Laetare Medal is the American counterpart of the "Golden Rose," a papal honor antedating the eleventh century. The name of the recipient is announced each year on

Laetare Sunday, the fourth Sunday of Lent and an occasion of joy in the liturgy of the Church. The presentation of the medal is normally part of the University's commencement exercises in May.

The idea of the Laetare Medal was conceived in 1883 by Professor James Edwards. His proposal met with the immediate approval of Rev. Edward F. Sorin, C.S.C., founder and first president of Notre Dame, and the Rev. Thomas E. Walsh, C.S.C., then president of the University. Through the years the recipients of the Laetare Medal have been selected by an award committee headed by the president of Notre Dame.

Generally regarded as the most significant annual award conferred upon Catholics in the United States, the Laetare Medal consists of a solid gold disc suspended from a gold bar bearing the inscription, "Laetare Medal." Inscribed in a border around the disc are the words, "Magna est veritas et prevalebit" (Truth is might and will prevail). The center design of the medal and the inscription on the reverse side are fashioned according to the profession of the recipient.

[From the Albany Times Union, May 30, 1974]

"GENIAL JIM" FARLEY REACHES 86

(By James Kilgallen)

NEW YORK.—James A. Farley, who has had two outstanding careers in his lifetime—one in politics, the other in business—observes his 86th birthday today and has no thought of retiring.

"My health is very good and I feel all right," said Mr. Farley when I interviewed him in his midtown office where he holds down the position of honorary chairman of the board of Coca-Cola Export Corporation. "I enjoy working and meeting people."

"Genial Jim" reaches his 86th milestone manifestly disturbed over the apparent loss of White House credibility, the revelations of campaign spending in the last presidential election and the Watergate disclosures. But his confidence in the American people is unshaken and he predicted once Watergate is cleared up, "the United States will come out more united than it has been in many years."

In his heyday in politics in the 1930s Farley, as Democratic National Chairman, visited every state in the Union and served 7½ years as postmaster general in FDR's cabinet. He was often referred to by newspapermen as "Mr. Politics."

After joining Coca-Cola in September, 1940, he traveled all over the world for the company and met many noted personalities and people in all walks of life.

I asked Mr. Farley to name the six persons who impressed him most during his career in politics. He replied:

"Former Mayor James J. Walker, former Gov. Alfred E. Smith, former Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman and Lyndon B. Johnson, and former Sen. Carter Glass of Virginia."

It was Sen. Glass who placed Farley's name in nomination for the presidency at the Democratic convention in Chicago in 1940.

When asked to name the personalities who impressed him most during his extensive travels abroad, he replied:

"This is a question not easy to answer. However, I do not hesitate to say that in my opinion Pope Pius XII was the greatest person I ever met."

"Naturally, I was impressed at the opportunity I had to meet and talk with Winston Churchill, General Franco, Chiang Kai-shek, and Mussolini who was at the height of his power in Italy in 1934 and at the time he was doing a great job for his country."

[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 no 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 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

*Except from Laetare Medal citation presented to General William Starke Rosecrans in 1896.

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 upon 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.

[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 affability."

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 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 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 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), Sargent Shriver (1968), 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.

IS IMPEACHMENT A PRIMITIVE POLITICAL WEAPON?

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the process

of impeachment is so unnatural and unused under our American system that the very novelty of it arouses a wide range of public interest. To many it is indeed a primitive weapon which should be employed, if at all, under the most extreme of circumstances. It was virtually abandoned in Britain 168 years ago. In this country it was directed at one President, more than 100 years ago—and then to assuage violent political emotions, based upon charges not really impeachable under the Constitution.

Thus, long ago the Anglo-Saxon system veered away from beheading, and then from impeachment, to the use of the ballot box as a means of invoking accountability for those in power.

Mr. O. R. Strackbein, an eminent historian, has written a paper on this subject. It is scholarly and very revealing, and places 20th-century impeachment in proper perspective. The article should be read by all who are genuinely interested in the current impeachment clamor. It follows:

IMPEACHMENT: A PRIMITIVE POLITICAL WEAPON

(By O. R. Strackbein)

The impeachment procedures relating to the Presidency of this country are patterned after the British system. There the House of Commons brings the charges, and if these are sustained, the case goes to the Lords for trial. Here the House of Representatives replaces the Commons, and the Senate, the Lords, in the process of impeachment and trial.

In England impeachment has fallen by the wayside. The latest Prime Minister who was threatened with it was Lord Palmerston who was in office in mid-nineteenth century. The preliminary motion to develop evidence on which to proceed was itself, however, defeated; so nothing came of it.

In the earlier 1800's only two charges that might have led to impeachment of high officials were lodged. One (1805) was against Lord Melville, First Lord of the Admiralty, and the other against Lord Ellenborough, Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench. Neither motion survived the House of Commons. In other words, no one has been impeached in Britain in nearly two hundred years.

One cause of the atrophy of the impeachment muscle is thought to lie in the nature of the parliamentary system wherein the Prime Minister and his Cabinet may be turned out of office by a vote of no confidence. Instead of waiting to the end of the set term of office an interim turnover may be accomplished. While this was nothing new, since upsetting of a going House was an old practice, it can only be surmised that experience with the impeaching process was so unhappy that it was set aside in favor of the vote of confidence. In any event impeachment in Britain represents a relic of history that can now quite safely be regarded as archaic.

This obsolescence followed that of a previous prevalent practice: namely, decapitation. This was a political instrument of the sharpest edge, not only in England but, notoriously in France during the Reign of Terror. During the 15th, 16th and even the 17th centuries in England beheading was a favorite means of ridding the scene of political opponents if they could not be captured. During the War of the Roses, when York battled Lancaster and vice versa, a lordship's gory head not infrequently was seen to adorn city gates and parks, usually mounted on a pike, as convincing evidence of who was boss or, more certainly, who was not. Not even queens escaped. Mary lost her head to her younger sister Elizabeth in mid-16th century. It was almost sure to be the one or the

other. A hundred years later Charles I of England made his last bow on the block.

From beheading to impeachment represented progress in the process of amelioration that set in during the first half of the last century that saw the execution of poachers and the imprisonment of debtors vanish. At about the same time the settlement of private encounters by dueling moved away from the crimson path to less gruesome endings. Oddly enough, while in England impeachment went out, we, in this country, are on the verge of reverting to the primitive usage of the rusty instrument.

In England, the origin of impeachment "lies in the 14th century, when it grew up as a means of initiating criminal procedures based on 'clamor' or outcry." So says the Encyclopedia Britannica.

"The Good Parliament of 1376 proclaimed the first recognized cases of impeachment," says the same source. The most important case was that of William, Lord Latimer. The latter had been "closely associated with the government of the aging Edward III, which was under hot attack." His case, says Britannica, revealed "a characteristic which persisted; subsequent victims of impeachment (in Britain) have often been political figures. Usually they have been royal ministers as well."

After the trial in 1459 of Thomas, Lord Stanley "impeachment fell out of use" for a long period, nearly two hundred years. In 1620-21 Sir Giles Mompesson was successfully impeached in the reign of James I who tried unsuccessfully to prevent the action.

"Flourishing their new-found weapon the Commons attacked much more important victims." Among these were Francis Bacon and the Earl of Essex. "Their success (i.e., that of the Commons) was dramatic; for thus the chief officers of the crown were otherthrown." Those were the days, of course, of intense struggle against the monarchy.

The political character of impeachment was showing its true color.

The account (Britannica) continues: "By it (i.e., impeachment) unpopular ministers and favorites, such as the Duke of Buckingham (1626), Archbishop Laud (1640), the Earl of Strafford (1640-41), the Earl of Clarendon (1667) and Danby (earlier: 1678-79) were brought down or at least brought into jeopardy."

Between 1620 and 1715, indeed, "there were about 50 cases of impeachment." The account then notes that "in attacking royal ministers the Commons were in effect attacking their policies." (Emphasis added).

The next sentence in the account throws some light on the current dispute about the question of Presidential impeachment on grounds other than a criminal act. It says: "Yet they (the Commons) could proceed by impeachment only if a minister could be convicted of a crime."

On this point the account dwells long enough to say: "Strafford's case had shown that a wary minister was often hard to trap in a net. A minister might be punished severely for some trivial offense which had been cozened up and which was not the real point at issue."

Probably the most celebrated of the British impeachment cases was that of Warren Hastings who was the Governor General of India. His situation was not political in the sense of the impeachment of Andrew Johnson in 1868 in this country. Warren Hastings, however, was pursued by a bitter enemy in the person of Sir Philip Francis, who had been appointed by Lord North (Prime Minister and well known in American history books on the American Revolution) to the supreme council of Ft. Williams, Calcutta. With two colleagues he engaged in "a long and bitter struggle with Warren Hastings," which after the death of his (Francis') two colleagues "culminated in a duel between him (Warren Hastings) and Francis (1730) in which the latter was wounded."

Quoting further from the Encyclopedia: "Francis returned to England in 1781, having failed to realize his ambition to wrest the Governor-Generalship from his rival" (Warren Hastings). (Emphasis added).

He (sir Philip Francis) back in England became "tireless in the publication of anonymous pamphlets," and won the support of public opinion, "turning it against Hastings; and he was the moving spirit in Hastings' impeachment."

This account adds the observation that the acquittal of Hastings which occurred only after 7 years (1788-95) was a bitter blow to Sir Philip "and in 1796 (the year after the acquittal) Francis (a member of the House) lost his seat at the general election."

This account concludes by saying: "Francis was a man of vast ability, but rancorous, unforgiving and prone to malignity."

On the subject of impeachment as a whole the account has this to say: "Never were the limitations of impeachment more clearly shown than in the case of Warren Hastings. It was then proved beyond doubt that in a complicated case the instrument was far too blunt and its use could entail interminable delays. Moreover, the new criminal process against a royal minister which was incapable of being stopped by the King had at length passed away."

In our own country impeachment has also had infrequent use, most of it against Federal judges (7 of 11 cases—6 being against district judges and one against a Supreme Court Justice). The first one (1797) involved a United States Senator. The impeachment was dismissed but he was expelled from the Senate. (Encyclopedia Brit.)

The most celebrated case after Supreme Court Justice Samuel Chase (1803) was, of course, that of President Andrew Johnson. That this proceeding was politically motivated bears of little or no doubt. Johnson sought to follow Lincoln's moderate policy toward the Confederate States. The Radical Republicans were bitterly opposed to such moderation. In the 1866 Congressional election Johnson campaigned vigorously and not softly against these Radical Republicans but they captured the House overwhelmingly and had enough votes for impeachment. After a first failure, impeachment was voted in 1868. The Senate fell short by one vote of the two-thirds needed to convict.

What had been proved? That a politically dominant House motivated by strongly held policy objectives, holding the advantage of a majority position, could find grounds for impeachment.

That impeachment has been discredited in England seems clear enough. Since 1806 or 168 years ago the instrument has been discarded. A move against Prime Minister Lord Palmerston in mid-century over a hundred years ago, as noted, did not survive the preliminaries.

In this country we have had the singular experience of 1868, so far as impeachment of a President is concerned. The British experience has spanned nearly six centuries, but has been so largely negative that it has been abandoned. Our own experience has been so meager outside of the impeachment of judges that no guidelines worthy of the name have been established. "The principal criticism directed at the impeachment process (in this country) is that it is cumbersome and anachronistic. An impeachment trial occupies the entire Senate from 16 days to 6 weeks, fills 1000's of pages of testimony and involves conflicting and troublesome political pressures." (Ency. Brit.)

Impeachment is not a product native to the United States. Moreover, its incorporation into our Constitution represented a lack of faith in the very system of checks and balances associated with the separation of powers that distinguished our Constitution from all its forerunners. Only if this system

should fall of its purpose would there be need of a backstop. Only if the new system of 1787 which incorporated the foremost thought of the 18th century political philosophers, should fail, could a surety in the form of impeachment as a remedy against, treason, bribery or other high crimes or misdemeanors, become necessary. Only such a confession of failure or fear of it would justify the impeachment process.

The adoption of impeachment by the British was part and parcel of the struggle against the monarchy. We, however, threw off the monarchy and have had none since the establishment of our republic. Why then should the people hold in their hands a weapon that was generated by the struggle against monarchy?

The impeachment provision of our Constitution sits like some alien bastard-form in the midst of our governmental structure. By assigning the initiation of impeachment to the legislative branch, a thoroughly political body and then mixing a judicial seasoning to the trial in the Senate by bringing the Chief Justice in as the presiding officer, the process invites or makes inevitable practices that are severely condemned and strongly guarded against in our system of jurisprudence. The process is not only grotesque in re-mixing the separated powers, but is at odds with the tireless efforts in our judicial system to prevent the intrusion of partisan passions and prejudgment of guilt or innocence into the premises.

Our legislators, the prosecutors and judges in the impeachment process, are elected every two years—all the members of the House and one-third of the Senate. Our news media, both press and electronic, are deeply immersed in the shaping of public opinion, which in turn is an immeasurable but anxious concern of all the candidates for Congress. When the impeachment process, even preceding the official preliminaries, is beset by the "clamor" or "outcry" of the media, the influence on candidates and prospective candidates, cannot be brushed aside as an innocent or neutral accompaniment of the quest of justice.

The impeachment process as we have it, and as the British also had it, invites unworthy political passions and animosities to infect the healthy tissue of our Constitutional system. It plays into the hands of mob psychology that is responsible for the obfuscation of principles of justice through emotional outcries, such as led Walter Bagehot to write over a hundred years ago: "The accusations which are brought against a public man in his own age are rarely those echoed in after times."

Impeachment is a process by which a high public official is charged "in his own age" and tried by those who are saturated with the "clamor" and "outcry" of the day. If in "after time" the accusations are seldom echoed, it does the victim little good if he was sentenced "in his own age".

The British who, so far as our practice and form are concerned, initiated us into the pursuit of impeachment have long thought better of it, and have abandoned the semi-barbaric process, if not use for a century and a half or more can be interpreted as abandonment.

Shall we be far behind?

BASIL PATERSON SPEAKS TO PROBLEM OF BLACK POLITICS AND POWER

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in our troubled urban communities today there

are many devastating reminders of the lack of communication between the business community, governmental agencies, and the needs of the poor. In recent years we have heard expressions of frustration from some segments of our society that social welfare programs have become so complex and bureaucratically inefficient as to make them almost unmanageable. Yet in our rush to criticize the existing system, we must not lose sight of the fact that the needs of the poor must ultimately be met by someone, either Government or private industry if our cities are to continue to grow and prosper. The American business community has a unique responsibility for providing leadership in areas of urban economic development.

Basil Paterson, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee and former New York State Senator has made a stimulating analysis of the need for strong leadership from business in the fight against poverty, and has proposed some concrete steps toward achieving this goal. I wish to insert the following speech delivered at a recent conference of the "One Hundred Black Men" in New York City for the benefit and interest of my colleagues:

ONE HUNDRED BLACK MEN, ALL DAY
CONFERENCE

A former black subcabinet member in Washington is fond of telling people of his first few days in office. It seems while sitting at his desk one day there was loud commotion outside and he soon heard violent protestations over the much weaker feminine voice of his secretary. On investigation it turned out that she was facing three brothers decked out in Dashiki, buffalo hide sandals, rings in their ears, topped by full-blown Afros.

The official, asking what he could do for them, received the reply that they were there demanding some kind of action on unemployment programs, welfare rights for mothers and Government grants. What's more they indicated if he did not come up with a program fast they were going to wreck the joint. The official wasn't unused to the street and knew that the worst thing he could do was to show signs of fear, weakness or indecision. So, he quickly showed them into his office, asked them to excuse him for a quick moment and closed the door between them and his secretary's outer office. "Now listen," he told her, "when I get in there with those brothers, wait five minutes and then buzz me on the intercom. After that hang up and I'll take it from there."

The official returned to his office, allowed them to start talking about why they were there and about what they were going to do to him and to his office if he did not come up with some funds for the programs they had mentioned. After five minutes, right on schedule, the phone rang. The administrator picked it up, said hello and carefully waited until he heard the almost inaudible click which meant the secretary had hung up. Then he started talking into the dead line while his visitors patiently stared and waited. "Now wait a minute," he said angrily, "You don't know who you're talking to, do you? You will, what?" The official leaped to his feet as he acted out talking to someone on the other end of the telephone. Eyes blazing, he said, "I don't care how big you are or what you have on your hip." The administrator was yelling at the top of his voice while his visitors sat transfixed at the scene of this mild mannered government official suddenly gone berserk. "Listen," he said, "you come right on over here and bring your entire

gang with you. I'll be waiting." With that he reached into his desk drawer and pulled out a very large pistol which he placed in the middle of his desk. The three visitors just sat there, scarcely able to believe what was happening. The official, however, continued to rave, "I'm going to drop the first S.O.B. who walks in that door even if they have to carry me out of here feet first." He suddenly stopped as if only once again aware of his visitors, looked at one of them and said, "watch out fellow, you're right in the line of fire." With that the leader jumped up and said to the others, "come on men let's get out of here. Can't you see this brother's busy?"

Now this formal black government official was not suggesting that the era of our grass roots brothers and sisters is at an end or should end, nor was he saying that there are no more social welfare programs, poverty programs, racial and economic injustices that do not need attention. What he was suggesting and I am stating is that many of the problems we face today are so sophisticated, so couched in subtleties and generally so complex that it is vital that we all join our grass roots brothers and sisters who so gallantly carried a large part of the struggle over the past two decades. Today, that struggle must be shared by you. It must be joined by trained professionals who can apply administrative know-how. It must be joined by trained professionals who can apply management talents. It must be joined by trained professionals who can apply good sound business techniques and who can enlist the support of an affluent and influential, black and white community to that cause . . . which is the direction in which the 100 black men are obviously moving.

Last week I read an article in the New York Times entitled "Lead Paint Ban Tying up Mortgage Help for Poor." The story described how low income black families in the city of Philadelphia were unable to obtain home loan financing through FHA because a local action group known as "The Citywide Coalition Against Childhood Lead Based Poison" had successfully brought suit and won an order forbidding the housing department to sell any more properties before they could be certified lead-free.

This, in effect, left thousands of home-hungry blacks without any means of financing since realtors refused to spend the necessary \$600 to \$1,000 that it would take to de-lead their homes before qualifying for FHA appraisals. Mortgage brokers, in turn, said that it was just not worth it. As a result, today FHA applications have dropped from approximately 250 per week to less than 50. The hue and cry in the city is against the judge who issued the restraining order and the community action group who filed the suit. The word is that they are bad because they have deprived hundreds of thousands of young black families from being homeowners. But this is not true. As I am sure most of you can see the real culprits are the realtors who would refuse to cut their margin of profit to ensure a young child's safety. And, as is so often the case today, the co-culprit is the Federal Government itself—the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, as it spends its Federal allocations fighting "the citywide coalition against childhood lead based poison" in court, is insisting that it cannot spend \$600 per black family to save a small child from what could be permanent brain damage. It is, sadly, a well documented study in the never ending conflict between money and morality, technology and ethics, and law and one's own conscience. It is a prime example of the invidious racism and classism that is practiced against blacks and all poor and deprived individuals.

Those are the kinds of problems that you here in this audience must begin to combat. We need only look to one of our own leaders,

Frederick Douglass, to find the Axiom: "Men may not get all they pay for in this world but they most certainly pay for all they get."

Gentlemen, we need each and every one of you to set the goals and the directions. But what are the problems? What are the immediate and the future goals? We can spend money controlling the nutrient intake of our astronauts, yet school lunches are cut back and helpless people still starve in this country and in the Sahel. We can level city block after city block to make room for new highways, skyscrapers and shopping centers, yet the households they displace and the families they uproot are squeezed into overcrowded rooms with walls covered with enough lead-based paint to kill two hundred children a year. Day after day after day we find that the funds and the resources we do have are used at the wrong time in the wrong places and in the wrong manner. Someone once said "it is a comedy to those who think and a tragedy to those who feel."

There is much talk today about the judicial process and the criminal justice system. "Law and order" was the cry that helped elect Richard Nixon and his cohorts and what do we find now? Spiro Agnew convicted. Others pleading guilty, others under indictment and maybe the President himself not only will be ousted but could be indicted, convicted and jailed.

Here was an administration in pretentious piety bending and breaking laws on the principle of pursuing their own vision of justice and proving very quickly as the New York Times editorial proclaimed, "that official lawlessness in pursuit of order ultimately produces tyranny not justice." But closer to home . . . can we be content as administrators, businessmen and managers all knowing that blacks are four times more likely to be arrested as whites? Can we be content when their chances of being prosecuted are twice as bad? When three times as many blacks are found guilty of crime as their white counterparts? When blacks and the poor are more likely to be given more time when sentenced than any other groups? When they are more likely to be imprisoned and when they are less likely to receive probation? Can we be content when sociologist Melvin Wolfgang tells us that of all the non-whites born in the city of Philadelphia in the year 1945 who were residents there from their tenth through their eighteenth birthday, 56% of them have been arrested at least once? And, just so none of you think that perhaps you may have moved up into a social strata where you no longer have to fear being victims of this kind of racism, let me quote you the following statistic: In 1970 the average white violator was sentenced to just 12.8 months in jail for the crime of income tax evasion. That very same year the average black violator was sentenced to an average of almost 29 months in jail for the same crime. And if we were to look closer we would find that blacks in each case were involved with considerably smaller amounts of money. How many of you here today feel that you could have gotten off as lightly as did our President on his income taxes? Or the former Vice President? A study by the administrative officers of the United States courts in 1969 showed that people who could not afford private attorneys could always depend on receiving twice as severe a sentence by a judge.

Blacks certainly have to be considered whenever we talk about the poor but realistically let's not limit consideration of poverty and deprivation to any one ethnic group. Does a Puerto Rican mother on welfare in the south Bronx have any fewer problems than a black mother on welfare in southside Chicago? Does a Chicano day laborer in southern California face fewer hardships than a black construction worker here in New York City? Are Eskimos in far off Alaska or Ameri-

can Indians in South Dakota any less victimized by past prejudices and present day unconcern? Is the Appalachian white or the Oklahoma Okie any less deprived than the black share-croppers of Mississippi?

Obviously, all these groups face the same staggering problems and are the product of a society whose members have exhibited a keen disinterest in resolving problems that don't pinch their toes. But that myopia must be cured if the body politic is to survive.

For those outside, the urban problem becomes the urban crisis only when the maladies of the ghetto are found to be contagious. Then it's discovered that human misery cannot be contained or cordoned off. We find youngsters hooked on drugs in Scarsdale and Beverly Hills as well as in the South Bronx and Central Harlem. Only then does this society recognize not only the inevitable cancerous pattern of such social problems, but the inexorable economic connection between uninterrupted poverty and uninterrupted tax escalation.

There is no need to further recount the litany of abuse and deprivation we as a people have experienced at the hands of a system allegedly designed to serve "all the people." There is no need to further recite the failures of that system. That is a story indelibly imprinted in the minds of us all.

There is a need, in fact a compelling urgency, for those of us who occupy roles of leadership, large or small, to lead. There is a need for us to learn to use the political system, as it has been used, is being used, and will continue to be used, for the benefit of certain people—but the certain people we are concerned about are all the underprivileged, under-represented and unresponded-to of the Nation.

There may have been a time when one could go to and from his or her daily job and read about government in the abstract. That time is history! Government and politics directly influences, and on an ever-growing scale, the ebb and flow of the quality of our lives.

If we are to be automatons, we can accept others making the decisions that determine how we live. However, if we are to use the brains that God gave us, and the sophisticated training that many of us have been

fortunate enough to receive, then we shall insist that we have an input in determining our destiny, and in so doing, the people who were brought to this country in chains may well be the catalyst for setting it free.

To a certain extent, black politics is still an estoric concept, although discussed but not clearly understood by many of us who have the leadership responsibility to give it substance, meaning, and direction.

The obvious challenge is for us to learn from our past, painful experiences and move from political rhetoric to the development and exercise of real political power. Frederick Douglass said it more than one hundred years ago, "politics, black or white, is meaningless without power."

CONGRESSMAN WYDLER'S 1974 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, it has become a tradition in my Fabulous Fifth Congressional District to send periodic reports of my activities to constituents and to ask, each year, for my constituents' views on important national and international issues. This is done by the mailing of a questionnaire, and I have been doing this for each of the 12 years that I have represented my district in Congress.

A copy of this questionnaire is sent to each household in the congressional district, regardless of the occupants' political affiliation. By using this method, I can truly test the prevailing opinions on great national issues.

Again this year, thousands upon thousands of people in my congressional district have answered the questionnaire. The results have been tabulated, and I am in the very difficult process of an-

swering the many special comments and requests that I have received with the questionnaire returns. This enthusiastic response proves once again that people do care about their Government and want to share their views concerning it with those who represent them.

I intend to send a copy of the questionnaire results to each home in my congressional district; and I consider these results the best available measure of the real feelings of my district on these important questions. The results truly represent the voice of the people.

MY REACTIONS

Following are my general comments and personal interpretations of the results I received: The people of my district do not support nor favor the impeachment of the President. Fifty-five percent answered the question "Do you believe Congress should impeach the President now?" with a no; 35 percent answered yes; and 8 percent were undecided. The most overwhelming yes answer was obtained to the question "Do you favor a defense budget which will keep us the strongest Nation in the world?" 77 percent favor it. The closest results were obtained on the question "Do you favor continued U.S. military and economic support for Israel?" 44 percent answered yes; and 42 percent answered no; with 13 percent undecided. Equally close were the questions on the continued operation of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the question of whether Congress should propose its own overall Federal budget. Finally, the people overwhelmingly approved a \$200 limitation on individual contributions in congressional campaigns, and I intend to act positively on this recommendation, obtained through my questionnaire, in my forthcoming campaign for reelection. I will respond directly to the voice of the people. The complete results are as follows:

RESULTS OF THE ANNUAL "FABULOUS FIFTH" QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE 5TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, NASSAU COUNTY, N.Y.

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided		Yes	No	Undecided
1. Campaign financing—Do you believe income taxes should be used to finance all Federal campaigns?	34.52	55.36	10.12	9. Economic opportunity—Do you favor continued operation of the Office of Economic Opportunity?	36.22	39.04	24.74
2. Health insurance—Do you favor a national health insurance as called for by President Nixon?	60.78	23.67	15.55	10. Federal budget—Do you believe the Congress should propose its own overall Federal budget?	39.92	37.79	22.29
3. Support for Israel—Do you favor continued U.S. military economic support for Israel?	44.60	42.11	13.29	11. Defense spending—Do you favor a defense budget which will keep us the strongest Nation in the world?	77.69	12.99	9.32
4. Soviet Union-China relations—Do you believe the present "détente" with the Soviet Union and China is in the best interest of the United States?	60.66	20.92	19.02	12. Gas rationing—Do you favor gas rationing for each driver of 10 gallons per week?	14.72	76.79	8.49
5. Impeachment—Do you believe Congress should impeach the President now?	35.94	55.30	8.76	13. Offshore oil drilling—Do you favor oil drilling off the Atlantic coast?	57.01	30.38	12.61
6. Abortion—Do you favor abortion on demand?	55.90	35.48	8.62	14. Campaign contribution ceiling—Would you favor a \$200 limit on individual contributions in congressional campaigns?	73.27	17.29	9.44
7. Private school aid—Do you favor some form of Federal aid for private schools?	50.28	44.44	5.28				
8. Press treatment—Do you believe the President has received evenhanded treatment by the press and T.V.?	38.03	54.34	7.63				

EVEN THE WELL TO DO BEGIN TO FEEL INFLATION'S BITE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, rather than improving, the Nation's inflation continues at an ever more rapid pace. In-

flation continued through April at an annual rate of more than 7 percent, in spite of the sharpest drop in food prices in 7 years, according to a Government report on May 21. Living costs of the typical urban worker's family in April were up more than 10 percent from a year ago, which is substantially more than the average increase in pay. The result is a decline in the consumer's purchasing power.

The way to solve the inflation problem

is well known. Despite this fact, those in a position to influence events hesitate to take the necessary steps, and the situation continues.

The June 3, 1974, issue of the Inflation Survival Letter points out that:

Most economists and many politicians know how to control inflation, how to turn inflation back to zero percent... Essentially, inflation can be stopped dead by two actions: by the Federal Reserve in strictly limiting the creation of additions to the

money supply and by cutting down on credit; by the federal government in limiting expenditures to the amount of revenues; should the administration and Congress wish to apply the surplus to the reduction of the national debt. As simple as that. But it won't happen because politicians lack both the integrity and the will to make it happen.

In its issue of June 3, 1974, U.S. News & World Report looked at inflation during the past 5 years. Suppose, the magazine stated, that 5 years ago you put \$1,000 in some typical forms of investment. How would each have protected you against the effects of inflation—a 32 percent rise in living costs since May 1969?

The answers are quite revealing—\$1,000 in common stocks would now have a real value of \$784, a loss of \$216; \$1,000 in corporate bonds would now have a real value of \$871, a loss of \$129; \$1,000 in U.S. Government bonds would now have a real value of \$795, a loss of \$205; \$1,000 in a saving account would have a real value of \$947, a loss of \$53.

Only three investments showed a profit—\$1,000 invested in a new home would now have a real value of \$1,045, a gain of \$45; \$1,000 in gold mining stocks would have a real value of \$1,647, a gain of \$647; and \$1,000 in U.S. gold coins would now have a value of \$3,434, a gain of \$2,434.

It is high time that American citizens be given the right to own gold. It is, as these statistics show, one of the few ways to stay ahead of the massive government-induced inflation. Hopefully, the expression of support for this policy by Secretary of the Treasury William Simon will soon be translated into action.

I wish to share with my colleagues the article concerning inflation and how it is affecting the American people which appeared in U.S. News & World Report of June 3, 1974, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

EVEN THE WELL-TO-DO BEGIN TO FEEL INFLATION'S BITE

Increasingly, inflation is wreaking havoc on the budget of American families.

More and more people are failing to pay their bills on time.

More automobiles are being repossessed by the finance companies.

Banks and savings and loan institutions are spending more time and money dunning home-owners who have missed payments on their mortgages.

And it's not just those at the bottom of the income ladder who are hard-pressed to make ends meet. The evidence suggests that a surprising number of people who have always given the impression of being well off—people making as much as \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year—are pleading with their creditors for extra time or trotting down to the local consumer-counseling service for some much-needed advice on what to do about budgets that are coming apart at the seams.

As a New York banker explains it, inflation simply means that today the typical family has less cash left over after buying the bare essentials—food, rent, utilities, medical care. By the time these are covered at today's prices, there may not be enough left to pay the note on the car or the accounts that come in on the credit cards.

THE GRIM STATISTICS

Inflation continued through April at an annual rate of more than 7 per cent, in spite of the sharpest drop in food prices in seven years, according to a Government report on

May 21. The rise was a good deal less than that of the previous month.

Even so, living costs of the typical urban worker's family in April were up more than 10 per cent from a year ago, and that was substantially more than the average increase in pay. The result was a decline in the consumer's purchasing power—and debt-paying ability.

The chart on this page shows what inflation has done in the past year to people at different income levels.

Figures compiled by several nationwide organizations tell of a rising tide of delinquencies on loans of various types. The American Bankers Association says its figures on tardy installment payments are the highest since it began collecting such information 20 years ago.

Early this year, when the slump was at its worst, more than 5 out of every 1,000 cars financed by auto dealers were being repossessed. The Midwest Recovery & Adjustment Services, Inc., in Detroit has taken back 1,100 cars this year, compared with 750 in the same period in 1973.

Problem loans on mobile homes are even more troublesome, with payments running late on 70 loans per 1,000 and repossession of 7 out of 1,000.

Reports from the Mortgage Bankers Association and the United States League of Savings Associations indicates that delinquencies on home mortgages are inching upward.

So far, lenders are quick to note, the majority of people who miss a payment soon make it up. Mortgage foreclosures, for example, have not yet shown a significant increase.

A spokesman for the Mortgage Bankers explains the way inflation works in the typical case:

"When the borrower gets to the end of the month, the grocery bill has taken more than he expected. Gas and electricity and the phone bill are higher. He has had to pay more for gasoline. There simply isn't enough to pay all the other bills, so he has to figure out which ones to skip. First he'll let the installment loan on the car go by. At the end of the month, he catches up on that one, but he misses the payment on the mortgage. A month later, he catches up on that and misses something else."

Generally the bankers say they are doing everything possible to help troubled customers. But keeping up with them has become a much more difficult and costly task.

The Home Federal Savings and Loan Association of Columbia, S.C., has sent out a dozen "demand notes" in the past two months. That compares with only one or two a month last year. Vice President Hayne W. Inabinet says that large commercial accounts on apartments and motels have become especially difficult to collect.

Christian Dahl, vice president and senior credit officer for the personal-banking division of Irving Trust Company in New York, says his company is "working overtime in collections."

THE NEW POOR

As they check up on shaky loans, lenders are discovering that more of the accounts are owed by people who in times past seemed "as sound as a dollar." Mr. Dahl says, "We have noticed some increase in difficulty among higher-income people—those making between \$35,000 and \$60,000—in meeting their loan payments."

Says a spokesman for a New York finance company, Avco Financial Services:

"Middle-income and upper-middle-income people are definitely feeling the pressure. These are the people with all the charge accounts and cars to support."

A bank in Detroit reports that its list of slow payers now includes "a number of people whom we hadn't expected to be de-

linquent—people who were good risks, who'd had no trouble before."

Organizations engaged in helping such people tell the same story.

Frederic Perley, manager of Consumer Credit Counselors, in Affluent Marin County just north of San Francisco, says that his clients nowadays "are doctors, attorneys, certified public accountants, professionals of all kinds, as well as blue-collar and white-collar workers." Mr. Perley explains:

"Generally, from 50 to 70 per cent of the people are living on the border line, considering their take-home pay, expenses and the credit they have set up, whether personal or for business. They all have encumbrances, and they need cash flow."

The inflation we're seeing is a very definite problem for many who are not used to retrenching."

The executive director for the Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Greater Boston, William J. Magan, declares, "The average income of people coming in to see us is creeping up; we are seeing the professional people now—doctors, dentists and lawyers."

HIGHER OVERHEAD COSTS

In Detroit, a man who cleared more than \$21,000 last year from a uniform-rental service typifies the problems and growing dilemma of the small businessman. The uniforms he buys and rents out have gone up 28 per cent in the past six months. The commercial laundry that cleans the uniforms has just raised its fees 10 per cent. Gasoline for his delivery truck, which cost only 25 cents a gallon a year ago during a "price war," currently costs at least 55 cents.

The uniform company has some customers on long-term contracts; on those it has no leeway to raise its charges. Other customers were treated to a 7 per cent boost last year, even though competition makes such hikes difficult.

The Detroit businessman complains that to meet personal expenses he has to dip into receipts that should be set aside for the business. And he figures there is not much extravagance in the way he and his wife and two small sons are living. An occasional vacation and a night out each week are the only luxuries they maintain. He pays for the night on the town by earning an extra \$50 a week doing delivery work for another man.

They've given up steak dinners. His wife has had her hair cut short so that she can take care of it herself. They've planted their own garden for the first time to save on vegetables, and they plan to reduce the use of air conditioning this summer.

"We're just scraping by," the businessman insists. "We're not putting anything back into the business."

COPING—OR FAILING

The strategies devised by others who are feeling the same squeeze vary.

Some discover they have done too much "secret borrowing"—paying for too many things with their credit cards—and that dispensing with these accounts is a partial solution.

In fact, halting use of such credit is one step required by the Credit Counseling Centers, Inc., of Detroit. Albert O. Horner, president of the nonprofit service, explains:

"One of the things we have them do is bring in their credit cards and take out the scissors and cut each card in two. We return the cards to the companies with a note explaining what is happening and saying that these people may want to ask for new cards when they get straightened out."

"It's a ceremony," Mr. Horner adds. "It makes a point."

In other cases, people pay bills by resorting to yet another loan. Mr. Inabinet in Columbia, S.C., complains that a good many

people in the past two or three months have taken out second mortgages on their homes through finance companies and then notified his savings and loan. "That'll put them behind that much more," he says. "They'll have two payments rather than one."

STRINGENT LIFE STYLE

The general tendency, however, is for people to pull in their belts, cut out some expenses. As might be expected, this is particularly the case with those who have succeeded thus far in keeping their heads above the financial waters.

One family in Alameda, Calif., now considers a weekly movie at a cost of about \$7 plus the cost of popcorn an impossible luxury. "We can't even go and skip the popcorn," the wife declares. The husband for a time was working at two jobs in order to keep up with the bills.

An accountant working for a utility in Columbus, Ga., has given up his favorite sport, handball, because visits to the YMCA seemed too expensive. He and his wife pay cash for everything and managed to save \$3,500, which they invested in the stocks of blue-chip companies. Now their investment is worth \$800 less. They once hoped to use that nest egg for a down payment on a house, but that is something they figure they simply won't be able to afford in the foreseeable future.

"There'd be garden tools, landscaping, a mailbox," the accountant points out, adding, "Have you ever priced a mailbox?"

The wife of a transformer repairman in Roswell, Ga., is keeping up with inflation by cutting down on meat purchases, making her own clothes and generally doing without. She would like to remodel her kitchen, but that would mean a third loan in addition to the ones on the house and car. "We can't afford it," she concludes.

"STAY WITH MACARONI"

The assistant manager of a brokerage house in New York has seen his income slashed this past year from \$15,000 to \$13,000. He was out of work 2½ months, fell behind in payments on loans and had to borrow from friends. Even though he is working again—at lower pay—he is holding the line on expenditures.

"We had to stop eating meat every day," he says. "Now, we stay with macaroni. No more sodas; the kids are told to drink water or my wife makes iced tea. She has cut out using the gas dryer and puts the clothes on the line to dry."

A telephone tester in suburban Yonkers, north of New York City, has eliminated week-ends away from home for himself and his wife. He recalls:

"That was our only real enjoyment. We didn't have that much time together. But we had to cut those week-ends out. They just cost too much."

Those people, like the account in Columbus Ga., who are frugal enough to save some money in these times have a problem, too: What to do with the savings? As the chart starting on page 34 indicates, most investments in recent years have given their holders no cause for rejoicing, after account is taken of the vagaries of the financial markets and the inroads of inflation.

The best showing has been made by the sorts of ventures that investment counselors usually tell the typical person to avoid—coins, gold stocks, silver bars. But one type of investment that most families make at one time or another has worked out well in the majority of cases; the purchase of a home.

Partly for that reason, even in these days of record-breaking prices and interest costs, houses seem to be selling well. Seattle-area builders, for instance, report that sales of houses are as good as they were a year ago, even though prices in that area are up as much as 7 per cent in some cases. In fact,

inflation seems to be stimulating the market, these businessmen conclude.

Fred Burnstead, who heads a construction company in Seattle, says, "People who bought new homes five years ago have made more on their money than they could have on the stock market."

That is one of the few glimmerings of light in an otherwise dismal inflationary picture, however. And the statistics accumulating in the bankers' offices suggest that increasing numbers of the home buyers discover after moving into their nice, new houses that keeping up the payments is a lot more difficult than they expected. So there, too, inflation takes its mounting toll.

WHY MANY PEOPLE FEEL POORER

	Year ago	Now	Change
Case 1—A typical worker, with wife and 2 children:			
Yearly pay	\$7,350	\$7,680	Up \$330
Federal taxes (income and social security)	893	963	Up 70
Inflation "tax"—reflecting 10.2 per cent increase in living costs		622	Up 622
What's left	6,457	6,095	Down 362
Case 2—A corporate executive, with wife and 2 children:			
Yearly pay	25,000	27,500	Up 2,500
Federal taxes	5,012	5,952	Up 940
Inflation "tax"		1,994	Up 1,994
What's left	19,988	19,554	Down 434
Case 3—A social security pensioner, living alone:			
Annual pension	2,000	2,140	Up 140
Federal taxes	None	None	
Inflation "tax"		\$198	Up 198
What's left	2,000	1,942	Down 58

Source: Estimates by U.S.N. & W.R. Economic Unit.

INVESTING TO BEAT INFLATION—THE RECORD OF 5 YEARS

Suppose that, five years ago, you put \$1,000 in some typical forms of investment. How would each have protected you against the effects of inflation—a 32 percent rise in living cost since May 1969?

LAGGING BEHIND INFLATION

\$1,000 in common stocks

Market value now	\$845
Dividends	190
Total	1,035
Less inflation "tax"	252

"Real" value now 784

A loss of \$216.

\$1,000 in corporate bonds

Market value now	800
Interest	350
Total	1,150
Less inflation "tax"	279

"Real" value now 871

A loss of \$129.

\$1,000 in U.S. Government bonds

Market value now	750
Interest	300
Total	1,050
Less inflation "tax"	255

"Real" value now 795

A loss of \$205.

\$1,000 in a savings account

Value now	1,000
Interest	250
Total	1,250
Less inflation "tax"	303

"Real" value now 947

A loss of \$53.

STILL AHEAD OF INFLATION

\$1,000 in a new house

Market value now	\$1,379
Less inflation "tax"	334

"Real" value now 1,045

A gain of \$45.

\$1,000 in gold mining stocks

Market value now	2,089
Dividends	85

Total 2,174

Less inflation "tax" 527

"Real" value now 1,647

A gain of \$647.

\$1,000 in U.S. gold coins

Market value now	4,533
Less inflation "tax"	1,099

"Real" value now 3,434

A gain of \$2,434.

CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention an essay I prepared for the Poynter project on American institutions at Indiana University, and which I delivered at the Bloomington, Ind., campus in February 1974, during the Lincoln recess.

The essay deals with the crucial topic of public trust in government, and the congressional role in restoring that trust from its badly eroded state. As I note in my conclusion:

People are rather understanding of the complexity of problems with which government deals, and tolerant of government's lack of success in solving them. But there are limits to the margin of tolerance people extend to their government, and those limits may soon be reached.

The essay follows:

CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

(By LEE H. HAMILTON)

I. Introduction

Any Congressman close to his constituents knows that they are deeply troubled about their government, and strongly dissatisfied with its performance on the crucial issues.

They doubt the ability of their government to govern and their leaders to lead, and they just are not sure that government can act with the force and imagination necessary to meet the problems on the national agenda. In their view government is not working as well as it should, and they have doubts about its responsiveness and their ability to have an impact on it.

The people no longer see a direct relationship between what they think, support and work for, and that actually happens. They are not sure what to do, but they are certain they want something done. From the President and the Congress they want clear and decisive leadership, not buck passing, wavering, or procrastination.

A Congressman also notes that, with few exceptions, his constituents are disenchanted with politicians. In their view, politicians don't always speak the truth, often act secretly, cannot be reached, pay too much attention to rich people and not enough to the common folk, promise too much, perform too little, make precious little progress on solving problems, and some of them, at least, have too much power.

Poll after poll in recent years has shown the decline in the public's confidence in government.

One of the more recent surveys, done by Louis Harris & Associates, Inc. for the Senate Committee on Government Operations in the Fall of 1973, shows that this loss of confidence has reached severe—even major—proportions, with most people displaying profound cynicism and alienation toward their government and its political leadership.

The polls confirm my own experience. I remember vividly a remark made to me by an Indiana farmer as we talked by the side of his field. He said to me, "I wouldn't trust a politician if he told me the sun rose in the East."

The seriousness of this public attitude is that a democratic government depends on people who believe in it. Without an attitude of trust and confidence toward the government, a democratic system will not work. To pick a single example, the tax collection system, which depends primarily upon people voluntarily assessing themselves, would collapse if people came to believe that taxes are basically unfair.

If the American people lost trust in their government, believing it to be unfair, or unresponsive, or just plain incompetent, it would be only a matter of time before they began to withdraw their consent to be governed.

In this context, the defense of the President and his aides that all they did in collecting campaign contributions and in waging political warfare has been done before and is "politics as usual" is especially disturbing. As Alan Barth, a former Washington Post editorial writer, has pointed out, there are several things wrong with that defense: It is not true; it adds up to an abdication of morality in political life; and it may become self-fulfilling. If the people really believe that the whole spectrum of illegal and unethical activities carried on by the Nixon White House, and commonly known as Watergate, is typical of the way the Nation does its business, how can one expect them to pay taxes with honesty, or act for the general welfare, or encourage promising young people to enter government service.

Public distrust, suspicion and cynicism about government erode the foundations of free government, and such a government must place high on its list of priorities efforts to deal with those attitudes.

This decline of trust did not begin with Watergate, but it has undoubtedly been exacerbated by it and the question that plagues many people as they view the impact of Watergate on the already low status of politics and government in the nation today, is: How much erosion of trust can our system tolerate and still survive? Surely there are limits below which the level of public discontent and disappointment cannot descend, and the nation may be approaching those limits now because of Watergate. If this resentment toward government should be combined with deep economic frustration that may lie ahead, the mix could have explosive effects on the American political scene.

The danger signals are apparent:

In an election that both presidential candidates agreed presented the clearest choice in decades, only 55% of the eligible voters—the lowest turnout in 24 years—bothered to vote and 68 million eligible citizens did not vote.

Far more people have confidence in the trash collector than in the President.

An average of 55% of the public is disenchanted with things as they are, compared with only 29% who felt the same way in 1966.

It is important, however, not to overstate this mood of disenchantment with the po-

litical system. People may vote less, rate politicians below used car salesmen in public esteem, withdraw from politics, picket and demonstrate, turn away from the major political parties and some even emigrate, but nothing truly apocalyptic appears to be happening. I see no mass rejection of the Congress or the office of the Presidency, nor do I see people grasping for extreme solutions. Underneath it all, they apparently believe in the ultimate ability of the country to resolve its problems and to continue to progress. They have faith in our political system, if not in many of the officeholders.

The people continue to think that the government, with the right leaders, can be made to work effectively and that even our most intractable problems, like inflation and corruption, will yield to energetic leadership, and they may just be right. Adam Smith observed that "there is a lot of ruin in a nation." It is not yet time, then, to ring the death knell of American democracy.

Nevertheless, the consequences of the low level of trust in the government are profoundly disturbing; the warning signals are apparent for all to see, and all public officials must think seriously about why confidence in government is declining, what steps must be taken to restore the confidence of the people, and then act with the force and resolution necessary to accomplish them. More important even than Watergate is how Americans react to it, what they learn from it, and what they do about it.

I believe that the topic of the Poynter Foundation lectures deal with a central issue in American political life today: How to achieve honest government. There is no more important business now before the American people. The country is obviously weakened by serious economic and political problems, and its ability to contend them depends on a generous measure of public confidence in leaders. Perhaps one of the dangers is that, with all of the concern about energy and inflation, the question of trust in government will not get the attention that it deserves.

II. WHY IS CONFIDENCE LACKING?

First, Americans have experienced an accumulation of frustrations from a series of specific events, including Vietnam, the civil rights disputes, the resignation of Vice President Agnew, inflation, and, of course, Watergate. Each incident has convinced large groups of people that the Government is incompetent, and as these events follow one another, the alienation spreads and deepens. The Events of 1973 only deepened the discontent.

A President proclaimed to the American people that he is not a crook, thereby measuring himself, as no previous President has done, by a most demeaning standard of conduct.

80% of the American people believed that one or more of the serious charges of wrong doing against the President are justified.

Former Attorney General John Mitchell pathetically affirmed his clean conscience by stating "I never stole any money," as if that were the standard to which the nation's attorney general should repair.

A Vice President resigned in disgrace, as a convicted felon.

Secondly, people's standards of performance, for government, as well as for other institutions, are higher today than in the past, and when government does not measure up to them, they are disappointed. Departing from attitudes of the past, people now look to government more often to solve problems and when action does not come, or is ineffective, they become critical because their expectations are not met. As the gap between the people's expectations and the government's performance widens, distrust of government, escalates.

For example, the promise of the Great Society outran the performance, and, even though real progress was made, when the programs fell short of their ambitious goals, many people were disappointed.

Third, the news media make people instantly and constantly aware of the national problems and the failure of government to solve them. The media bombard people daily with news which focuses on the problems, the shortcomings and the failures.

As a secretary in Grand Rapids, Michigan, who was polled in the Harris study, put it: "Everyday when I wake up I feel something new in the way of trouble is coming out of Washington: Another rise in the cost of living; the Government selling food when we have shortages; another terrible scandal with Watergate. It's all too discouraging for words."

My 13 year old daughter reflected this awareness, too, when she replied to my suggestion that she watch the nightly T.V. news report by saying: "I don't like to watch it. All those problems depress me."

Fourth, few people really feel a part of the political system. They feel powerless to influence the actions of leaders, who, they believe, do not really care what they think.

One evidence of this feeling is the high number of non-voters in the U.S. Another is the comment any party precinct worker hears frequently: "What difference does it make whether I vote?"

The sheer size of government has much to do with this attitude of political impotency. Government is no longer plain, simple and intelligible, as the Founding Fathers intended it to be. It's vastness baffles, confuses, and defies comprehension. People simple do not know how to make government work effectively for them, and not understanding it, they tend to be suspicious of it.

Every Congressman confronts at some time a group of frustrated constituents who have petitioned, marched, demonstrated, voted, written letters, and done all they knew to—without making progress toward the achievement of their goal. It is no small task to get government to act, and too many persons become too quickly discouraged when government does not respond immediately to their pleas.

No one expects an institution that spends \$300 billion a year and employs over 2.7 million people to run as smoothly as the neighborhood grocery, but even making allowances, the public sees too much inertia, unresponsiveness, delay and general mismanagement. Few Congressmen can satisfactorily explain to a constituent with a social security problem, for instance, why it takes at least a month, and sometimes six months, to get a reply to his inquiry.

And, lastly, people are unhappy with government because they believe that public officials keep information from them, don't tell them the whole truth, avoid them, and generally do not level with them. In their view, politicians are anxious to espouse popular, rather than effective, solutions, and they are strong on rhetoric, weak on candor, and skillful at half truths.

Credibility is a favorite word in politics today because of the long list of recent experiences which have taught Americans to doubt the statements of their political leaders.

After all, people are entitled to some skepticism about statements from their highest leaders when:

The President tells them that no one on his team (people who have since departed in disgrace) had any connection with Watergate.

A former Attorney General says that he had no idea how the Watergate break-in came about, although he later acknowledged presiding over several meetings in which the burglary was discussed.

The former Vice President insists he would never resign and is innocent of wrongdoing, and shortly thereafter resigns, a convicted felon.

III. STEPS TO RESTORE CONFIDENCE

Like many things these days, the remedy for the people's discontent with government is complex. To suggest a single, simple answer to the crisis in confidence in government would be impossible. Given the prevailing attitudes toward government, anyone can be forgiven a few questions about whether the system can respond quickly enough, when such a recovery of confidence will come, and what can be done to hasten it.

A long list of reforms is needed in political values, in the operation and structure of the executive branch and the Congress, in the political parties and in the electoral system. Most observers of American democracy have at least a partial list of urgently needed reforms, but none has the complete solution to the restoration of confidence.

It should be recognized that the Congress cannot resolve all the problems and enact all the reforms suggested by Watergate. It may, for example, be able to deal only marginally with the persistent demand of the people for honest government, which they think is in short supply today. In describing an ideal public official the first quality they stress is honesty, according to the Harris poll. Their preoccupation with the problem of integrity in government and corrupt politicians prompts the question that every Congressman hears repeatedly: Whom can I trust or believe?

Although the issues of Watergate range from the impact of big money in politics to the effect of politics on big government, from doubts about the use of the national security rationale to justify domestic surveillance to questions of personal loyalty to the office of the Presidency, from the President's position under the law to questions about the closed Presidency, the ultimate issue perhaps is the extent to which the American people retain their confidence in the integrity of the American system.

Some things, like conflict of interest statutes and codes of ethics the Congress can, and should, implement, but integrity cannot be legislated or tough standards of personal and fiscal integrity decreed.

I believe that there are 3 major elements underlying much of the discontent with our political system:

1. The inappropriate, even illegal, use of money in campaigns,
2. Secrecy in doing the people's business, and
3. The concentration of too much power in the office of the President.

I would expect that, if we are able to devise effective means of solving these problems, the pervasive sense of frustration and helplessness will lessen. For example, if the incidence of secrecy declines, politicians may feel more pressure to be honest. If the influence of money declines, they will be less responsive to the wealthy. Similarly, greater openness and candor may lead to a more informed public and, ultimately, more realistic expectations of government.

Successful resolution of these 3 major problems will go a long way towards providing the American people with the kind of government they want.

The role of Congress in the post-Watergate period is to focus on the several areas where it can play a meaningful role and, where, taking into account political and organizational realities, it can have a beneficial impact.

These "realities" limit the role that the Congress can play. They include the sheer weight of the workload of the Congress, the complexity of the issues with which the Congress deals, and the difficulties of developing a consensus on these issues. The Con-

gress deals each session with over 25,000 pieces of legislation, appropriates \$300 billion, and oversees the vast interests of the Federal Government. It does this with insufficient staff support, meager informative resources and little use of computers and data banks, while trying, by accommodation and compromise, to reach a high level of agreement among 535 strong-willed politicians who represent vastly different constituencies. Moreover, the force of the law the Congress eventually enacts must be buttressed by the process of discussions and consensus-building so that the law will be acceptable to, or at least tolerable for, most groups and individuals in the nation.

These limitations of the Congress are apparent in its efforts to deal with an event as complex as Watergate, and in reaching a decision on what caused it and what should be done about it.

Given these limitations, Congress may not be able to provide the kind of dynamic and comprehensive leadership necessary to restore quickly the people's confidence in government, but it can tackle effectively several salient problems.

The period after Watergate may be an opportune time for the Congress to deal with the problems of money, secrecy, and power because each of them played a role in that traumatic affair.

If Watergate passes without the occurrence of meaningful reforms, not only has an opportunity for improvement been lost, but the cynicism and suspicions of the people toward government will only be deepened, perhaps to the point of no return.

A. MONEY

People will have confidence in their government only when they have confidence in the manner in which their governmental leaders are chosen. If they believe money buys elections or the votes of politicians, they will have confidence in neither the system nor the politicians.

At this stage in our history that confidence cannot be taken for granted:

Two in three Americans believe that there are Congressmen who won election by using unethical or illegal methods;

Seventy percent of the American public, sensing that something is wrong with the electoral process, favor major campaign reform, and 90% of the businessmen polled favor limits on campaign spending.

The attitude of the people about the influence of money is just as important as its actual influence. The people who feel that the wealthy have all the influence in public affairs throw in the towel before the bell rings.

Such feelings are being held by more and more Americans, with 74 percent of the public believing that special interests get more from the Government than the people do, according to the Harris survey. Rightly or wrongly, they believe that a small number of wealthy people have the potential to exert disproportionate influence, and that because of the influence of money:

- Ambassadorships are purchased;
- Antitrust actions are influenced;
- Legislation is advanced;
- Contracts are awarded;
- Federal agency actions determined; and
- Federal appointments are made.

The cost of campaigning, as well as the influence of money, have reached the stage where they threaten the lifeblood of the democratic system. Recent reports of increased milk price supports and favorable anti-trust settlements for campaign contributions suggest the corrosive influence of private wealth on American politics.

In 1846, friends of Abraham Lincoln gave him \$200 with which to run for Congress, and he used only 75-cents for a barrel of cider. The days of 75-cent campaigns for Congress are gone forever, of course, with many Con-

gressional campaigns now costing in the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Total spending for political candidates at all levels climbed from \$140 million in 1952 to \$400 million in 1972, a 285 percent increase in only two decades.

Richard Nixon spent \$35 million to get elected in 1968 and \$56 million to get re-elected in 1972. Nelson Rockefeller spent \$1.8 million to be elected governor of New York in 1958, and \$6.8 million in 1970, a 380 percent increase in campaign costs in 12 years.

Apparently, the sky is the limit. Unless immediate attention is given to revising campaign finance laws there will be a government by the rich and for the few, and, most assuredly, a government that will not have the people's confidence.

Joseph Califano, President Johnson's special assistant for domestic affairs, wrote that "private wealth has become the most debilitating and corrupting force in American politics today;" and John W. Gardner has observed that:

"In almost every aspect of the Watergate there was one common element: The flow of unreported campaign cash—lots and lots of cash, stashed in safes and hidden bank accounts, transported in black satchels, disbursed without an accounting.

"Polluted rivers of cash, drenching everyone and everything in sight. We mustn't let the drama of political espionage and high-level intrigue divert us from that element. The deepest lesson of Watergate is the corrupting influence of money in politics, of uncontrolled campaign financing. If we don't learn that lesson, future Watergates will be bigger and nastier."

The Campaign Finance Reform Act of 1972, the first comprehensive campaign spending bill in 47 years has helped to reduce the excesses of campaign spending practices by requiring disclosure of contributions and expenditures. It has advanced us toward the goal of competitive fair and open and honest elections. But a few series of steps, building on the law, must be taken to further protect the integrity of American elections and reduce the influence of "big money." These steps are contained in the Clean Elections Act, H.R. 7612.

Philip Hughes, Director of the Office of Federal Elections within the General Accounting Office and the person responsible under the 1972 law for monitoring presidential campaign spending, concurs and says "Present laws are inadequate to rectify the abuses we have seen."

One hundred fifty Congressmen have now co-sponsored the Clean Elections Act. Its major provisions and their justifications are as follows:

Federal Elections Commission:

(1) By far the most important aspect of the Clean Elections Act is the provision for the creation of a bipartisan and independent Federal Elections Commission with tough enforcement powers. The recordkeeping functions currently delegated to the "supervisory authorities"—the Clerk of the House, Secretary of the Senate, and Comptroller General—would be transferred to the Commission, which would take on a number of functions now performed exclusively by the Justice Department. It could subpoena witnesses, compel evidence, administer oaths, submit legislative recommendations to the President and the Congress, initiate court action against violators of the act and require any person, under oath, to submit written reports on campaigning activities.

The President, the Speaker of the House, and the President of the Senate would each appoint two of the Commission's six members, each of whom would serve 6 years. Member's terms would be staggered, and no more than half of the Members could be from the same party.

The Commission would be independent of

any branch of government. Thus, the act avoids a pitfall under the current law, which in effect has Senators and Representatives monitoring their own campaigns.

(2) Limits on contributions: The bill would limit yearly contributions by any person or committee to \$1,000 for a House or Senate candidate and \$2,500 for a Presidential candidate. The only exceptions to this rule would be the national party committees and the four Congressional campaign committees, whose expenditures would not be limited. In effect, though, the limit on contributions from all sources places a limit on expenditures by these committees.

Objections to excessive campaign spending are based on the concern that large contributions frequently make elected officials susceptible to pressures from special interest groups. If this bill is passed, candidates will find it more difficult to raise large sums. A small number of wealthy contributors will not be able to contribute more money, or have any greater influence on the candidate, than any random group of citizens who choose to donate to the campaign. The amount which a candidate raises will depend solely on his ability to solicit small contributions. If a candidate enjoys broad popular support, he may indeed spend large amounts on his campaign. But he will do so without becoming indebted to any special interest group.

The combined factors of less ease in raising large sums of money and limitations on individual gifts should help remove the specter of unethical spending from our political campaigns.

(3) Income tax credits: H.R. 7612 provides a number of incentives for small contributions. One of these is the increase in income tax credit from \$12.50 to \$50 for each taxpayer, or \$100 for a joint return.

If large donations are eliminated, candidates will still need enough money to carry on an effective campaign. This bill encourages the candidate to raise small contributions from many sources, and prohibits large contributions from a few sources. The influence, or even the appearance of influence, of large contributions will be removed.

(4) Public Financing: This bill provides for public financing of federal elections, an innovation which has been much discussed but never tried on a large scale in the U.S.

The U.S. Treasury would, under the bill's provisions, match any contribution up to \$50 received by a candidate or his committee. Before becoming eligible to receive these payments, a candidate would have to submit proof of a specified amount in matchable donations. This would tend to discourage phony or frivolous candidates or "ego trippers" from running simply for the Federal money which would accrue to them.

Elections are already subsidized by public funds to a greater extent than is commonly realized. Local governments provide voting machines and election officials; incumbents enjoy a variety of benefits, including staff, travel allowances, and the franking privilege; and contributors receive tax breaks.

Elections would be made more fair and open if a limited and impartial procedure of matching Federal donations were the primary means of campaign financing.

This would encourage candidates to seek small contributions, since the amount of their Federal subsidy would depend directly upon the number of small contributions they received. Treasury outlays would be limited to 10 cents per eligible voter to candidates, and to a total of \$15 million to all national and congressional campaign committees. Total cost to the U.S. Government is estimated at \$100 to \$150 million per year, should this act become law.

A Gallup poll conducted in September

1973, showed that 65 percent of the people favor some form of public financing of elections, up from 58 percent in June, 1973. Previous proposals, however, have foundered on questions of third-party eligibility, frivolous candidates, and financing of primaries and multicandidate races. The Clean Elections Act provides workable answers to all these questions.

(5) Voters' time: Since its development in the late 1940's, television has grown into the most popular and pervasive means of mass communication. Especially in recent campaigns, politicians have seized on it as the ideal means of presenting their ideas and themselves to nationwide audiences. A candidate's major obstacle using television has been its prohibitive cost. This bill is based on the premise that all candidates who have demonstrated substantial popular support should be given the opportunity to present their views on television.

Therefore, the bill provides for "voters' time" following a proposal made in 1969 by the Twentieth Century Fund. Parties are identified as "major," "third," or "minor," depending on the portion of the popular vote which they received in the previous election. A party may establish itself as a minor party for a congressional election in one of two ways: By showing that its candidate received 5 percent of the popular vote in that State in the preceding election; or by filing with the Federal Communications Commission a petition containing a number of signatures of registered voters equal to 5 percent of the votes cast in the Senate's preceding senatorial election.

A formula allots segments of publicly-subsidized television time to candidates, including third party and minor party nominees. Amounts range from 5 half-hour blocks for major party Vice Presidential and Presidential candidates to one 15-minute block for minor party congressional candidates. All television stations located in the affected area would be required to transmit these broadcasts simultaneously, except in metropolitan areas containing a large number of House districts. In such cases, the Federal Communications Commission would be permitted to divide voters' time responsibilities among the television stations, and thus protect the channels from constant inundation with campaign speeches.

If this bill is adopted, no candidate will be relegated to obscurity simply because he or she lacks the funds to flood the air with political messages.

The Clean Election Act does not prevent third party candidates from being heard. A candidate need show only a specified, but low, amount of public support before he becomes eligible to receive the public subsidy. At the same time, frivolous candidates would be excluded. It is unlikely that a totally nonserious contender for public office could muster the requisite number of signatures on his petition for voters' time, or raise enough money in small contributions to benefit from the Federal matching payments plan.

The Clean Elections Act proposes a novel but reasonable scheme of public and private financing, incentives for public participation, and enforcement of the laws. It promises to go a long way in ridding this country of campaign spending abuses and unethical political methods, and it should be enacted into law.

By the enactment of this bill, or something close to it, the Congress can show its concern with the disproportionate impact of money on the political process, and, in a single stroke, take a giant stride toward limiting the influence of money in the decision-making process and encouraging the people to have confidence in the integrity of the process by which their public officials are elected.

B. SECRECY

Secrecy in the operation of government is another one of the principal reasons people have lost confidence in government. People simply do not like a government that practices secrecy, and a government that prefers to do its business in secret will not have the trust of the people.

Secrecy is at the center of the Watergate scandals. They simply could not have occurred in the sunlight of public knowledge. The kind of secrecy that marked the whole affair has no place in a democratic society. The framers of the Constitution were interested in the right and the duty of the people to participate in public decisions, and throughout our history these interests have been reasonably well satisfied, but in recent years, at least since World War II, the government has often conducted its most important business behind closed doors.

Somewhere along the line, recent Presidents have become entranced with what General DeGaulle called the "mystique of high office," which involves treating the people with condescension and withholding information from them. One high U.S. official, when asked about secrets in government, responded by saying that "those who needed to know were told." Such an attitude expresses contempt for the democratic process.

It is interesting to note that in the Harris poll the people felt that government secrecy was a prime obstacle to responsiveness of government, and that openness by officials was a prerequisite to successful contact between the leaders and the led. At every turn voters are saying to politicians that they will not tolerate secrecy in the conduct of the public's business, but, even so, political leaders may not yet understand the intensity of this public mood.

Any reasonable person recognizes the necessity of secrecy in government in certain situations, like sensitive diplomatic negotiations or development of some military weapons. But secrecy has become an accepted way of doing business in Washington in far too many instances.

In foreign affairs there have been secret agreements at Yalta, secret U-2 flights, a secret invasion of Cuba, secret moves in Vietnam and the Gulf of Tonkin, and secret bombing of Cambodia.

In domestic affairs all kinds of important information has been denied to the American people: The safety of nursing homes, meat inspection reports, civil rights complaints, an IRS agent's manual, safety data on birth control pills, reports on aircraft and automotive equipment failures, the amount of fat in hot dogs, and the mass drowning of dolphins in tuna nets, to name a few.

Even the Congress, the people's branch, has had a long history of doing the people's business in secret, and although the Congress is beginning to open up the legislative process, many of its most important decisions, like action by conference committees, are still made behind closed doors.

While the House has recently created a resumption of open committee meetings unless committee members vote publicly for a closed meeting, the Senate rule creates a presumption of secrecy unless committee members vote to the contrary. The political party caucuses in both House remain closed to the public.

In 1972, 40 percent of all House and Senate committee meetings were closed to the public; meetings other than hearings—where legislation was discussed, marked up or voted on—were closed nearly 80 percent of the time.

The Congress annually appropriates hundreds of billions of dollars in a process dominated by secrecy from closed committee

hearings to secret House and Senate conference committees.

The Executive Branch exhibits a passion for secrecy and spends enormous sums of money and considerable human resources to maintain secrecy.

One device used by the Executive Branch to keep information from the people is a comprehensive classification system for public documents. According to recent estimates, government costs of maintaining secrets run as high as \$80 million a year, and about 20,000 federal workers have the power to classify documents. The government carries the classification system to absurd lengths. Only recently has the declassification of 172 million pages of secret documents from World War II begun, many of which are hardly earthshaking: e.g., a telegram reporting the loss of the battleship Arizona at Pearl Harbor and a design for a slingshot for harmlessly detonating German rockets. One estimate is that the Defense Department alone has the equivalent of 18 stacks of classified documents, each as high as the 555 foot Washington Monument.

This perverse system lessens the flow of full information to the people and inhibits their understanding of current events. It allows policy makers to operate with blinders on, and, all too often, allows them to make policy without having to defend it adequately. The historical record offers no proof that officials protected from public scrutiny by the classification system make wiser decisions than they would otherwise, and the democratic process argues for public scrutiny.

Sometimes the Executive and the Congress conspire, as where the Executive confides in a few favored, reliable committee chairmen. For the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs to have a cozy chat with a Senator Stennis or a Congressman Hébert is scarcely conducting the public's business in public, or, for that matter, even informing the Congress.

This addition of the Executive Branch and the Congress to secrecy makes a farce of the principle of open government. It is offensive to the public. Closed meetings damage the political system by implying hanky-panky and shady deals. They arouse suspicion and resentment. They make it more difficult to get the support and cooperation of persons affected by the secretly made decisions. Closed meetings destroy the credibility of public officials and make their tasks more difficult.

Secrecy can no longer be excused as an operational necessity in government; it excludes the participation of the people in their Government, and can be used as a screen for subverting freedom.

One of the distinctive marks of a democracy is its commitment to an open society. It is assumed in a democracy that policy can be improved by steady public examination and debate. Few topics should be immune from public scrutiny and criticism, because only by such examination can mistakes be avoided or corrected.

The validity of this view is accepted by many former public policymakers, among them McGeorge Bundy and Nicholas Katzenbach. Consider the words of Mr. Bundy, one of the architects of secrecy in our Vietnam policy in the early 1960's:

"It is time for all of us, in or out of office, in or out of politics, in or out of any party—to appeal to what is still our Government to accept the charge of moving our great affairs into the open once again."

Mr. Katzenbach, former Under Secretary of State and U.S. Attorney General, has noted that secrecy has increasingly become a way "to avoid the difficulties inherent in our political system and hopefully to present the public with triumphant facts accomplished." He argues that:

"The President . . . must welcome public discussion and criticism of his proposals

. . . He and his principal assistants must be far more willing than in the recent past to lay out candidly the problems, the choices, the recommended actions."

To move governmental affairs into the open, legislation should be enacted to require all meetings of Federal Government agencies at which official action is taken, considered or discussed to be open to the public. Many other steps are needed, but the common theme of all of them is greater openness to discussion and criticism and more candor in the conduct of the public business.

Basic alterations should be made in the classification system to require that secret papers be made public more quickly, with only rare exceptions, and that classification itself be used with the utmost restraint.

The Congress must also insist that Government officials explain and defend their actions in public hearings, not in secret committee sessions or intimate chats with a few selected, and usually cooperative, Congressmen and Senators.

Our essential commitment to freedom of inquiry and publication, and the value of a free press as a disseminator of information to the public, needs to be confirmed. With the growth of government, the increasing complexity of public policy and the wider scope of American concerns, neither government nor any government official has a monopoly on information or wisdom. The news media must be allowed to inquire and to publish so that the people may know what they need to know to make the choices a democracy demands. Except in rare instances, government should not be afforded the right to decide what and when the people are to know. Obviously, this approach places an enormous responsibility for objectivity on the news media, but the first amendment presupposes that right policy is more likely to emerge from a variety of sources than from a single, authoritarian source.

The surest safeguard of the people's confidence in government policy is to let them know what is happening. If a cardinal rule of the post-Watergate policies is to level with the people, then the beginning point is to let the sun shine on the decision-making processes. Although complete disclosure cannot be employed in every instance, disclosure should be the rule, not the exception, and a heavy burden of proof should rest on those who insist that secrecy in a given case will serve the national interest. Secrecy in government should be held to a minimum.

C. POWER

Another step the Congress should take in order to restore confidence in government is to reduce the concentration of power in the office of the President.

The dominant fact in American government in recent decades has been the accumulation of power by the President. At least since Franklin Roosevelt, the American political system has concentrated more power in the hands of a single individual than was ever envisioned by the Founding Fathers or seemed prudent for a democratic government.

As the National Academy of Public Administration has recently noted:

"The centralization of power in the presidency has increased over the years to the present extreme situation in which the prevailing view is that the whole government should be run from the White House. The role of principal assistants to the President has been virtually transformed to one of 'assistant President.'"

There are several reasons for this concentration, including the passivity of the Congress, its inability to respond to crises, and the superior information, actual or presumed, of the President, but, whatever the

reasons, the results are apparent and disturbing:

Presidents assert an executive privilege of dubious constitutional origin as a shield to keep information from the Congress and the people.

Presidents assert that they have the right to spend or not to spend money that the Congress appropriates.

Without consulting the Congress, Presidents commit American troops to Korea, Lebanon, Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Vietnam.

Presidents make commitments pledging the money and lives of Americans, and conclude a ten-year war in Vietnam by Executive Agreement.

President Nixon has compounded the secrecy and unconstitutional practices that grievously harmed President Johnson's Administration. President Nixon's manipulation of the war-making powers with his secret bombing of Laos and Cambodia, and the invasion of Cambodia, his admitted approval of projects that violate the law, as in the investigation unit known as the "plumbers," and his abuse of the impoundment power—turning it into an item veto, have all been steps that exceed the constitutional checks and balances. Indeed, one of the basic causes of Watergate has been an insensitivity to legal and constitutional restraints by the White House staff and by the President. Alexander M. Bickel, Yale University law professor, has written, "There was a time there, soon after the election in 1972, where Mr. Nixon gave the impression that he thought the American political process was over for a while, and that he could simply rule."

The result, e.g., in the field of foreign policy, is that the constitutional power to declare war has passed to the President. The constitutional power to ratify treaties has been largely nullified by extensive use of executive agreement, and even the constitutional power to advise and consent has been diminished and ignored.

Americans instinctively dislike placing all power in one person, even if that person is the President. They believe with the Founding Fathers that governmental powers should be jointly possessed. Because President Nixon has been especially aggressive in his assertion of Presidential powers, a mood of anxiety has gripped the country and the Congress about the expansion of Presidential power at the expense of the Congress.

The accumulation of power by the President, certainly not contemplated by the Constitution, is the root cause of the friction that exists today between the Congress and the President. Concern about it cuts across party and ideological lines.

The distinguishing mark of the 1st session (1973) of the 93rd Congress was the confrontation between the President and the Congress, with vetoes or threat of vetoes, and attempts by the Congress to take back powers it contends the President has usurped.

The effort of the Congress to reassert itself should not be misunderstood to mean that the Congress can truly become an equal branch of government. It is simply too difficult for 535 strong-minded, aggressive persons "to get it all together" on all the issues on the nation's agenda. The Congress cannot control inflation, solve the energy shortage, or negotiate trade agreements. Congress may win some battles, restrain the President here and there, but it will remain essentially a body which confirms or rejects Presidential proposals, and reviews them after the fact.

Nevertheless, it is important that the Congress constantly guard against the accumulation of too much power in the President.

While the fight over runaway presidential power is present in almost every piece of legislation, the main battles have been fought over substantive proposals on war powers, spending and executive privilege.

War powers

When historians take a look at the record of the Congress in 1973, they may judge the war powers as the most important piece of legislation enacted because it is a turning point in the continuing struggle within the American constitutional system to restore the power of the Congress.

The War Powers law, a product of three years of Congressional work, aims at limiting the Presidential power to commit armed forces to hostilities without Congressional approval. It contains the following provisions:

- 1) The President is required to consult with Congress before introducing U.S. forces into any foreign hostilities;
- 2) The President is required to make a full report to Congress within 48 hours after committing armed forces abroad;
- 3) The President must withdraw all troops within 60 days if Congress has not declared war or specifically authorized the commitment. The President can extend the period for 30 days by certifying to Congress that the additional period is necessary for the safe withdrawal of U.S. forces;
- 4) And it requires the President to withdraw all troops immediately if Congress at any time adopts a veto-proof concurrent resolution to end any action.

The War Powers law seeks to assure that the most important decision made by government—whether or not to go to war—is a shared responsibility between the President and Congress, as the Constitution intends and the standards of democracy require. It compels the President to consult with Congress when committing American forces overseas and to obtain Congressional consent for any prolonged military action. The consultative process will require him to justify his actions to Congress. The chief virtue of the law is that it will bring the decision-making process on whether or not to go to war into the open. A primary lesson of the Vietnam War is the peril of secrecy in the conduct of foreign policy and the necessity that basic foreign policy decisions must rest upon public support.

The War Powers law also signals a resurgence of Congressional independence after a long period of acquiescence to the President's war-making power. Beyond the vital Congressional check it contains, the law signifies that the Congress is reclaiming some of its Constitutional power after a long period of allowing it to be eroded. The President's weakened political position because of Watergate may have been a factor in the bill's enactment, but the bill should not be viewed as a vote of no-confidence in President Nixon. Rather, it reflects the new attitude among Congressmen that the Congress must play an important role in the question of whether to go to war. The law is directed to all recent Presidents, and says, in effect, that future Presidents should not make war without Congressional approval. As House Majority Leader Thomas O'Neill (Mass.) said, "If the President can deal with the Arabs, Israelis and the Soviet Union, he ought to be willing to deal with the Congress of the U.S."

The war powers law had a rocky road to enactment. When it first came up for consideration, few legislators expected it to become law, and most were surprised when events converged to enable the Congress to override the President's veto. Some conservatives claimed it was unconstitutional and deprived the President of the power to act decisively in a crisis. However, the law specifically states it is not intended to alter the Constitutional authority of the President, but only to establish a procedure for its legitimate exercise. The measure does not preclude bold and effective Presidential action in a crisis, but only requires him to gain Congressional support. For example, the law

would not have hindered the President in following his chosen course in the recent Mideast war, or, for that matter, in any of the recent international crises.

Some liberals objected to the law because they claim it gave the President authority he does not have to wage war for 60 days. This argument ignores the fact that the President already acts in this matter.

No miracles should be expected from this legislation. It does not insure the nation against future wars or make the decisions about going to war any easier. The war powers law probably will not have any immediate practical effect since American soldiers are not in combat today anywhere in the world, or expected to be in combat anywhere. Even with this legislation, the President, on his own, can still commit the nation's armed forces to foreign combat. And once the military power of the U.S. is committed, and with it the honor and prestige of the country, it is unlikely that any Congress will reverse the President and force an end to the fighting. But, this law will make future Presidents more cautious and deliberative in committing American forces, and more inclined to consult with Congress on their decision and to think about its impact on the American people.

Impoundment

In its efforts to rein-in the Presidency the Congress has tried to restore its control over the power of the purse, and this has meant a clash over presidential impoundment of funds.

Presidential impoundment of funds appropriated by the Congress dates back to 1803 when President Thomas Jefferson refused to spend \$50,000 appropriated for gunboats on the Mississippi River. It was institutionalized in 1921 when the first Budget Bureau Director, Charles E. Dawes, used the authority of the Anti-Deficiency Act of 1905 to impound funds whenever an agency could meet its objectives without spending all appropriated money. Under President Franklin Roosevelt the impoundment practice was broadened beyond a simple economy step to become an instrument of economic policy through the withholding of funds for specific purposes. After World War II impoundment was used to cut back defense appropriations no longer required, and impoundments by the Presidents slowly grew.

President Nixon has used the impoundment device more extensively than his predecessors, impounding over \$40 billion in his first term, and he has used it to cripple or terminate domestic programs with which he disagrees. President Nixon estimates his impoundments for FY 1973 at \$8.7 billion, but the Library of Congress estimates them at \$18 billion. Using impoundments as a permanent weapon in his constitutional arsenal, not in isolated cases, the President has tried to achieve his policy objectives of decentralization and liquidation of domestic programs. He has impounded to circumvent the will and the priorities of the Congress as expressed in appropriation laws, and not just to manage effectively government funds.

The controversy over impoundment, then, is essentially over which branch of the Federal Government, Executive or Legislative, will decide national priorities and which programs will have their funding cut and by how much.

The President has contended that "the Constitutional right for the President to impound funds . . . is absolutely clear" and that he has a duty to impound funds as he thinks necessary. He argues that he must control spending because the Congress, under its present budgetary process, has lost control over spending.

In decision after decision, however, the courts have rejected the President's contention that he had a right not to spend money voted by Congress. There has not been a

single lower court decision in support of what the President has called his "constitutional right" to withhold funds. The New York City Bar Association has noted that:

"Where Congress has made its intent clear, the President is constitutionally obligated to effectuate that intent. He does not have discretion to substitute his own views as to policy for those of the Congress. . . ."

U.S. District court judge Charles R. Richey wrote simply, "It is not within the discretion of the Executive to refuse to execute laws passed by the Congress but with which the Executive presently disagrees."

Since these court decisions did not attempt a general solution to the impoundment controversy, and, in response to the President's impoundment policy, the Congress is considering legislation to require the President to seek Congressional approval of all impoundments.

The House has passed a bill which would permit either House to disapprove an impoundment within 60 days. In the absence of such disapproval the impoundment would stand. The Senate bill would automatically terminate any impoundment after 60 days unless both Houses took action to approve or disapprove the impoundment. Both bills legitimize impoundments, and deny the President the power to scramble Congressional priorities.

The President has tried to make the issue a budgetary rather than a constitutional issue, a fight for fiscal sanity rather than for constitutional balance of power, insisting that he has had to impound to stop the extravagant spending of the Congress. The President's charges are simply not supported by the figures. The Congress, for example, reduced the President's budgets in his first term by more than \$20 billion. The real financial issue between the Congress and the President is not on the amount of spending, but the spending priorities.

Fortunately, Congress is coming to the view that it should not reclaim its constitutional power over the purse without establishing fiscal discipline and self control. The impoundment bills therefore, contain spending ceilings and improved budgetary procedures described later in this essay.

Impoundments are sensitive matters to the Congress because they strike at the heart of Congress' exclusive power of the purse, a power James Madison regarded as the "most complete and effectual weapon with which any constitution can arm the immediate representative of the people." The effect of them is to destroy the constitutional power of the Congress to legislate and to allow the President to substitute his judgement for that of the Congress on the desirability of many different programs. Obviously if the President can administer a program in a more efficient manner than the Congress contemplated when it approved the appropriation, he should be able to withhold the money. But efficient management is quite different from a presidential decision to terminate a program.

Executive privilege

Congress should also act to restrain the presidency by limiting the abuse of "executive privilege," the doctrine that the President has the right to withhold information from Congress. While early Presidents rarely claimed the power to withhold information from the Congress, executive privilege, according to the Library of Congress, has been asserted 49 times since 1952—more than double the number of all prior claims. Not until 1954 was the claim made by Attorney General Herbert Brownell to an unreviewable executive power to withhold information from Congress.

Congress does not and should not object to a reasonable Presidential denial of information, but President Nixon has extended

it to all employees of the Executive Branch, whether they were personal advisors to the President or not.

In an August, 1973, legal brief, the President argued that there are no limits to the doctrine and that it "reaches any information that the President determines cannot be disclosed consistent with the public interest and the proper performance of his constitutional duties." The disclosure of such information, he contended, would bring "severe and irreparable" damage to the institution of the Presidency.

At issue, the President declared, is "the independence of the three branches of our Government . . . The very heart of our constitutional system."

Congress, and most constitutional scholars, do not agree with the President's expansive view of executive privilege. This privilege, although often cloaked by President Nixon in grand language about the separation of powers, is not mentioned in the Constitution. Using his interpretation of executive privilege, the ability of Congress to exercise its oversight and investigatory powers would be checked, and abuses of executive powers hidden behind the cloak of executive privilege.

The Constitution diffuses power to better secure liberty, but it also expects interaction and reciprocity between the branches of Government. The courts have been explicit that the separation of powers argument cannot justify a claim of unreviewable privilege to deny Congressional requests for information.

The Congress should act to curb a steadily expanding executive privilege by enacting legislation to require that the executive branch should make information requested by the Congress available, except advice to the President or where the Congressional need for it is substantially outweighed by the harm which disclosure would cause the national interest. The courts would have the ultimate responsibility to resolve the disputes between the President and the Congress.

A REASSESSMENT OF THE PRESIDENCY

The Congress should also begin a careful study and reassessment of the institution of the Presidency, and encourage the best political thinkers in the Nation to do the same. There are signs that the reassessment may already be underway, as an affirmative response to Watergate.

Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish social scientist and shrewd observer of the American scene, comments that "there has to be a diffusion of power in Washington. The White House cannot have it all." The title of historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.'s new book, *The Imperial Presidency*, is indicative of the mood of many Americans.

Respect for the office of the President is obviously necessary, but with it must come a decline in awe, and a determination to examine a President's proposals with care, intelligence and a healthy skepticism.

One wonders whether the intense focus by the news media, the fascination of the public for the details of the goings and comings of the President and his family, the almost reverential atmosphere which marks the President's appearances, are really healthy for a government based on separate and co-equal branches. Surely the trappings of the office—fleets of airplanes and helicopters, multiple residences, a fiercely loyal and increasingly large staff—only add to his isolation and dull his political senses.

Fortunately, some proposals to reassess the Presidency are beginning to be made, including these:

- Limit the President to a six-year term;
- Transform the Presidency into a collegial institution, with a board of directors exercising the executive function;
- Create an independent office of counselor general to check abuses of Presidential power;
- Limit the size of the White House staff; and

Move toward a parliamentary system, compelling the President to explain and defend his policies at regular intervals before the political opposition—an American question hour, modeled on the British tradition.

To begin this reassessment in the legislative sphere, the Congress should enact the substantive legislative proposals on impoundment, executive privilege and secrecy already discussed.

In addition, it should pursue its interest in federalism, with an ongoing review of Federal revenue sharing laws and a search for ways and means to develop responsibility to levels of Government closer to the people and away from the central office of the President.

A distinguishing feature of the Federal system has been its remarkable capacity to adapt to changing circumstances. With the concentration of power in the Presidency, our constitutional system has been altered. All levels of Government need to be strengthened and improved because the burden of governing this Nation is simply too complex for one branch, even the Presidency, to handle efficiently.

Such worthwhile measures would counteract the growing power of the Presidency, which, if not restrained, will make a sham of the Constitution and will at some point, lead to one-man rule.

No one advocates a weakened Presidency. In the day of central economic planning and nuclear weapons, a shackled Presidency would not be wise. Our system requires a strong Presidency, but a strong Presidency under the Constitution, and a Presidency, not insulated or isolated, but exposed always to the political pressures of the day.

The essential point, in all the discussion of Presidential power, is that decisions of Government, both domestic and foreign, should be shared decisions, meeting the requirements of the Constitution and the standards of democracy.

D. POST-WATERGATE EFFORTS

Although they are not often in the headlines, progress is being made on two bills that may become the most significant reforms of congressional procedures in this century, reforms that, coincidentally, may better enable the Congress to deal with such widespread problems as those raised by Watergate. The two reforms aim at better regulating Federal spending and at redistributing jurisdictions among the committees of the Congress.

Budget reform: Budget reform bills create budget committees in both the House and Senate, and establish a mechanism for the Congress to regain control of the budget by establishing a procedure to look at the budget as a whole in order to determine spending priorities within total spending ceilings. Under the bills the Congress would set appropriate levels of expenditures, taxes, and budget surpluses or deficits. The bills would allow the Congress to determine competing claims for the Federal dollar in a comprehensive and systematic way, rather than the present procedure whereby the Congress acts on various money bills separately, often months apart, and in isolation from one another.

The legislative budget office, established by the bills to develop data and make cost projections, would give the Congress an independent source of information equal to the President's Office of Management and Budget. Tax and expenditure policies could be coordinated, and the revised budget timetable, also provided in the bills, would reduce the likelihood of the Congress having to approve interim financing due to failure of the Congress to complete action on appropriation bills prior to the start of the fiscal year.

Several important questions must still be resolved, but I believe ultimate passage is assured. These bills will be a giant stride

toward making the Congress fiscally responsible.

Committee Reform: The present committee system was created 28 years ago, at a time when the legislative topics which preoccupy the Congress today—environment, energy, health insurance, to name a few—were only dimly perceived. Today, jurisdictional lines are tangled, workloads unbalanced, and overlap and confusion all too frequent (no less than 12 House committees have responsibility for energy legislation). Some committees have too much to do, and others not enough. Members frequently face daily schedules requiring them to be in several different meetings at the same time, and everyone agrees that Congress needs to intensify its review of governmental programs once they have been enacted.

Early in 1973 Speaker Carl Albert appointed a bipartisan Select Committee, headed by Congressman Richard Bolling, with a mandate to recommend changes in the structure and procedures of the House. The House of Representatives approaches an internal struggle as it considers the recommended actions of the Bolling committee. The highlights of the proposals include:

Creation and equalization of 15 major standing committees;

Placing control over major policy areas—health, transportation, energy, environment, foreign economic affairs—in separate committees;

Allowing each Representative to serve on only one of the 15 major committees in order to spread choice assignments and to reduce meeting conflicts;

Abolishing proxy voting in committees, strengthening committee staffs (guaranteeing at least a third of staff positions for the minority party), improving committee oversight, increasing the quality of information available to Congressmen, and providing a continuing study of committee jurisdiction.

The basic idea behind this proposal is to simplify and focus the legislative process by concentrating jurisdiction in major areas, limiting each House Member to one major committee and equalizing the workload among the committees. The effort is to inject coherence and vitality into the legislative process.

This proposal has precipitated a bitter power struggle within the House because it fundamentally redistributes power by abolishing some committees (like the Post Office and Civil Service Committee) and reshuffles jurisdictional authority. An unusual alliance of business and labor interests is working with a powerful group of committee and subcommittee chairmen and staff to defeat the plan. Washington lobbyists fear that their carefully cultivated contacts with key Congressmen will come loose, and several Congressmen, who are losing vast empires of influence, are mightily displeased. Staff members are fearful they may lose their jobs.

The Republicans appear to be solidly in favor of the reforms, in part because they do not have much to lose since they do not control the House, but the Democrats are much more split. The proposals present them, as the majority party, with a real test of leadership.

Although no single step can restore the effectiveness and public esteem of the Congress, the Bolling committee proposal will, in my view, make the operation of the House more rational and insure that many complex subjects receive better scrutiny. While the proposal does not touch several areas that need examination, like appropriations, it is generally sound, rearranges committee jurisdictions in a coherent way, and makes several valuable reforms. No reform comes painlessly or solves all the problems, but the opportunity for genuine improvement of the structure of the Congress comes only seldom, and it should be seized.

IV. CONCLUSION

The several suggestions put forward in these remarks by no means exhaust the steps the Congress should take to restore the confidence of the people in government.

The people do not demand that government take all these steps, all at once, but it is necessary that people know about the concern of public officials over their lack of trust in government and necessary for them to be persuaded that those officials are willing to take steps to restore their trust. People generally are rather understanding of the complexity of problems with which government deals, and tolerant of government's lack of success in solving them. But there are limits to the margin of tolerance people extend to their government, and those limits may soon be reached.

UTILITIES' ARGUMENTS JUSTIFY
FLUE GAS DESULFURIZATION

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over flue gas desulfurization—FGD, or stock-scrubbing—involves not only environmental concerns but also critical decisions regarding coal extraction.

A lavish advertising campaign by the American Electric Power System—AEPS—has sought to convince the public of the undesirability of stack-gas scrubber technology and the need to open federally owned Western low-sulfur coal reserves to private mining. However, the utilities' evidence and arguments intended to support the leasing of these Western reserves actually provide even stronger reasons for a commitment to the perfection and installation of FGD and the mining of our massive eastern deposits of high-sulfur coal.

The utilities contend that Clean Air Act emissions standards and energy needs can be satisfied only by using this western coal. However, EPA's Control Systems Laboratory estimates that only 8 percent of Eastern and Midwestern coal resources have a sulfur content low enough to allow combustion without desulfurization. Furthermore, a recent study by Dr. Michael Rieber of the University of Illinois points out that estimates of the value of Western reserves must be revised downward by as much as 85 percent if heat as well as sulfur content is computed.

A major utility contention is that scrubbers are costly, impractical, and unavailable. Ample evidence and commercial applications of FGD systems refute these claims. Moreover, the costs and time requirements of a shift to western coal are certain to be considerable. Mines would have to be dug from scratch and massive strip mining would be necessary to reach this coal. According to the Edison Electric Institute, one major mid-Eastern utility estimates that extraction and transportation costs for low-sulfur western coal could increase consumers' bills by one-third, or twice the increase predicted for FGD installation.

Furthermore, the AEPS itself admits that two heavily industrialized States,

Ohio and Indiana, could not be supplied with Western coal until the 1980's. Yet EPA estimates that widespread commercial use of stack scrubbers could be achieved by 1980, and a Battelle-Columbus "state-of-the-art" report commissioned by AEPS found that the general consensus of private concerns and government experts was that 90 percent scrubber reliability would be satisfactorily demonstrated by the late 1970's. Presently there are 13 stack scrubbers commercially operational in the United States, and 29 more are either under construction or planned.

The abandonment of eastern mines in favor of new Western development will result in severe unemployment and economic dislocation. A commitment to FGD technology will enable the environmentally safe extraction and combustion of the 92% of our coal reserves which contain high percentages of sulfur, an alternative which offers the greatest advantages in terms of energy supplies, environmental health, and economic stability.

I include herewith the following: Excerpts from testimony by Joseph Dowd of the AEPS before the Senate Subcommittee on Environmental Pollution; an analysis of the Rieber report which appeared this month in Conservation Report No. 18; excerpts from the fiscal year 1973 annual report by EPA's Control Systems Laboratory; and excerpts from an Edison Electric Institute position paper entitled "Toward a Rational Policy for Achieving Clean Air":

SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR ORAL PRESENTATION OF A. JOSEPH DOWD, VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL OF AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER SERVICE CORP., AT CLEAN AIR ACT OVERSIGHT HEARINGS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION OF THE SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, MAY 13, 1974

Our fuels supply people have left no stone unturned in their search for eastern low sulfur coal. More importantly, AEP, itself, is developing just as expeditiously as possible reserves of low sulfur eastern coal. This is evidenced by the fact that in January we announced a new 1,300 mw plant in West Virginia which will be fired by low sulfur West Virginia coal. And we will continue these massive efforts for these problems must be resolved if we are to continue to carry out our obligation to supply the power requirements of our service area. Approximately 20% of these requirements are residential in nature and most of the remainder are industrial and commercial. You can readily see the economic consequences should it become impossible for us to meet the power requirements of this highly industrialized area of our country.

Unfortunately, Ohio and Indiana—where the balance of our fossil-fired generation is located—are devoid of low sulfur coal and it does not appear that sufficient quantities of such coal from elsewhere in the eastern coal provinces will be available to bring our Ohio and our Indiana plants into SO₂ compliance—and it is in these States where the greatest concentrations of industrial load exist.

There are, of course, vast reserves of low sulfur coal in the West which could meet the SO₂ limitations. These huge deposits are in thick seams which can be developed safely, inexpensively and in a matter of only a few years once we get started—and the AEP System is getting started both with respect to developing these western coal reserves and the necessary transportation and unloading facilities to bring the coal East. This western

coal is intended for use primarily at our future plants in Indiana and, perhaps, Ohio. For example, on April 11th we announced a new 2,600 mw plant on the Wabash River in Indiana which will be fueled by low sulfur western coal. Of course, most of the low sulfur western coal reserves are owned by the federal government which has, in effect, placed a moratorium on their development pending completion of comprehensive environmental studies. At the present time, even the issuance of federal prospecting permits is prohibited.

In addition to our future plants, we are also considering the use of conforming western coal at two of our existing Indiana plants which are located in the most westerly part of our System and which have boilers that, with some modification, could burn western coal.

Our most serious problem of compliance is in Ohio. Under the Clean Air Act, States are permitted to adopt regulations which are more stringent than those adopted by the federal EPA. Ohio, a major industrial State with hardly a speck of low sulfur coal, has done just that—and with a vengeance. First, for all power plants above a certain size—existing as well as future—it has adopted an SO₂ limitation of 1 lb. per million Btu of heat input. This is significantly more stringent than the 1.2 lbs. which the federal EPA has promulgated for new emission sources. Secondly, irrespective of whether a plant is operating in a region which is meeting the primary and/or the secondary ambient standards, all such plants are required to meet the 1 lb. limitation by mid-1975. In other words, Ohio has by-passed the health-related primary standards and has gone directly to the secondary standards. I doubt that any major power plant in Ohio will be able to comply with that limitation within the existing time frame.

While it might be possible, given time, to meet the 1 lb. limitation at our existing Ohio plants through the use of the very lowest sulfur western coal, substantial, if not insurmountable, difficulties would have to be overcome. Also, the development of these western coal reserves, the development of the necessary transportation and unloading facilities, the effecting of the necessary boiler modifications could not be accomplished overnight—we are probably talking about a time frame that would extend into the early 1980's. Furthermore, the burning of western coal in Ohio power plants would ruin a very major Ohio industry—the coal mining industry—and adversely affect related industries. Very substantial investments made in good faith would be wiped out and thousands of miners would be thrown out of work.

While compliance by burning low sulfur coal might not be impossible in the long term, we do not regard western coal as a reasonably available or practical method of compliance for our existing plants in Ohio. All that can be said for it is that it would be preferable to shutting down the plants.

Thus, at a time when the technology has not yet arrived, when oil and natural gas are in critical short supply—at such a time man-made SO₂ limitations have ruled out the use of most of our eastern coal and a moratorium has been imposed by our own government on the development of most of our western coal—coal, the only fuel that exists in abundance to meet our nation's energy requirements.

Coal is the only answer to our energy problems today and for many years into the future. We must begin a crash program to dig it and to put it to work as quickly, cleanly and efficiently as possible. In order to do that, we must release the vast resources of federally-owned coal in the West and we must make the necessary modifications in the Clean Air Act so that our mid-western coals can be burned.

CONSERVATION REPORT NO. 18, JUNE 1974
NEW COAL STUDY EXPECTED TO AFFECT CONGRESSIONAL STRIPPING, CLEAN AIR DELIBERATIONS

A study entitled "Low Sulfur Coal: A Revision of Reserve and Supply Estimates" done by Michael Reiber at the Center for Advanced Computation at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is expected by some observers to have considerable impact on upcoming Congressional deliberations on the bill to regulate coal stripping on the land to amend the Clean Air Act. Mr. Reiber points out that "conventionally, the definition of low sulfur coal, on which traditional reserve and supply estimates are based, depends only on the weight of sulfur in a ton of coal. The Btu content of the coal is not considered. Coal purchases and SO₂ regulations are based on Btu content. A recalculation of reserve estimates of low sulfur coal on a utility average Btu basis reduces traditional U.S. estimates by over 75% and western estimates by 85%. When calculated on a Btu basis, maximizing low sulfur coal production results in a supply shortage by 1985."

Many of the coal companies and utilities who have been actively lobbying on the stripping regulation bill and pushing for weakening of the Clean Air Act amendments have stressed the importance of developing the "massive" low sulfur coal reserves of the western United States. In underlining a point also made by the recent study of the shift from eastern to western coal made by the Mines and Mining Subcommittee Staff (See Conservation Report Number 8, page 96) Reiber points out that in order to meet the emissions standards contained in the Clean Air Act the coal sulfur content must be considered on a Btu basis. For example, coal containing 24 million Btu's per ton cannot contain more than 7% sulfur and still meet the standards of the CAA. However, coal which contains only half the heat value must contain correspondingly less sulfur. Much of the western coal is of such low heat value that it must contain less than .3 or .4 percent sulfur to meet the emissions standards. Under these criteria, Reiber points out, the western reserves of coal which can meet current air pollution standards are reduced by 85%. Throughout the country the total coal reserves of the United States are reduced by this reclassification on a heat value basis by almost 76%. Coal reserves in two regions of the country—the Appalachian and Interior regions—are increased by almost 18% because the coal from these regions has a relatively high heat value.

Assuming that coal production increases at an annual growth rate of 7%, Reiber estimates that the known recoverable reserves of coal of less than 7% sulfur "would fall short of maximum cumulative production by over one billion tons" in the next 15 years. Because of technological problems of burning lignite for steam electric power plants, Reiber says that the reserves of these must "be considered more a potential than an actual reserve." There is no corresponding shortage of high sulfur coal and one of the policy recommendations made by Reiber is that large capital expenditures in research and development of processes which reduce or eliminate the sulfur content of coal are necessary to provide the energy the United States will need in the coming decades. He points out that "for the consumer some of these costs can be offset by the elimination of the transportation charge differential between local high sulfur coal and coal from Wyoming, Colorado and Montana." As pointed out by the Mines and Mining Subcommittee report, many utilities are planning to pass through to the consumer the high transportation costs of bringing western coal to eastern utilities for electric generation. These charges to the consumer, Reiber suggests would be better spent to develop ways to utilize our more plentiful high sulfur coal reserves.

Reiber also examines factors affecting coal

utilization, including strip-mining and mine safety legislation, and suggests some policy options and alternatives. He points out that while "the current fuel emergency situation is being cited as a reason for allowing the burning of high sulfur coal for the duration of the emergency" . . . "unless and until the electric utilities in all the regional councils are required to share their capacity via the national transmission network, the justification for this is unclear." He also suggests that "neither the sulfur content of coal nor the current fuel oil shortage can be blamed for the shortage in electric utility generation capacity. Brownouts have occurred over the past two years. Given the time lag and plant construction, the causes of this shortage must be looked for, at least in part, in the period predating the Clean Air Act."

He also points out that the plans being developed by the energy industry for gasification and liquefaction plants in the West have not taken into consideration the problem of water. He points out that "given water problems, distance from major markets (which requires extensive pipelining), and available economically recoverable reserves, coal gasification plants in the states of Illinois, Indiana and Ohio would appear to be economically superior to those in the Rockies. With regard to stack gas scrubbing, Reiber says that "since the average sulfur content of coal used in power plants is about 2.5%, about 75% efficiency is necessary to ensure compliance with current EPA new source emission standards." Therefore, he concludes, "all processes which are reported to have a sulfur dioxide removal capability of greater than 90% can be used when burning high sulfur, high Btu coal." He also tries to place in perspective the problem of stack gas scrubber reliability. He quotes Mr. Louis H. Roddis, Jr., President of Consolidated Edison of New York, as saying that most economic studies which led utilities to go to nuclear power were based on an 80% deliverability of energy and that as of October 1, 1972 the average availability of the nuclear reactors operating in the United States was only 60%. Since the average availability of a new fossil fuel steam electric plant is expected to be 80%, Reiber says that combining the availability of new steam electric plants and the 60% availability of nuclear plants the stack gas scrubber would have an availability of no more than 75% in order that the joint probability would equal the 60% availability factor apparently acceptable to the public utility industry with respect to new atomic energy plants."

The dependence being planned by many utilities on low sulfur, but low heat value western coal, may cause some problems for pollution control technology, Reiber points out. " . . . Stack gas scrubbing is more efficient if the coal is high rather than low sulfur and if the ash content is relatively low. This tends to eliminate western "low sulfur" lignite and subbituminous coals. There is therefore, less need for strip-mining or coal development in the Rocky Mountain region." If western coal is to be used for electric power generation in the Interior and Appalachian regions where high sulfur higher Btu content coal is widely available, Reiber says it is possible to make "at least a ball park estimate of the amount of money that would be available for gasification, liquefaction or scrubbing in order to be able to use local coals in the high sulfur categories." He cites the example of Detroit Edison which recently made a 26 year commitment for the purchase of low sulfur western coal to be sent to two of its generating plants. According to the buyer, he says, the "value of the contract for the 26 years is \$1 billion for the coal, plus \$2 billion more transport and storage. It is this \$2 billion which, over a 26 year period, must be considered or available for alternate uses; in particular, for the purchase of liquefied or gasified coal from the Mid-West and Appalachian sources or stack gas desul-

furization." He also points out that the "transportation costs for coal from Montana or Wyoming to Michigan involves the energy cost of 3 to 5 percent of the heat value of the coal involved." A 7 million ton coal contract "involving rail transport from Wyoming to Chicago, would require 750,000 barrels of diesel oil per year. This cost is paid for, not in terms of relatively abundant coal, but in terms of diesel fuel oil."

CONTROL SYSTEMS LABORATORY: ANNUAL
REPORT FISCAL YEAR 1973

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Consistent with Congressional guidelines, CSL's major concern has been with the control of sulfur oxides from fuel combustion. About 80 percent of the Laboratory's total expenditures to date have been in this area and have been concentrated on flue gas cleaning. Flue gas cleaning devices are now being installed on commercial power plants in this country. The prototype demonstrations that CSL has underway are tabulated below. Except for clean fuels, flue gas cleaning is probably the only sulfur oxides control technique which will have widespread application within the next 10-15 years. With the expected shortage of clean fuels (amounting to about 20 percent of the coal demand), flue gas cleaning should find wide application.

PRESENT AND PROJECTED FLUE GAS CLEANING
DEMONSTRATIONS

Process and application	Startup	Removal efficiency, percent
Wet limestone scrubbing Shawnee-		
TVA (30 MW, coal)	4/72	75-90
Key West (40 MW, oil)	1/74	60-80
MgO scrubbing (Chemico; 155 MW, oil)	5/72	85-90
(Cat-Ox) (Monsanto; 100 MW, coal)	6/74	85-90
Wellman-Lord (115 MW, coal)	7/75	90-95
Stone & Webster/Ionics (70 MW, coal)	11/75	90-97

Value of coal resources: @ \$4/ ton.

Total value of eastern and midwestern coal resources: \$2.5 trillion.

Naturally occurring low-sulfur coal (less than 0.7% S) which meets New Source Performance Standards: \$0.2 trillion.

Additional reserves (to 2.5% S) meeting NSPS made available by 75% efficient flue gas scrubbing processes now becoming commercially available (Example: wet limestone scrubbing): \$0.8 trillion.

Additional reserves if essentially all known reserves made available by 95% efficient flue gas cleaning processes (Examples: sodium ion scrubbing with thermal regeneration, and sodium hydroxide scrubbing with electrolytic regeneration): \$1.5 trillion.

Because of physical and contractual limitations it is not possible to mine all the low sulfur coal first. (That is, the mining will proceed from left to right, not from bottom to top.) Thus a native resource approximating the GNP will not be available for use if cleaning techniques are not utilized. It had been projected that this would cause economic dislocations and unemployment, substantial increase in the flow of dollars outside the country, and increased dependence of the security of our country on mid-eastern oil; current events substantiate that projection.

Flue gas cleaning provides an economical and available solution to this problem. A typical annualized cost for control of a new, large, coal-fired power plant would be equivalent to a fuel premium of 18¢/MMBtu, and for oil, 13¢/MMBtu. Approximately 50 percent of the coal-fired power plants could be retrofitted at a cost equivalent to 20¢/MM Btu fuel premium, compared to a 35¢ to 50¢/MMBtu premium on clean fuels.

In conclusion, it would be well to emphasize one point which we hope has become clear: the identification of air pollutants, the setting of air pollution standards, and the development of economical technology to control the air pollutants to the required levels

is a complicated job requiring the most sophisticated monitoring, effects, and control technology. It is a big job; it will take time to accomplish; and it will be expensive. However, the reward for accomplishing this task is that the overall benefit to the country will far outweigh the cost of developing control techniques and technology and applying them to sources of pollution.

TOWARD A RATIONAL POLICY FOR ACHIEVING CLEAN AIR

President Nixon, drawing attention to the nation's plentiful coal resources in light of the energy crisis, has urged utilities to make even greater use of coal in the years ahead, and an estimated two-thirds of all fossil-fueled power plants now on the drawing boards are being designed for this fuel. Unfortunately, it appears unlikely that utilities can obtain sufficient quantities of low-sulfur coal prior to the 1980's.

In order to utilize low-sulfur coal on a widespread basis in the mid-1970's, the utilities must first determine whether mining interests can make available the vast deposits of low-sulfur coal west of the Mississippi River (in Wyoming, Montana, and North Dakota), whether their customers will be willing to pay the cost of bringing these deposits long distances to market, and whether such coal can satisfactorily be burned in existing boilers. Because the only method to remove these deposits is by surface mining, government is almost certain to require advance planning for land reclamation before surface mining can begin—further adding to the time and cost of development. The chairman of a major mid-eastern utility has estimated that the cost per ton of extracting low-sulfur coal, plus the cost of freight, could increase his company's total operating expenses—and, thus, consumers' bills—by a third. In addition to these high costs, the matter of proper management of fuels resources comes into play. For example, it has been estimated that approximately 4.2 million gallons of diesel fuel would be required to transport low-sulfur coal from Wyoming to fuel a single generating unit located in Western Illinois, a unit that has a capacity of 400 megawatts and requires annually some 1.3 million tons of coal.

Finally, a forced shift to low-sulfur coal will cause severe economic hardships for the coal industries, largely based in the East, and its employees. The Pittston Company, with coal mines in Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky, closed three mines in 1972 when utility customers were no longer allowed to burn high-sulfur coal. The Tennessee Valley Authority purchases over one-fifth of Kentucky's total coal production, including 44 percent produced in western Kentucky. None of West Kentucky's coal is sufficiently low in sulfur content to meet sulfur oxide emission standards.

SCIENTISTS WARN ABOUT NUCLEAR GIVEAWAY

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, atomic scientists are uniting in alarmed protest about Mr. Nixon's promise of "peaceful" nuclear reactors to Egypt and Israel. On Sunday June 23, several scientists were quoted in an interview with Thomas O'Toole in the Washington Post. All stress the danger of plutonium, separated from fission products of uranium-fueled reactors. Whether the reactor is

"peaceful" or "military," the danger is the same:

Every nuclear reactor in the world starts making plutonium the moment its uranium fissions and begins to make heat . . . Plutonium in its powdered form is about as poisonous a substance as there is . . . Inhaled plutonium would cause immediate lung damage, and if the dose were large, death from suffocation would take place in minutes . . .

Plutonium also endures. Its half-life is 24,000 years. An ounce of plutonium created today will be radiating alpha rays 200,000 years from now. There is nothing more toxic than alpha rays, not even an overdose of X-rays.

What are we doing to the future of the world when we toss such a substance around as carelessly as if it were talcum powder?

I feel very strongly that Congress must take the responsibility for rejecting such reckless acts, and I would like my colleagues to read carefully the article which I now insert into the RECORD:

SPREAD OF PLUTONIUM WORRIES A-SCIENTISTS (By Thomas O'Toole)

When India decided in 1971 to build an atomic bomb, it was already halfway along to achieving its goal.

Hundreds of physicists had been put to work before 1970 at Bhabha Research Center near Bombay, designing the bomb and the super-sensitive explosive that would serve to trigger it.

Computers had begun the painstaking task of testing the weapon on paper. Most important, India had secretly been removing from a small "research" reactor the priceless plutonium it used to make the 14-kiloton bomb that exploded in the Rajasthan desert May 18.

Only India knows how much plutonium it put together to make its first bomb, but it could have been as little as 14 pounds.

Whatever they used, the Indians had little trouble accumulating it. For 10 years they had been gathering as much as 20 pounds of the gray metal every year, merely by separating it from the fission products of a uranium-fueled reactor built for the Indians by the Canadians in the 1950s.

India was the sixth country to explode an atomic bomb, the fifth to do it first with plutonium. Only China exploded a uranium bomb first, presumably because it acquired uranium before it could make plutonium.

Plutonium was discovered only three decades ago, and is made when an atom of U-238 (natural uranium) absorbs a neutron cast off by fissioning U-235, the isotope of uranium used in bombs and, in much less concentrated form, in reactor fuels. Every nuclear reactor in the world starts making plutonium the moment its uranium fissions begins to make heat.

This means that whoever wants to make a bomb need only extract plutonium from the irradiated wastes of an atomic power plant. He doesn't need a uranium enrichment plant to make "weapons-grade" (93 per cent U-235) uranium, a factory that's likely to cost \$250 million to build and \$50 million a year to operate.

There are other reasons why a plutonium bomb is the cheapest and easiest to make. It can be built from half as much metal as a uranium bomb. It can also be made using impure plutonium. In fact, the impurities contain a built-in generator (an isotope known as Pu-240) of neutrons, something needed to start the chain reaction that explodes the bomb.

"It's the plutonium curse," is the way it's put by the Atomic Energy Commission's Dr. Charles Thornton. "Something that society

is going to have to struggle with for the rest of time."

The perils of plutonium have been spotlighted by the world's rush to "go nuclear." There are today 15 countries operating atomic power plants, all of them quietly producing plutonium. It's true that a nation needs a plutonium separation plant to get at it, but India's example has served to dispel any ideas that plutonium extraction is reserved for the rich.

Atomic power plants are also being built in another 10 countries and are on order in at least 10 more, including oil-rich Iran. Spain is building six, Sweden eight, West Germany 13 and Japan a staggering 16. Egypt and Israel aren't on this list, even though President Nixon promised to sell one plant to each of the countries on his 10-day tour of the Middle East.

The likelihood that Egypt and Israel will have power plants producing plutonium has triggered a busy debate on Capitol Hill, where the House Armed Services Committee is to hold hearings on the subject this week.

Three senators (Lawton Chiles of Florida, William Proxmire, of Wisconsin and Frank Church of Idaho) have questioned the wisdom of introducing plutonium to the Middle East.

"The world has witnessed a spurt of nuclear developments in several countries, which does not bode well for the future," said Church, a key member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. "I am particularly disturbed that President Nixon has committed the United States to furnish nuclear capability to Egypt and Israel, two countries which have fought four hot wars over the last quarter of a century."

It will be eight years before Egypt and Israel get the nuclear power plants promised by the President, and in those eight years the rest of the world will have accumulated more than 250,000 pounds of plutonium. That's enough to make 20,000 atomic weapons, almost as many as the United States has today in its arsenal.

By the time Egypt and Israel get nuclear power, the plants will probably be fueled with plutonium instead of uranium. So plentiful will plutonium be by the end of the decade that it might make sense to turn to "plutonium recycle," where the extracted plutonium is put back into the power plants to save uranium and money.

The pressures to go to a plutonium power economy will be enormous, partly because uranium is becoming scarce and partly because it is so expensive. A typical uranium fuel core with a 10-year lifetime costs more than \$100 million. The value of the fissile uranium is close to \$5,000 a pound, more than twice the price of gold.

Plutonium is more valuable than gold. More than \$1 million worth of plutonium can be recovered every year from a nuclear power plant. Four plants could produce enough plutonium to run a fifth plant. In effect, a million kilowatts of electricity would be generated free of fuel costs for every 4 million kilowatts, whose costs run \$40 to \$50 million a year.

"Plutonium recycle means you must worry about theft as well as an Indian-type diversion," said Dr. Theodore B. Taylor, a one-time designer of atomic weapons for the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. "Theft becomes a distinct possibility with plutonium fuel moving around the world."

The thieves could be the scientists of a country deciding to build a bomb. They could also be organized criminals, lured not by the wish for weapons but by plutonium's rising value on the black market.

"Once special nuclear material (like plutonium) is successfully stolen, a market for such illicit materials is bound to develop," said AEC Commissioner Clarence E. Larson. "As the market grows the number and size

of the thefts can be expected to grow with it, and I fear such growth would be extremely rapid once it begins."

The AEC takes pains to point out that the world is still debating the merits of a plutonium-fueled economy, but spreading nuclear power plants without plutonium fuel are still a threat. It's true the United States builds safeguards into atomic plants, but there are ways to break the safeguards.

The way India did it was to place its own natural uranium (less than 1 per cent fissile U-235) into the 40,000-kilowatt research reactor built for it by Canada. It took time and patience, but for every two pounds of uranium the Indians put in they got two ounces of plutonium out.

There are more clandestine ways to make plutonium. A few pounds of uranium could be taken out of the fuel package each year a plant is refueled, then irradiated secretly to make plutonium. Bootleg piping could be built into a power plant to remove tiny amounts of irradiated fuel, including the plutonium that has already been made.

The best way to do it would be to place plentiful natural uranium in the control rods and shielding inside the fuel bundle. Wherever neutrons leak out from the chain reaction will do. There is a chance of fouling up the neutron balance, and even a slight risk of losing the chain reaction this way, but if a country is dead serious about this approach it could make as much as 1,000 pounds of plutonium in a year.

One thing that worries the experts about plutonium is that terrorists or criminals might get their hands on it. They wouldn't even need enough for a bomb to make impossible ransom demands. The reason is that plutonium in its powdered form is about as poisonous a substance as there is.

The threat of a plutonium smoke bomb tossed into a New York bank might be enough to extort \$1 million from the bank. The threat of a plutonium "dispersal device" exploded in the air over San Francisco could be enough to empty the city. Winds could carry plutonium dust for miles, and people might have to stay indoors for days while trained troops wearing gas masks cleaned up the city streets and surrounding countryside.

A person could hold plutonium in his hand and not be seriously harmed. He might even get away with swallowing some of it, but if he got any in his bloodstream (through a wound) or inhaled any of it death might follow in a matter of hours, days at the most.

Plutonium is one of four radioactive metals (americium, curium and polonium are the others) that are alpha-emitters, meaning that they discharge alpha rays as their radioactivity decays. Plutonium also endures. Its half-life is 24,000 years. An ounce of plutonium created today will be radiating alpha rays 200,000 years from now.

There is nothing more toxic than alpha rays, not even an overdose of X-rays. Their radiated energy is 10 times more potent than X-rays and gamma rays, even though both those forms of radiation penetrate farther into the body.

Plutonium that seeps into the bloodstream seeks out the bone immediately, following the path of metals like calcium and strontium. It settles on the bone surface and stays there forever. It is even more poisonous to the lung, whose tissue is among the most delicate and sensitive in the human body. Inhaled plutonium would cause immediate lung damage, and if the dose were large, death from suffocation would take place in minutes.

"An alpha particle lays down its energy much more rapidly and much more completely than an X-ray," and the University of Minnesota's Dr. Donald Geesaman, once with the AEC's Livermore, Calif., labora-

tory. "It's like getting hit with a car and then run over by a truck."

There is little hard medical experience with plutonium and humans. The people killed in the Hiroshima and Nagasaki explosions (one a plutonium bomb, the other with some plutonium) were killed outright by blast, heat and immediate and massive radiation from all fission products of the explosion, including plutonium.

There have been experiments with dogs, tests done over the past 25 years with beagles at the University of Utah. One series of tests involved plutonium injections into the dogs' bloodstreams. Another followed the inhalation of plutonium by the dogs.

The dogs injected with the lowest dose levels got sick from plutonium. Fully one-third of the 65 dogs injected got bone cancer, living nine months after the onset of the disease. Two dogs got cancer of the liver, surviving about as long as the bone-cancer cases once the disease had set in.

Dogs inhaling plutonium suffered more. Forty-four of the 65 dogs in this test died in less than five years, all of them from lung failure. Twenty of the 21 dogs who survived five years died of lung cancer, all within a year of the start of the disease.

Despite its obvious ill effects if inhaled from a smoke bomb or a dispersal device, plutonium is at its most fearsome when it is used to make an atomic bomb. The irony of the fear is that weapons experts worry less about other countries building a plutonium bomb and using it than they do about terrorists threatening to make a stolen smoke bomb.

"If anybody built a plutonium bomb and used the goddamn thing they could count on retaliation from the rest of the world," said one of the country's foremost atomic weapons experts. "You might find the Russians and the Americans falling over themselves to make a world example of what happens to nations who tinker with nuclear weapons."

CHICAGO MINORITY BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY FAIR

HON. RALPH H. METCALFE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, last week representatives of major corporations of the Chicago area and representatives of minority-owned businesses came together at the seventh annual Chicago Business Opportunity Fair. Representatives of more than 100 large corporations arrived as customers and the minority enterprises came as potential suppliers of goods and services. I am pleased to learn that the number of participants was a record in both categories.

I would like to commend the Chicago Minority Purchasing Council, which sponsored the fair, for its continuing effort to help minority businesses break out of the limited minority market into the larger and more important general market. Without the cooperation of established companies, minority enterprise would be an even more difficult struggle.

I would especially like to compliment the companies which comprise the executive committee for the council: Abbot Specialty Metals Co., Inc.; Bell & Howell Co.; Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc.; Carson Pirie Scott & Co.; CNA Insurance

Co.; Commonwealth Edison Co.; Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co.; R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co.; Ebonie Oil Corp.; El Informado Press; The First National Bank of Chicago; Illinois Bell Telephone Co.; Inland Steel Co.; Jewel Food Stores; Montgomery Ward & Co.; Quinco Manufacturing Corp.; Sears, Roebuck and Co.; Soncraft, Inc.; Standard Oil Co. of Indiana; and Western Electric Company, Inc. They are giving needed leadership to a worthwhile cause.

The chairman of the fair, James W. Button, senior vice president for merchandising of Sears, has made an interesting report on the progress of minority enterprise in the Chicago area, and the continuing activities of the Council. His report follows:

REMARKS BY JAMES W. BUTTON

We are an economic society, in an economic world. We cannot, therefore, anticipate the full participation of minorities in our society unless there is equal access and opportunity for the minority entrepreneur.

The latest official figures for Chicago—developed four years ago—show 11,927 minority business organizations doing \$430 million annually. Some 8,747 black-owned businesses account for \$332 million; and 1,560 Spanish businesses account for \$46 million. Other minorities make up the remainder.

Any guess as to the size of the current local market would be hazardous. There is, however, one general observation that can be made. The number of minority businesses in Chicago, and their gross revenues, has grown impressively since 1969. More importantly, their share of the market has grown. Minority enterprise is healthier today than ever before.

I think it might be useful to note the reasons for this improved situation.

A major factor has been the determination of the minority businessmen. Despite the economic and social barriers, these men and women are struggling to establish viable enterprises—and to extend them beyond the limits of the minority market.

In addition, we have witnessed an increased appreciation for the minority businessman on the part of large corporations. Not only are major businesses more receptive to the minority vendor, but an increasing number are actively soliciting minority sources. We know through our work in minority enterprise that scores of companies have established minority purchasing units or functions, and the trend is continuing.

The National Minority Purchasing Council reports that more than 475 major corporations are participating in various programs sponsored by the Council.

Financing is another reason for the growth of minority business. Since 1970, approximately \$750 million has been lent to minority enterprises. The American Bankers Association expects figures to exceed one million dollars by 1975.

Further, combined deposits in minority banks have grown from \$395 million in 1970 to more than \$1 billion in 1973. Of this amount, federal deposits account for less than 15 per cent.

In 1970, there were ten Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Companies—MESBICS as they're called—with total capitalization of \$1.6 million. By 1973, there were 64 MESBICS capitalized at \$25 million. Today, it is estimated that there are more than 70 with capitalization in excess of \$30 million.

Finally, we cannot overlook the positive impact that government has had on minority business. The Office of Minority Business Enterprise in the Department of Commerce and the Office of Minority Enterprise at the

Small Business Administration have both made significant contributions to minority enterprise—contributions in the form of technical assistance, counseling and funding. These offices have also been instrumental in helping to develop markets for the minority entrepreneur. This has been done through organizations such as the Chicago Minority Purchasing Council, National Economic Development Association, Chicago Economic Development Corporation and Spanish American Businessmen's Association—each funded wholly or in part by OMBE, and all—I am happy to say—are among the co-sponsors for the 1974 Fair.

In 1970, the federal government provided \$200 million in grants and loans for minority business development. The figure for 1973 is in excess of \$670 million. For the five year period, the total government contribution was \$2.1 billion.

The government has also used its procurement powers to benefit minority enterprise. In 1969, the federal government purchased \$13 million from minority-owned businesses. The outlay for 1973 was more than \$731 million—approximately 55 times the 1969 figure.

Through the continuing combined efforts of the minority businessman, major corporations and government, I am confident that we will see minority enterprise continue to make solid progress.

I would now like to turn our attention to the 1974 Chicago Business Opportunity Fair, which is one means by which we bring together major corporations and governmental units with minority vendors in an effort to stimulate business.

It is important that we put the role of the Fair in perspective. Minority enterprise is a year round effort. The Fair is not. Contracts involving substantial sums of money cannot be negotiated and culminated at a booth in a convention hall atmosphere.

The purpose of the Fair is to initiate the contact between the minority vendor and the potential buyer. To maximize the possibility that these initial contacts do result in contracts, we have instituted several innovations for the 1974 Fair.

Probably the most significant innovation is the establishment of dollar goals by the major corporations. In addition to purchasing a booth, the major corporations are asked to submit an estimate to the amount of money they have available for the purchase of minority goods and services for the remainder of the calendar year. Let me emphasize, that this is an estimate—a goal, if you will. How much is actually spent will depend on the same influences that govern all transactions of this nature—quality of product, production schedules and so forth.

The establishment of these goals does two things. First, it tends to attract businesses with a sincere interest in developing minority sources. In addition, it gives us the ability to more realistically estimate the business potential of the Fair.

Another innovation for this year's Fair is the matching system. Major corporations will be asked to indicate, in advance, the particular goods or services for which they will be looking. This information will then be compiled and vendors will be referred to these companies. There are nine categories of products and services covering some 84 separate industries.

Another innovation has been the inclusion of smaller businesses as potential buyers. Companies with between 100 and 250 employees will be invited to participate. They will be represented in consolidated booths.

Earlier, I said that minority enterprise is a year round effort. One innovation is more apropos to the continuing effort that it is to the Fair. It is the Greater Chicago Minority Vendors Directory. In the Directory are identified 224 minority companies that have the proven capability to compete for major busi-

ness. The qualifications for inclusion in the Directory are similar to the qualifications for participation at the Fair. The companies must be wholesalers, distributors, manufacturers, contractors, and service businesses. Furthermore, they must meet minimum requirements, such as having a federal employer identification number, a non-residential address, bank references, or a resale tax number.

The Directory is not merely a listing of businesses. It is a summary of information about the individual companies—information useful to purchasing representatives.

I would be grossly remiss if I were not to mention the fine work being done by the seven co-sponsors for the Fair. They are: The Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry; the Chicago Economic Development Corporation; the Chicago Minority Purchasing Council; the Chicago Urban League; the Cosmopolitan Chamber of Commerce; the Latin Economic Development Corporation; the National Economic Development Association; and the Spanish American Businessmen's Association.

While we share overall responsibility for the total success for the Fair, the majority co-sponsors are concentrating on the participation of major corporations and the minority co-sponsors are using their resources to encourage minority vendor participation. Though we are a little more than a month away, it appears that both efforts will be successful.

The co-sponsors have also arranged a series of meetings designed to brief the minority vendors on how they might best utilize their time and opportunities at the Fair. Two days is hardly sufficient time for a minority businessman to participate in substantive meetings with more than a hundred business prospects. Judicious use of time is essential to the minority vendor.

I am confident that the 1974 Chicago Business Opportunity Fair will be a success, and that it will be one more step toward full participation in the American economic system by all minorities. That is not only an honorable and just goal, it is an essential one.

BOSTON TOWN BOARD PRAISES KEVIN KOBEL: MILWAUKEE BREWERS STARTING PITCHER

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, Kevin Kobel of the town of Boston, N.Y., has recently become a starting pitcher with the Milwaukee Brewers of the American Professional Baseball League. Kevin, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard Kobel of Boston, N.Y., got his start playing baseball in the Boston Recreation Little League Baseball program. At 15 he pitched, left-handed, on the Boston team in the County of Erie Baseball Association, competing against boys from all of Erie County.

When Kevin was 16, he successfully pitched on the Boston town team against men of all ages from all over western New York and northern Pennsylvania. Many were former professional baseball players, former college players, and the best high school players in the area.

Coming from an area which does not have a major league baseball team and competing in an age when the competition is extremely tough and selective, Kevin's achievements are extraordinary.

I am calling this to my colleagues attention because, as a former professional athlete, I am well aware of the discipline and dedication it has taken for Kevin to have attained the position of starting pitcher. Kevin's determination and hard work deserve the praise of all professional baseball fans.

A resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

At a regular meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Boston, Erie County, New York, held at the Boston Town Hall, 8500 Boston State Road, Boston, New York, on the 5th day of June, 1974, at 7:30 P. M. Eastern Daylight Savings Time, there were:

Present, John Sedovy, Supervisor; Milton Wittmeyer, Councilman; Leo Stromecki, Town Justice, Robert W. Tills, Town Justice.

Absent: Richard Kennedy, Councilman.

Supervisor Sedovy presented the following resolution and moved its adoption:

Whereas, Kevin Kobel is the son of Patricia and Richard Kobel of Eddy Road, Town of Boston, and

Whereas, Kevin is a native son of Boston and

Whereas, he got his start by learning to play baseball in the Boston Recreation Little League Baseball Program, and

Whereas, as a 15 year old he excelled as a left handed pitcher on the Boston team in the County of Erie Baseball Association competing against boys up to 19 years of age from all over Erie County, and

Whereas, as a 16 and 17 year old he excelled as a left handed pitcher on the Boston Town Team where he competed against men of all ages from all over Western New York and Northern Pennsylvania, many of whom were former professional baseball players, former college players and the best high school players in the area, and

Whereas, now at the tender age of 20 Kevin is a starting major league pitcher for the Milwaukee Brewers of the American Professional Baseball League, and

Whereas, The Town Board of the Town of Boston and all the people of The Town of Boston share the very deep pride that Dick and Pat Kobel have in their son and Boston's native son.

Now therefore, be it resolved that this resolution be bronzed as a trophy and a lasting symbol of our pride in Kevin and that it be displayed in the Town Hall trophy case for all to see, and

Further, be it resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to all the newspapers, radio stations, TV stations and Governments in Erie County to express to the peoples of other communities the deep pride that we have in Kevin Kobel and his family.

SUPPORT FOR INTERIOR COMMITTEE STRIP MINE CONTROL BILL BROADENS

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the senior Senator from Tennessee, Howard H. Baker, Jr., issued a statement endorsing H.R. 11500, the strip mine control bill reported by the House Interior Committee. I think his statement is important since it reflects an independent assessment of the features of the House Interior Committee bill and their practicality with respect to protecting the environment without preventing the

mining of coal. Senator BAKER's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.

U.S. Senator Howard Baker today endorsed H.R. 11500, the House Surface Mining Reclamation Bill, and expressed hope that Congress will complete work on the legislation as quickly as possible.

Baker, a leading supporter of the coal strip mine legislation which passed the U.S. Senate last fall, noted that the bill recently reported by the House Interior Committee contains a number of provisions similar to those approved in the Senate measure.

Among those provisions are requirements that surface mined land be regarded to its approximate original contour, except where more beneficial uses are proposed for the site, and that a process be established for prohibiting surface mining on lands which cannot be properly mined and reclaimed.

Senator Baker said the House bill represents an effort to balance the need for environmental protection with the need to expand domestic production of coal.

"Passage of the legislation along the lines of the Senate or House bill will provide the coal mining industry with a clear and attainable standard," Baker said, "so that it can make the financial commitments necessary to play an important role in making the United States self-sufficient in energy."

In view of the trend in the costs of competing fuels, Baker said he felt that increased production costs related to proper reclamation will not endanger the competitive status of coal. In my opinion, environmental costs are not nearly the threat to expansion of domestic coal production that continuation of the present ambiguity in reclamation requirements would be, the senator explained.

Senator Baker indicated he felt the House measure was superior to the Senate bill in the manner it deals with split ownership of surface and mineral estates. By requiring the written consent of the surface owner, the bill provides ample protection to land owners, but without arbitrarily banning access to coal where the U.S. owns the mineral estate, as the Senate bill would do.

FIRST NATIONAL CITY BANK PREDICTS 6-PERCENT UNEMPLOYMENT DURING COMING FISCAL YEAR

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday the House will consider the Labor, HEW appropriations bill for the 1975 fiscal year. I, along with Congressmen SILVIO CONTE and EDWARD PATTEN, will be offering an amendment to bring the amount of money available for public service employment up to the same level as was contained in the fiscal year 1973 appropriation.

An important factor in deciding what the level of jobs created under PEP should be is, of course, the unemployment rate that is expected for the coming year. The following article is a prediction about the rate of unemployment in the coming months made by the First National City Bank of New York for its customers. All important economic indicators, according to the article, point toward more joblessness during the next

12 months than we have experienced at any time in the past decade.

The article follows:

UNEMPLOYMENT: THE WORST IS YET TO COME

In this era of gaps—whether missile, generation or credibility—there is one little-known statistical interspace that's important to everyone. It's called the GNP gap, the difference between what the economy is capable of producing in any given time period and what it actually turns out. The gap has been widening since early 1973 and is expected to spread further during the remaining quarters of 1974. Indeed, the width of the gap may reach a degree not seen since the 1960-61 recession. And, as the gap widens, unemployment will probably rise to about 6% by year-end.

A number of signals have been foreshadowing the latest cyclical rise in unemployment, which began with a half-percentage-point jump in the first quarter. The manufacturing workweek and overtime hours both peaked early in 1973 and have eased steadily downward ever since. New hires and the "accession" rate—which includes rehires—in manufacturing also reached their highs in the first half of 1973, while manufacturing layoffs, an inverse indicator that rises in recessions, have been increasing since late summer, early-fall of last year. This latter series excludes service employees, such as airline personnel, who suffered layoffs due in part to energy problems. All of these series are officially classified as "leading indicators" by the National Bureau of Economic Research.

They have performed well in foretelling developments in employment as well as in the general economy. Moreover, the employment indicators, unlike others, are not measured in dollar terms and are, therefore, not directly distorted by inflation.

LEADERS AND OTHERS

As they curtail production, businessmen initially seek to reduce the size of labor input in man-hours with a minimal disruption of employment levels. This is particularly true with respect to overtime, which can be reduced with no effect on unemployment. Other adjustments cushion the unemployment rate from abrupt changes, but still contribute to unemployment. As new hires decline, for example, there is no loss in employment, but people seeking work will be less successful.

Thus, the unemployment rate itself is considered a coincident, not a leading indicator. As the economy withdraws further from its inherent upward path, the unemployment rate will rise step by step, lagging just a few months behind the GNP gap.

The reason the GNP gap and unemployment rate move in parallel is that both measure deficiencies in resource utilization. The unemployment rate is a measure of labor underutilization while the GNP gap measures the underutilization of both labor and capital. The GNP gap is most meaningful when expressed as a percentage of the economy's real potential output, since economic growth will widen the actual dollar gap over time.

The concept of real potential gross national product was popularized in 1962 by the Council of Economic Advisers. It is intended as a gauge of the level of real GNP that would prevail if available resources were fully employed. Estimating the level of potential GNP requires the use of some admittedly arbitrary assumptions, such as the unemployment rate assumed to represent full employment—traditionally, a 4% rate has been used.

In addition, since potential GNP is intended to reflect changes in the labor force, hours worked, the capital stock, technology and labor skills, it cannot be expected to grow in a steady, smooth fashion. But because it

can't be measured precisely, smooth rates of increase have been projected. The CEA has estimated that potential real GNP grew at a 3½% rate in 1952-62, 3¼% in 1963-65 and 4% from 1966 to the present.

Computational difficulties notwithstanding, the calculation provides a useful tool for economic analysis. Whenever real GNP grows less rapidly than the potential growth rate and the percentage gap widens, it is an indication that business conditions are softening. And when actual growth exceeds the potential growth rate—as in post-recession periods—it is both a sign that slack is being taken up and a warning of possible inflationary demand pressures. Over the years, the percentage gap has averaged between 3½% and 4%, corresponding to an average unemployment rate of 4½-5%.

The unemployment rate is a slightly more slippery notion because changes in its numerator, the number of unemployed, are intertwined with developments in its denominator, the labor force—the number of people working or seeking work—and because growth in the labor force is quite volatile as opposed to the smooth tracking calculated for potential GNP. Most notably, labor-force growth appears to respond to changes in the real wage rate. In the late stages of expansion and heading into a recession, the typical softening in the labor markets and in real wages often produces a reduction in labor-force growth. This restrains the rise in the unemployment rate, but not enough to prevent it from performing cyclically anyway. There is one further aspect of the GNP gap-unemployment rate mutuality to consider: lags. And this introduces a more quantitative analysis.

Arthur Okun, an erstwhile member of the Council of Economic Advisers and later its chairman during part of the Johnson Administration, was the first economist to describe econometrically the relationship between the percentage real GNP gap and the unemployment rate. He suggested that each percentage point difference above the 4% full-employment target was associated with a 3% decrease in real GNP over the course of the year. This approach was subsequently refined and reestimated to provide a model linking changes in the unemployment rate to changes in the GNP gap. Its most recent redefinition indicates that if real GNP were to remain flat for a year the unemployment rate would rise by between 1.2 and 1.4 percentage points.

DRAWING A FORECAST

One form of the model that is more useful in forecasting correlates the current level of the unemployment rate with the levels of the percentage gap in both the current and previous quarters. In fact, the influence of the gap in the previous quarter is three to four times greater than that in the current one, reflecting the factors that make the unemployment rate a coincident, rather than a leading indicator.

Linking this model with the outlook for the economy sketched in the first article in this issue of the *Letter* produces the forecast of a rise in the unemployment rate. Until real GNP begins to grow at a 4% annual rate, the GNP gap will continue to increase. Real GNP is not likely to rise this strongly until the end of 1974 at the earliest. It appears probable, therefore, that the unemployment rate will rise at the end of the year to the neighborhood of 6%.

Employment, however, should remain relatively steady, with most of the increase in the unemployment rate reflecting labor-force growth. With the exception of the 1948-49 recession, the percentage decline in employment has consistently been smaller than that in output.

HE WHO GETS STUNG

A rise in the overall unemployment rate will not affect different age-sex groups uni-

formly. All rates will rise, but those for adult females and teenagers will not rise proportionately as much as that for adult males. Plotted on the chart are the ratios derived by dividing first the female and then the teenage unemployment rates by the rates for males. They show a very clear cyclical pattern, turning down in advance of a recession and then dropping sharply as it runs its course. In addition, an examination of the percentage-point difference, or spread, between the female and teenage rates and the male rate suggests that, at least for women, it also narrows during bad business times. This is in marked contrast to the experience of black workers, for example, in which the ratio of black-white unemployment rates remains fairly stable at 2:1 while the absolute spread increases.

The reasons for this variation in relative rates of unemployment are not entirely clear. In part, the answer may be purely statistical. Since the unemployment rate for adult males is typically at a much lower level when recession begins, the proportional rise in the rate tends to be large. But there are also more substantive reasons.

The labor force can be divided into those workers who are strongly committed participants and into another group for whom participation is one option in a choice of life styles. The first group is composed largely of family breadwinners while the spouses and teenaged children of those breadwinners make up a goodly proportion of the second group. When a member of the first group, is laid off or otherwise out of work, he or she joins the ranks of the unemployed until a new job is found. Some members of the second group, however, leave the labor force when jobs are lost and potential members don't enter the labor force when jobs are scarce.

Since the adult women and teenage segments of the labor force comprise a larger proportion of people in this second category, this helps to explain why unemployment rates for these groups don't rise proportionately as much as they do for adult males when recession strikes. The converse is that, at such times, participation rates for these groups are subject to wider variations from trend than the rates for adult males.

While the dimensions of the prospective rise in unemployment are not up to the colorful projections heard during the chill of the oil embargo, they project the most serious dose of unemployment since 1961. The recent decline in the jobless rate—down 0.2 percentage points from January-February to 5.0% in April—cannot be treated as a harbinger of things to come, and must be discounted. Economic growth is expected to lag for some time yet, and this means a period of uncomfortably high unemployment.

COMMON CAUSE?

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, Common Cause is the highly successful and unique "citizens' lobby" headed by former HEW Secretary John Gardner. Founded in 1970, membership in Common Cause has grown continually and the group now numbers 230,000 members.

One of Common Cause's major targets has been the need for campaign reform. Virtually every positive measure which has been taken recently in this area can

be attributed in some way to the efforts of Common Cause. Moreover, the overall effectiveness of this organization, I believe, stems directly from the willingness of its members to work toward a better America.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting article concerning Common Cause appeared in the April edition of *Worldview*, a magazine published by the Council on Religion and International Affairs. Written by Mary Topolsky and entitled "Common Cause?" the article highlights many of the strengths of the organization, while objectively probing some of its weaknesses. In view of the fact that to a certain degree we are all somewhat familiar with the activities of Common Cause, I would like to take this opportunity to share this illuminating article with my colleagues. The article follows:

[From *Worldview*, April 1974]

COMMON CAUSE?

(By Mary Topolsky)

Dominating the lobby of Common Cause's very modern and very busy offices on M Street in Washington is a cork bulletin board nine feet high and six feet wide. Bold red letters proclaim NEWS! Littering the board are newspaper clippings from all over the country, each bearing a red pencil stripe beneath the phrase "Common Cause." Every working day over a thousand checks pour into this office, none of them tax-deductible. Membership in the organization has grown to 230,000 since its founding in 1970, and its membership renewal rate increased from a healthy 65 per cent in 1970 to a phenomenal 85 per cent in 1973. What sort of organization is this, and what can it tell us about our society and the individual's role in it?

"Everyone is organized but the people" proclaim its ads, and Common Cause has set itself the task of organizing a "people's lobby" operating in the same manner and, it is hoped, emulating the success of the special-interest lobbies. Out of these offices as many as twenty full-time professional lobbyists "work the hill." For the moment they confine their efforts to the legislature, but if their operations there prove successful they may extend them to the executive branch. Ironically, in the yearly report of lobbyists required by law, Common Cause found itself in the unlikely position of declaring the highest expenditures of any lobby on Capitol Hill, \$126,000.

Recently, Common Cause eliminated its regional offices in favor of a series of state organizations so that there may be lobbying at the state legislatures in the near future. Within the states Common Cause is uniquely divided into national Congressional districts, each of which is (theoretically) captained by a district coordinator whose main function is to organize and implement the telephone tree by which Common Cause members are directed to call or write their representatives on crucial legislation. The communication system seems quite effective.

The elaborate telephone communication center—the "Washington Connection," as it is called—is manned mostly by volunteer labor, as many as five hundred volunteers in the Washington area alone. There is no doubt that the national goals take priority: most of the calls are outgoing.

To date it has been the organization's policy to define the "common cause" as procedural or instrumental reform, rather than substantive change.¹ "The very instruments

the people must use to solve their problems—the instruments of self-government—are themselves in need of repair." Or as founder John Gardner put it metaphorically:

"We began with systemic repair. As I listen to people listing all the great problems they intend to solve, I think of people sitting in an ancient automobile by the side of the road. The tires are flat, and the steering wheel is broken, and the drive shaft is bent, but they're engaged in a great argument as to whether they should go to Phoenix or San Francisco or the Oregon Coast, and in my imagination I am standing by the side of the road saying, 'You're not going anywhere till you fix the goddam car.'"

To this end Common Cause is generally credited with getting the eighteen-year-vote amendment passed; initiating the litigation which forced the Nixon campaign to reveal its contributors prior to April 7, 1972; forcing an end to the seniority chairmanship on House committees; supporting the passage of the Women's Rights Amendment; and monitoring campaign finances in the New York City mayoral primary.

Unfortunately, in pursuing a single-minded goal such as "opening up the system" Common Cause can sometimes make superficial judgments. For example, "Operation Open Up the System" called the seniority system in Congress the "most shocking barrier to accountability in national government today. It frustrates a basic political right and responsibility: the citizen's capacity to call to account those who hold the levers of power. The public will never be able to make the committee chairmen accountable without requiring them to stand individually before their fellow party members for reelection." At the same time, John Gardner, writing in the June, 1973, issue of *Common Cause Report*, observes: "What got us into the horrors of Watergate is unbridled presidential power. We must curb that power in important ways."

One questions whether, given a need to curb Presidential power, it was wise at this time to end the institution of seniority. While seniority makes Congressional chairmen unaccountable to the people, it has the advantage of making them unaccountable to the President as well. One needs only a moment to reflect upon the enormous arsenal of pressure and inducements a President may bring to bear on his "fellow party members" to doubt the wisdom of such civics course nostrums. On a very practical level, those in line for chairmanships are no longer the conservative Southerners but the very reform-minded Congressmen who are most likely to be sympathetic to Common Cause's program. There is an eerie lag in these proposals, as if the undergraduate students of political science of a decade ago had at last come of age. (When the seniority system was abolished this past session, all of the incumbent committee chairmen were re-elected.)

By concentrating solely upon procedural questions, Common Cause gains the advantage of pursuing issues of low emotional effect, thereby avoiding divisions in its membership. It also has the advantage of being nonpartisan and helps allay the suspicion that Common Cause is a Democratic front organization. (At this point its membership is 50 per cent Democratic, the other half split between Independents and Republicans.) Of procedural issues available, the leadership shrewdly selects only those likely to be won, thus building a formidable batting average. Jack Conway, president of Common Cause, likes to depict it as a "tough, tight, and hard-hitting" organization.

out of obligation to other lobbies with whom C.C. usually combines. There is a 10-15 per cent overlap between C.C.'s members and the membership of environmental groups.

¹ There have been two exceptions to this rule: end-the-war legislation and the ban on the SST. These were probably in response to overwhelming membership interest, and

Dissension among the membership has been carefully avoided. Common Cause does not have chapters or regular meetings at the local level. When asked why, Conway replied that "the last thing our members wanted was another meeting to attend," and went on to note that such chapters would only be divisive and open to capture by small cliques which would drive other members away.

Communication between Common Cause and its membership is mostly from the top down, either through the various publications or the telephone tree. State organizations, which exist in about half the states, enjoy little autonomy from the central office and are required to have their programs examined by the national board for conformity with national priorities. Common Cause members can make their views known in several ways. They may run for, and vote for, fifteen seats on the Board of Directors (fifteen others are appointed to balance for geography and ideology), and they can respond to periodic polls of their views on various issues. This feedback is taken into account by the central office as an indicator of trends and sentiments and is sometimes implemented into policy.

There are still problems at the state level, however. Successful efforts are often the result of the work of a few highly dedicated individuals with no cushion of back-up personnel in case they should leave. Since Common Cause's philosophy is that leadership will surface of its own, no attempt is made to discover or develop leaders in the community. It would therefore seem to limit itself to people with certain socioeconomic and personality assets. Local members feel a lack of fellowship among themselves, and in fact often don't know who the other members are in their community. Because membership in Common Cause requires no deep commitment, volunteers may become capricious in following the latest political whim or fad (a problem by no means confined to this organization). In many states local issues are considered more important than national ones, although Common Cause is unequivocally focused upon national issues. For its membership—overwhelmingly middle class and suburban, and therefore used to purchasing services—Common Cause is not unlike the repair contract signed by appliance owners (this is certainly the way Common Cause sees itself: professional "fixers" of a "system" someone else has broken). Litigation (by the prestigious law firm of Arnold and Porter) and lobbying are professional skills requiring quick decision and expert discretion, and therefore not subjects for extensive debate by the membership.

An outstanding characteristic of Common Cause is its emphasis upon using the media. The leadership is unusually aggressive in its quest for "currency" in the press and on television. A state leader confided that he was under great pressure from the national office to break into a local slick magazine, a benefit he considered doubtful at best. Yet on a visit to this same state office the day Common Cause was highly praised in James Reston's column, I found an air of jubilation supreme. A Common Cause scrapbook, in which clippings had been neatly fossilized under plastic, was exhibited with considerable pride.

Can communication through the mass media replace real fellowship at the grass roots level? In a recent house study on field organization, one of the remedies suggested for "the need expressed by activists to meet with each other" was to "encourage activists to take the occasion of John Gardner on 'Face the Nation' to gather with other members to view."

In order to understand more fully the phenomenal success of Common Cause it is necessary to go beyond the history and organiza-

tional apparatus and delve into the values and philosophy that underlie it. The philosophy is detailed in the writings of John Gardner, founder and head, Ph.D. in psychology, former Secretary of HEW under President Johnson, member of the Carnegie Corporation and head of the Urban Coalition. His writings offer a rather systematic analysis of the nature of man and society, as well as prescriptions for action.

To John Gardner the human being is essentially a creature who seeks meaning, security and order. In his New Yorker interview with Elizabeth Drew he stated:

"We value meaning. It's a curious fact that no human society we know anything about has been willing to live in a meaningless world. The human being is a meaning seeking animal . . . and we value security."

"DREW. Do you mean personal or national security?"

"GARDNER. Both. People value a degree of safety. Critics have pointed out that it isn't a particularly heroic value, but they would be foolish to ignore it."

Gardner then touches what is perhaps the heart of the issue:

"D. Isn't it a fact that when various societies have had to choose between chaos and order, they have chosen order?"

"G. That's right. They have chosen order. So could we. Because order offers some measure of predictability, most Americans seek order and fear disorder. We are reluctant to let our minds dwell on this fact. Ever since Mussolini was praised for making the trains run on time, many Americans have been uncomfortable about even contemplating the deep impulse toward order. But it is there."

"D. So the issue, then, is what kind of order?"

"G. The issue is whether we have an order that squeezes out freedom or whether we have a "humane, ordered liberty." It's such a central issue that one would think it would be the subject of national debate. But it isn't."

If meaning, security and order are values foremost in our minds, we are at a loss to find these values realized in government, which is hopelessly inadequate, malfunctioning, unresponsive and corrupt. No optimist, Gardner takes the view that all institutions are doomed to failure (recall Conway's views on local chapters being captured by "cliques"). Gardner appears willing to settle for merely reducing corruption to tolerable limits, it having long ago exceeded those limits. For the present, he views government at all levels as a meaningless morass which is totally unresponsive to human needs—

" . . . Most state governments are incompetent. . . . Most state legislatures are tragically inadequate. . . . Most city government is so designed to make government impossible. . . . the Congress of the United States needs a thorough overhaul . . . the political parties are too often unresponsive to the concern of their own members, and . . . corruption runs rampant through the system."

"The truth is that our political and governmental arrangements are so badly designed for contemporary purposes that they waste the taxpayer's money and mismanage good programs. The citizen does not have access to them. They are not instruments of the popular will. They cannot be held accountable."

"Effectiveness, access, responsiveness, accountability—these are the attributes we have a right to expect of our instruments of self-government. They do not characterize our government today. Under present conditions, our political and governmental machinery cannot serve anybody—neither poor people nor the middle class, neither black

¹ If this sentence is boiled down to its essentials it reads: Because order provides order most Americans seek order.

nor white, neither young nor old. Even very gifted leaders can't make the machinery work" (*In Common Cause*).

"Even very gifted leaders can't make the machinery work," because the very size of modern society, especially its bureaucracies, undermines the best efforts of the best individuals. "Individuals are less apt to be victims of a tyrant," Gardner has said, "than to be victims of large-scale organization, victims of the tyranny of the formula. You may not be done in by an enemy but by impersonal forces. That's why citizens have to organize—to understand the bewildering pressures impinging on them, and examine ways of holding their own against these forces."

If the bureaucracy is intolerable, political parties are also incapable of serving the needs of the individual. These are captured by special interests, a victim of the large campaign contributors, political machines and a "cult of personality." Therefore, individual action can prove only frustrating and ineffectual, while nongovernmental action by small private groups can turn out to be insignificant, since they quickly come up against the power of government.

The result of this dilemma, Gardner says, is that the disaffection which generally characterizes the ideological poles is now spreading inward to the solid middle which normally stabilizes a society. He warns: "The loss of confidence in our institutions isn't a visible objective reality like a flood or a recession. One might more easily compare it to the unmeasurable subterranean stresses that precede a major earthquake. . . . We must not ignore the possibility of such shattering surprises on the political and social front—indeed, we've already had a few."

When Gardner speaks of government he is likely to employ mechanistic metaphors, like that of a broken-down automobile, or to speak of "governmental machinery." On the other hand, when discussing the threats to government and its attendant dangers, he is more likely to express himself in analogies to natural forces—floods, recessions or earthquakes. The significance lies in the extraordinary importance he places upon organizational gadgetry in government institutions, an emphasis most congenial to the white, suburban middle-class constituency to whom Common Cause appeals. In these people lies the repository of skills most in demand at the upper levels of industrial society. This class of professionals is most susceptible to arguments that employ solutions to political problems analogous to those they use in everyday life, in their work and personal lives, and which have proved to be so financially remunerative. One does not become a professional without internalizing a belief in the efficacy of organization and technology.

This reliance upon technological solutions to political problems is, of course, not unprecedented. It is characteristic of American reform movements to combine a set of diametrically opposing notions. On the one hand they perceive government to be inadequate to the challenge of the times as they define it, and on the other they desire to make it more "democratic." It is the reconciliation of these polar opposites which makes such movements so curious. In the case of early twentieth-century reform movements, for example, it was the eminently successful administrative apparatus of the German enemy which American bureaucrats emulated. In order to do this it was necessary to strip away the Prussian autocratic elements and retain only the efficiency. These techniques were then synthesized with the notions of Jacksonian democracy to produce a civil service open to everyone with the requisite education. Naturally, "corrupt politics" and "bossism" had to go.

With Common Cause we find again the

charge that government is inadequate to the task imposed by the changing times. Again we find the attempted reconciliation of democratic citizen participation with the techniques of the enemy, in this case the big lobbies. However, where the other lobbies fit Madison's famous definition of factions as "adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community," this lobby operates "in the common cause."

Common Cause's isolation of technique from its invidious matrix is the organization's hallmark in thought and action. It raises the question of whether a reconciliation of these techniques with democracy is possible. Are instruments empty vehicles, or do they carry their own freight? Are the solutions of organizational society relevant, when there is strong evidence that we are at the end of industrial society as we have known it? Furthermore, is efficiency what people really want from government, or are they searching for something more "meaningful"? Is government a piece of machinery, to be tinkered with like an "ancient automobile"? Or, to turn Gardner's metaphor around, what good does it do to fix the car if you don't know where, or even if, you want to travel? Perhaps you will want to get someplace too far to travel by car.

The Common Cause program reflects the feelings of the outsider: a desire to know what is going on, to be able to get "inside," to have accountability and attendance to one's needs. The program will presumably liberate the citizen from inaction and bestow renewed confidence in himself and his institutions:

"The individual has to regain confidence through being able to act. You just can't tell people, 'Now, be confident. The society is going to be good to you.' They have to act, and discover that the action counted. That is why I set out, in my endeavors, to carry through a set of exercises, in which we as citizens could in fact accomplish something. I felt strongly that it was the act that counted—not just holding certain values but acting in terms of our values, not just honoring the ideal but embedding it in our social institutions and, in the process, regaining our confidence that we could act, regaining our confidence that we are not cogs in the machine, not grains of sand in the bucket, but individuals with the power to initiate. That is where the whole pulsing life of a healthy society has to start."

In choosing as a symptom of a sick society the individual's inability to act, Gardner begins to approach the core of the case, the psychology of the citizen. Why are Common Cause's members themselves unable or unwilling to act? Why are they content, in fact, to delegate all decisions to the leadership of a Washington lobby? Why don't they insist upon grass roots meetings, discussions and control? Why is it that one can be an active member of Common Cause—making telephone calls, writing one's Congressman, reading the monthly newsletter, filling in the questionnaires, voting and even running in national board elections—without ever looking another member in the eye?

A frequent criticism of Common Cause is its almost exclusively white, affluent, suburbanite membership. This reverse snobbery serves only to mask the fact that Common Cause serves a very vital function for its constituents—it enables them to avoid further conflict while simultaneously performing their duties as citizens. No less than any other class in society, the affluent suburbanite is torn by the anxieties of conflicting beliefs. In this sense the suburbanite is no better or worse than his blue-collar counterpart, who also seeks to avoid conflict through surrogates—the police, judges, prison guards; and tends also to focus on a scapegoat—criminals or radicals. However, there is no other

class in society which subscribes as fervently as the professional middle class to the ethic of citizen participation, nor is there any class as painfully aware of how marginal such efforts are, or what a large psychic toll they invariably exact.

The members of Common Cause, after all, are not numbered among the politically inert. They are, for the most part, the experienced citizen-activists within their communities who have already realized how frustrating such activity is and who know the tremendous price exacted for meager results. The Vietnam protest movement was a tremendous political mobilization of this class. For them, Common Cause is a buffer against further frustration and disillusionment; the "activist" can hire lawyers and lobbyists to man the barricades for him.

Currency in the press serves to perpetuate this illusion. The more the member sees his organization and its leaders mentioned in the media, the more he is reinforced in his belief that Common Cause has found the key to successful political action. The danger is that the illusion of participation may prosper while the slums decay, economic concentration intensifies and America becomes a nation with fewer and fewer causes in common.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WALTER E. FAUNTROY ON THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, hearings were held on June 19, 1974, on what I regard as one of the most pressing issues facing this city today. This issue—how are we to organize the resources of local government and the private sector to combat the severe housing and economic development crisis confronting the District of Columbia? Three years ago I proposed, in H.R. 3266, one part of a solution, an urban development corporation patterned after a similar corporation in New York State.

With the prospect of hearings on my measure and legislative action this year, I redrafted and updated my initial proposal to bring the bill in line with events occurring over the past 3 years. That bill, H.R. 15363, was the subject of the June 19 hearings. The most important of the events contributing to my decision to update the bill is the advent of home rule government. The home rule bill brings planning and housing functions directly under the control of the Mayor and City Council. Accordingly H.R. 15363 more closely integrates the operations of the corporation with the planning processes of the local government. Also, in line with these greater measures of self-government, the bill was modified to eliminate Federal guarantees of the corporation's bonds. However, under title V of the housing and community development bill passed last week by the House Banking and Currency Committee, community development corporations, such as is here proposed by H.R. 15363, would be entitled to a Federal guarantee for their bonds.

There is no more important issue fac-

ing the District than the alleviation of the truly horrifying housing situation endured by thousands of District residents. The District government has only limited tools available to it to reverse the tide of deteriorating neighborhoods by generating new housing and commercial development.

The District now has no structure adequate to the task of coordinating and effecting the orderly and efficient growth of the community.

The Community Development Corporation, proposed by H.R. 15363, would begin to meet that problem. The CDC would bridge the gap between Government, where the power of planning and land assembly resides, and private enterprise, where the powers of development primarily rest. The CDC would give the District the power to build on its own initiative housing, commercial, and supporting facilities where the development objectives cannot be accomplished through the normal operation of private enterprise.

The CDC would have the authority to plan, finance, develop, and operate residential, commercial, and related facilities in risk situations where development is difficult under the normal operation of private enterprise. As such, the CDC would neither substitute for nor conflict with private action, but rather would create the basic conditions necessary to stimulate private investment. But private action would be guided by housing and commercial development goals established by local government and the Corporation.

Consistent with the actions taken in the Home Rule Act, the CDC is designed to be a part of the District government from the standpoint of overall policy and executive control, but would be a separate entity for administrative and financial purposes. The Corporation would have a board of directors which would be appointed by the Mayor and approved by the City Council. This Board of Directors would determine the general policies and procedures of the Corporation.

In accordance with the comprehensive planning and community development objectives adopted by the Mayor and City Council, the Corporation would submit an annual program to the Mayor and City Council describing the activities it proposes to carry out during the subsequent year. Each year, the Corporation's proposed annual budget and financial plan, including an estimate of the amount of bonds and debentures to be issued and the projects which are to be undertaken, must be approved by the Mayor and City Council. In addition, specific project plans must be submitted to the Mayor and City Council and approved before the Corporation may proceed on any project. The approval of the specific plans can be given only after public hearings by the City Council, with due notice given to affected occupants and property owners of the area.

The Corporation's operations are further integrated with those of the local government by the requirement that the Corporation consult with agencies of the District charged with the duty of preparing the annual city budget, capital

improvements program, the comprehensive plan, and the community development program for the city.

The Corporation would establish appropriate procedures for informing, involving, and providing opportunities for review by affected citizens and organizations. In addition, the Mayor and City Council must establish that private enterprise is either unable or unwilling to accomplish satisfactorily and in a timely manner the proposed planning and policy objectives.

The CDC would comply with all local zoning laws and regulations. However, where the Corporation determines that strict compliance with such regulations would prevent construction of any project, the Corporation may petition either the Zoning Commission or the District of Columbia Council for an exemption. The exemption would be automatically granted unless the Zoning Commission or Council takes action within 60 days of the request. This provides a mechanism that insures that difficult policy questions related to zoning and codes are confronted and decided and not buried by bureaucratic inaction as is now so often the case.

The Corporation has two major functions: community development and housing finance. With respect to community development, the Corporation may acquire property, construct or rehabilitate structures, sell, assign, lease, mortgage, or dispose of any of its property or structures.

The potential effectiveness of the Corporation comes from its ability not only to plan, but also to build and manage its projects. After their completion, the Corporation then has the ability to sell its projects which will enable the Corporation to gain the capital to develop new projects and thereby stimulate growth to meet the ever rising and ever changing housing needs of the community. The rebuilding of the riot corridors has been stalled by the unwillingness or inability of the private investor to undertake higher risk development when more attractive and "safer" investments are readily available. The Corporation can fill the void and offer the development momentum necessary to attract private capital.

With respect to housing finance, the Corporation will have the power to make, insure, and sell mortgage loans secured by a mortgage lien. The Corporation will thus be able to provide a secondary mortgage market for the higher "risk" property in low-income areas. The Corporation will have the financing power to assist and encourage the provision of housing for rental or purchase by persons of low or moderate income, where private financial institutions or Federal Government programs are unable to do the job.

The Corporation will have the power to acquire real property by eminent domain. The Corporation will have the responsibility of relocating all displaced persons in decent, safe, and sanitary housing before proceeding with any approved project. Those individuals and families who are displaced by the Cor-

poration's projects will be given priority in projects undertaken by the Corporation.

The Corporation and not the District, will be primarily responsible for the Corporation's financing. The most important source of funds for the Corporation would be from the sale of corporate bonds. The Corporation would also have the authority to use funds appropriated by Congress, Government loans, its own bonds, notes, debentures, or the revenue from its own operations to meet its project costs. The Corporation would have the authority to issue bonds and notes not exceeding \$75 million for which it shall be liable. To assure the continued operation and solvency of the Corporation, the Corporation, together with the District government, would create a capital reserve fund which would equal the maximum amount of principle and interest maturing and becoming due in any succeeding calendar year. This reserve fund would be created for all outstanding bonds of the Corporation.

The Corporation would be subject to all local and Federal taxes, but the City Council may waive any or all local fees or taxes. This is a means of providing additional subsidies, particularly for persons living in low- and moderate-income housing.

In order to commence operations, the Corporation will receive an appropriation of \$5 million which will be repaid to the U.S. Treasury within 5 years.

The concept of the CDC is neither new nor untested. New York led the way in 1960 with a State housing finance agency and followed with an urban development corporation. In the next decade, 11 States followed New York's example. At present, 30 States have housing finance or development agencies, and another 10 States are considering legislation to establish such agencies. The primary function of these agencies has been to provide financial assistance for the construction of low- and moderate-income housing. In general, the State finance agencies have been given a broad range of authority which includes both evaluating housing deficiencies and developing programs to correct these deficiencies.

Twenty-nine States have a bonding limitation of at least \$50 million with the vast majority having a higher limit. Seventeen States have the authority to acquire land and 14 States have the authority to undertake the construction of or rehabilitate housing. Over 20 States have the authority to make construction or mortgage loans.

The more experienced housing finance agencies have been able to deliver their projects for occupancy more rapidly than HUD. The agencies, although autonomous by statute, have established relationships with other State bureaus and have thereby coordinated their planning activities with State departments of community affairs and local social service agencies. Hence, the State housing finance authorities in existence have been able to function in harmony with other State agencies and have shouldered the responsibility of meeting State housing needs.

The District of Columbia needs a CDC. Rather than awaiting City Council action next year, congressional authorization this year is necessary for a number of reasons. The first is timing. Because of the need to organize itself and sort out its legislative priorities, the new City Council might not establish a CDC for a considerable time. Action is needed now. Second, congressional authorization would avoid this delay and accelerate the momentum of development in the Bicentennial period. Congressional authorization would also allow us to take advantage of new Federal housing legislation expected to go into effect in January of 1975. Finally, and of great importance, congressional approval establishing the Corporation may avoid much time-consuming test litigation to determine the exact limits of the Corporation's authority, and also would result, I have been advised, in a higher degree of marketability for the Corporation's bonds.

If the CDC is authorized, the District government will have more flexibility in determining how it wishes to organize itself in terms of how much of which functions to assign to various city departments. The city will have at its disposal and control an instrument with which it can lead the way to an integrated and responsive program to meet the Nation's Capital housing development needs.

BROOKLYN JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL ISSUES RESOLUTION

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the Soviet Jews has always been of great concern to me inasmuch as these people have suffered a great deal merely because they follow their religious convictions.

With President Nixon's forthcoming visit to the summit meeting in Moscow, I think it is imperative that we again reaffirm our commitment to supporting the Soviet Jews right to freedom from persecution and the assurance that should they chose to emigrate to other lands that they will not be denied this right.

The Brooklyn Jewish Community Council, the organization which is at the helm of all synagogues, institutions, and organizations within the Brooklyn Jewish community and which represents more than 1 million citizens, recently assembled at its annual meeting and issued a resolution dealing with the Soviet Jewry. In light of the significance of this resolution, I extend my remarks today to include this document in the RECORD:

SOVIET JEWRY—RESOLUTION

The Brooklyn Jewish Community Council assembled at its Annual Meeting on June 6th, 1974.

Mindful of the fact that the President of the United States and the leaders of the Soviet Union are on the threshold of another meeting in an effort to achieve peace and

prosperity, welcome and endorse all efforts to secure global detente. However, we strongly believe that cooperation between our two peoples must be extended to include freedom for Soviet Jews, especially their right to leave, and for those Jews who choose to remain in the U.S.S.R., their religious and cultural identity.

To Soviet Jews we pledge our continued solidarity, and we give our promise to remain vigilant.

We call upon the government of the U.S.S.R. to:

1. Release the Jewish Prisoners of Conscience who languish in Soviet labor camps, and whose only real crime was their wish to emigrate to Israel.

2. Allow those Soviet Jews who have been waiting, for many years, to immediately emigrate.

3. Permit all Soviet Jews who wish to do so to leave for Israel, or any country of their choice.

4. Remove vague and arbitrary emigration procedures, by regularizing and standardizing the process, in an open form.

5. Make available the institutions, schools, textbooks and materials necessary to teach the beliefs, the languages, the history, the practices, the culture and the aspirations of the Jewish people.

In the name of humanity and justice, we voice our hope that the government of the U.S.S.R. will respond to this call.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS SOUND AND WORKING

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I request that the text of an excellent article on the social security system by Wilbur J. Cohen, dean of the school of education at the University of Michigan, which appeared recently in the Detroit Free Press, be printed at this point in the RECORD:

SOCIAL SECURITY IS SOUND AND WORKING
(By Wilbur J. Cohen)

The recent articles on the American Social Security System by Warren Shores are a collection of prejudicial half-truths, misstatements, and misleading comments. They are a grossly unfair and inaccurate presentation.

Their cumulative effect is to create anxiety, misunderstanding and doubt about the financial integrity of the Social Security System. These articles are vicious and unfortunate attacks on the peace of mind of millions of older citizens and other beneficiaries of the program, as well as being a collection of misleading and inaccurate statements.

The "solution" to the problems presented by Mr. Shores is the impractical idea of having Congress repeal the federal law creating our Social Security System and giving Americans the option of buying government bonds or commercial bonds to cover their retirement and disability and their survivors as social security now does for eligible persons. Everyone has this option now, but it is not a realistic alternative to the problem social security was intended to alleviate. Shores' "solution" didn't work before the depression in 1929—that's why Congress created social security in 1935—and it would not be a feasible solution to old age dependency or poverty for millions of people now or in the foreseeable future.

Author Shores' major problem is that he apparently doesn't understand the difference between the concepts of "insurance" and "savings." The second reason that the conclusions he arrives at are inaccurate is that he mixes up and is confused by those statistics and figures which he does give to readers and then fails to give all the information and data necessary to evaluate his freak illustrations. Shores is obviously a devotee of the philosophy that "the exception proves the rule." Let us take his charges one-by-one and show the immensity of his misrepresentations and his use of the "big lie."

1. Mr. Shores says "social security has not done any part of what it set out to do." This is a flat outright lie. If there were no social security program today, there would be 12.5 million more persons in poverty in the United States. This would be an increase of 50 percent in the number of people in poverty. There are 25 million people with incomes below the poverty line at the present time. How can Shores in good conscience claim then that social security hasn't done "any part" of what it set out to do?

SOCIAL SECURITY IS VALUABLE FAMILY PROTECTION

2. Mr. Shores has related examples of persons who could receive more in benefits by some other investment of their funds. Social Security is a government-operated insurance plan.

The essence of "insurance," whether public or private, is that some people will pay into the plan more than they receive back, some will receive back more than they paid in, and some will break even. This is in contrast to "savings" in which each person always receives back more than he paid in. Social security was never designed to be a substitute for a savings-bank system. It was designed to be insurance.

Thus, an individual who lives to age 85, 90, or 95 years will receive back in pension payments much more than he or she paid in premiums. A person who dies the day before he or she retires will have lost all the payments.

A mentally retarded person or a retired, disabled, or deceased person may receive \$50,000 or more in social security payments during his lifetime.

The widow and children of a deceased young worker may receive a total of \$50,000 or \$100,000 even though the payments into the social security system were only \$2,000. A widow with young children can now receive over \$700 a month in survivors' benefits. Moreover, these benefits are not taxable. This is a tremendous financial security for young families. Survivors' benefits under social security are frequently the only continuing monthly benefits received by most families where the worker has died.

What Mr. Shores doesn't disclose when he argues that each worker should be permitted to buy his own protection is that there is a vast difference in the cost of private life insurance among different companies in the United States. A study made by the Pennsylvania Insurance department shows that for a man age 35 the average annual cost of a straight \$10,000 life cash-value insurance policy varied from \$42 a year to \$86 among the 50 largest companies in the nation—a 100 percent difference in cost between the lowest and highest!

What Mr. Shores also doesn't tell is whether each citizen will buy the cheapest insurance or the dearest. In social security, he or she gets the benefit of the maximum protection at the minimum cost—and at the lowest administrative costs. No private insurance company can provide the same coverage as the federal Social Security System does unless it charges the wage earner higher costs for administering the program.

Mr. Shores ignores the great advantage of social security over most private insurance

and private pension plans. Social security benefits will automatically increase in the future as the cost-of-living and wages increase. This mandatory requirement has already been written into the existing federal statutes governing social security. Thus, while most insurance contracts and private plans guarantee a fixed amount of dollars, the social security plan now guarantees an inflation-proof benefit! The government-paid insurance benefits will increase in amount as the years go on. Shores tries to compare present social security benefit levels with present private insurance benefit levels in order to show that social security benefits will be inadequate in the future. By intentionally or unintentionally neglecting to tell readers that government insurance (but not private insurance) must pay more in the years ahead, it becomes obvious that all the illustrations used by Mr. Shores are basically erroneous for the future.

What Mr. Shores also forgets to tell the reader is that social security benefits are never taxable to the recipient. So when a retired worker and his wife after age 65 receive \$480 a month in social security benefits, they are receiving the equivalent of approximately \$600 a month in taxable income.

For instance, Mr. Shores leaves out of his articles the fact that the social security program has the lowest administrative cost of any comparable private insurance, pension or retirement system. In 1973, the total administrative cost of the old age and survivors' benefits was 1.6 percent and for disability benefits, 4.7 percent. The total combined cost for all three types of benefits was 1.9 percent.

If the social security system saves only two percent in administrative costs each year as compared with private insurance, the savings which go into paying benefits would be \$1 billion a year at the present time! What private system can compare with this? Why doesn't Mr. Shores tell about some of the values and good points of social security? His articles were directed solely at picking out a few very extreme examples and overlooking the major and overwhelming instances of comprehensive and valuable protection.

There are 30 million people receiving social security checks every month. It has not missed a payment in 34 years. It has never gone bankrupt and ceased to do business as have a number of private insurance plans. Shores also neglects to mention that some private pension plans like Studebaker and Kaiser-Frazer have failed to carry out their pension commitments. As long as social security payments are guaranteed by the federal government, I do not believe there will ever be any default in the commitments made under the social security program. Most people, but not Mr. Shores, know this.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS GOOD INSURANCE

3. Mr. Shores says the "social security system is emphatically unlike insurance." Mr. Shores doesn't give his definition of insurance so the reader is left in the dark as to what he means. Insurance is simply a system of a large number of individuals making payments in advance into a pooled fund for certain specified risks and benefits from which pool the benefits are paid in accordance with the agreement entered into by the parties. Some beneficiaries are intended to receive more than they paid in and some less. Insurance is not savings where each saver always receives more than he originally paid in.

There are different kinds of insurance. There is pure insurance like term life insurance in which the individual does not get any reimbursement at all if the risk death doesn't occur during a year that the policy is in force.

This is like automobile or fire insurance in which no money at all is received by the ben-

efficiary if no hazard occurred. It is like Blue Cross or Blue Shield health insurance in which no reimbursement is made if the individual is not sick and incurs no bills. Mr. Shores implies that an insured social security beneficiary who never has the hazard occur (such as disability) is being cheated because he hasn't received any insurance benefits back.

Endowment life insurance is a combination of pure insurance and savings. It is necessary to know what kind of insurance is being purchased. Just as there are many kinds of automobiles, there are many kinds of insurance. The costs vary on the model, size, and quality purchased.

The great value of social security as a national insurance pool was best expressed many years ago by Winston Churchill.

Churchill said that social security brings the magic of the averages to the rescue of the millions. It is not a savings bank. It is low-cost insurance.

In this connection it is important to remember that among the 30 million persons who receive social security every month, 2 million are disabled persons under age 65, that nearly 5 million are children, and nearly a million are younger widows and mothers. Social security is a strong support for families in addition to its retirement income features.

It should be remembered that each individual's contribution to social security covers four different insurance coverages: Old age; death at any age; disability at any age; and hospitalization for the aged and disabled.

From the 5.85 percent paid by the employee (and an equal amount by the employer), the following allocations are made:

	Percent
Disability coverage.....	.575
Hospitalization coverage.....	.900
Total	1.475

This leaves 4.375% for old age and survivors' (death) coverage. The survivors' insurance coverage is worth about 0.375%. Thus, an employee is paying only about 4% for old age protection and 1.85% for the other three coverages.

U.S. GOVERNMENT BONDS ARE A GOOD BUY

4. Mr. Shores says the social security trust fund is "simply a myth." What nonsense. If the United States government bonds in the social security fund are a myth, then government bonds are a myth for the banks, insurance companies, and private investors who bought them too.

The amazing inconsistency of Mr. Shores is evident when he recommends that workers be required to buy federal bonds as a substitute for social security. Why are they a myth in one case and a desirable purchase in another? Mr. Shores is just uninformed and inconsistent.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS NOT BANKRUPT

5. Mr. Shores says the "Social Security System is bankrupt." He comes to this erroneous conclusion because there is not sufficient money in the social security fund today to pay off all its obligations for the indefinite future. If this criterion is used then practically every private pension plan in the United States is also bankrupt. By this criterion, the Civil Service Retirement fund is bankrupt, so is the Railroad Retirement system, and practically all state and local public employee retirement systems.

The fact of the matter is that a governmental system does not need to be a full-reserve system such as private companies must have in accordance with state insurance laws. It is simply mischievous and misleading to label social security as bankrupt. No responsible private insurance actuary would do so and none has done so. It is only a

misinformed non-expert who would make such a misstatement.

There is \$40 billion in United States government bonds which back up the Social Security System. These bonds are guaranteed as to principal and interest by the federal government. They have the same value as government bonds held by banks, private insurance companies, and individuals.

DISABILITY INSURANCE

6. Mr. Shores says that a twenty-seven-year-old freight handler could buy a disability insurance benefit from a private insurance company for "about" \$10 a month and get more protection than he could get from social security. He neglects to say the man would have to pass a medical examination and that if he couldn't he would be denied disability insurance coverage. He fails to point out that social security provides the disability insurance coverage to all persons without any medical examination. It covers the weak and the strong; the person with medical difficulties; the young and the older person.

Mr. Shores does not tell that the cost to the individual goes up with the hazard of his occupation and is much more for an older person. In other words, Mr. Shores does not tell the whole truth—only that little part of the iceberg above the water he wants to see.

THE RETIREMENT TEST

7. Mr. Shores at various points in his articles refers to the retirement test as the "saddest, least defensible part of social security." He refers to it as "punishing." But he doesn't tell the reader that to repeal the retirement test would cost \$4 billion a year in increased taxes in the beginning and this would mount in future years.

Even more, Mr. Shores doesn't tell that all of the \$4 billion a year would go to about 3 million beneficiaries while 27 million beneficiaries would not get a single cent more!

It seems appropriate and reasonable for a retirement system to provide that payments are based upon some test of being retired. Why should contributions by all employers and all workers be increased in order to pay benefits to persons not retired and who in many cases are earning as much as they did before?

Mr. Shores omits from his discussion all these significant considerations which the Congress has carefully weighed. If Mr. Shores is in favor of repeal of the retirement test, why wasn't he honest enough to recommend additional taxes of \$4 billion a year to cover the cost? It's easy to criticize a provision if you don't take the responsibility of figuring out how to pay for the alternative.

Mr. Shores incorrectly uses out-of-date figures relating to the retirement or earning test. He refers to the test as \$140 a month. At the present time it is \$200 a month and the law provides for automatic increases in this amount as prices rise. Mr. Shores also incorrectly describes the effect of this test on a widow with two children since he neglects to consider and mention the fact that the children's benefits will continue to be payable even if the mother goes to work full time. Moreover, he fails to point out that if the mother has three or more children, her employment would not reduce the total family payment whatsoever. These are the kinds of omissions which make Mr. Shores' articles incomplete, erroneous, and misleading.

SOCIAL SECURITY ENCOURAGES THRIFT

Mr. Shores doesn't really understand the objective of the Social Security System as established by the Congress. The idea was not to provide a completely adequate benefit for everyone. Congress wished to give individuals a basic floor of protection on which individuals could build a supplemental protection by additional savings, investments, and work. Congress wanted to leave individ-

uals the opportunity to utilize the private enterprise system to build greater security. Thus, the Social Security System gives individuals an incentive to save and work to improve their economic security. It would be foolish to repeal a tried-and-tested system for the Shores-Friedman kind of plan which would put the younger and disabled worker at a great disadvantage.

Mr. Shores says that as a result of social security "saving is discouraged." But he doesn't give any documentation to this allegation. The reason he doesn't document it is because he can't. All the evidence is that savings of the American people have remained at a high level. If savings is or will be discouraged, it is primarily due to inflation. I challenge Mr. Shores to prove his point. If anything, private insurance companies will tell you that social security has served to stimulate purchase of additional protection.

PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVEMENT

I believe that the Social Security System needs further improvement. The system has been improved by the Congress over the past 40 years. I am sure it will continue to be improved.

However, I am opposed to the radical solution proposed by Mr. Shores which throws the baby out with the bath. I believe we should continue the basic elements of the present system which are:

A contributory, earnings-related system which builds upon individual responsibility for meeting costs and encourages thrift and incentives.

A legal right to benefits which is backed by a guarantee from the federal government and legal recourse to the courts for payment.

A nationwide system which assures a maximum degree of protection at the minimum administrative cost.

The changes which I believe are needed in the Social Security System and which I believe are practical and realistic are:

1. Refund of social security contributions to persons whose incomes are below the poverty line as advocated by Senator Russell Long, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance.

2. Reduction in the social security tax rate from 5.85 percent to 5 percent and an increase in the maximum earnings limitation from the present \$13,200 a year to cover all earnings for the employer contribution and to \$25,000 a year for the employee contribution.

3. Increase in the retirement test from \$2400 a year to \$3200 a year which is above the present poverty line for an aged couple. This amendment is supported by many members of Congress.

4. Revision of provisions which discriminate against women by making widowers and husbands eligible for benefits on the same basis as widows and wives as proposed by Congresswoman Martha Griffiths of Detroit.

5. Coverage under social security of all household employment so that women will earn benefits in their own right and can receive them whether they are married, divorced, remarried, or single.

6. An increase in the low benefits being paid to many older people.

7. Reduction in the waiting period for disability insurance benefits to three months from the present five months.

8. Establish the Social Security Administration as an independent Board as it was in 1935. Make the Board independent from the Budget Bureau, take the receipts and expenditures out of the Consolidated Budget, and make the Board report directly to Congress. Over 33 Senators are supporting this idea along with Chairman Wilbur D. Mills of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Shores' only direct quotation in his articles is by Professor Milton Friedman, the leading proponent of a radical solution to changes in social security. Mr. Shores did not seem to consult or quote from anyone in Congress like Chairman Wilbur D. Mills, or Russell Long, who helped design the present system. He quotes an unnamed "spokesman for the Illinois Department of Insurance" so it is impossible to check the source or meaning of his quotations.

SHORES' VIEWS ARE NOT SHARED BY THE EXPERTS

There are at least 25 other experts on social security in the United States who do not share Professor Friedman's ideas or who would be willing to rebut the statements made by the unknown "spokesmen." Why weren't these distinguished experts consulted or quoted to give a fair presentation of differing views? Obviously Mr. Shores doesn't believe in giving equal time to his opponents.

For those who wish to read about different points of view, here are some references:

An American Philosophy of Social Security: Evolution and Issues by J. Douglas Brown, Princeton University Press, 1972.

Future Directions in Social Security, Hearings before the Special Senate Committee on Aging, July 1973, Washington, D.C.

Social Security: Universal or Selective? A debate between Milton Friedman and Wilbur J. Cohen, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C. 1972.

ABSURD FEDERAL SPENDING

HON. JOHN B. CONLAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1974

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent report to my Arizona constituents I cited some absurd Federal expenditures to illustrate how the public's hard-earned tax money is being squandered in large sums by the Government bureaucracy.

Among projects funded by Federal agencies with millions of dollars appropriated by Congress for research and other discretionary purposes were studies of bisexual Polish frogs, the odor of sweat from Australian aborigines, and mating calls of Central American toads.

Money was also spent for a teenagers condom stamp program, patterned after food stamps, a dictionary on witchcraft, and other questionable purposes. I cited more than a dozen such boondoggles in my brief weekly report.

A United Press International story on my report by Donald Lambro, published by hundreds of newspapers throughout the country, sparked considerable nationwide interest in these spending items. Columnists and broadcasters commented on the almost carte blanche discretion with which Federal agencies spend money, with almost no oversight by Congress.

Thousands of letters from understandably indignant citizens throughout America poured into my office and those of other Congressmen and Senators. Working men and women complained about this scandalous spending situation, requesting further information, and asked what they could do to help fight this battle of the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I asked the General Accounting Office to provide me with a re-

port detailing the background of these federally funded projects. The GAO's Division of Financial and General Management Studies investigated those projects I complained about, as well as many others cited by the National Taxpayers Union and other public-spirited watchdogs of Federal spending.

I would like to include the GAO findings in the Record, as well as my own original report, so working American citizens who pay the price of government will realize how much more than reform of its own helter-skelter taxing and spending procedures Congress must do to stop Federal boondoggling.

Congress has been very derelict in monitoring the way Federal agencies spend money for research and other purposes. It has appropriated millions of dollars in lump sums to these agencies, with no monitoring of whether the money is used wisely or efficiently. A much tighter rein should be held on spending by Federal agencies. And agencies that habitually spend money for far-out academic research and other projects providing no direct benefits to the general public should certainly be held accountable for such spending when they come back to Congress for additional appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, it is a laborious and time-consuming process to identify all the specific ways that Federal agencies and departments spend lump-sum discretionary appropriations, which is a large part of the problem. Most projects can only be found by searching through reams of computer listings that identify how money is used, since most Federal departments do not publish detailed reports of how all funds are spent.

Many questionable expenditures are often disguised by the bureaucracy with innocuous descriptions, or lumped together under general headings where they are almost impossible to find. Grants to community action agencies for a multitude of social engineering schemes, for example, are often listed under the general heading "conduct and administration," or some similar generality.

With the help of GAO, the few Members of Congress who have been willing to tackle this complicated, full-time job of being a watchdog on Federal spending are somehow able to control some of this waste. Public pressure when wasteful spending is exposed is certainly an essential ingredient in getting less concerned public officials to spend hard-earned tax dollars more judiciously.

But taxpayers need many more friends in Congress before we can truly put government on a more businesslike basis and stop inflation that insidiously erodes purchasing power. If the public is fed up enough about Government waste and deficit spending that is ruinous to earnings and savings of individual citizens, perhaps they will put big spenders out of Congress, and give us younger, reform-minded Congressmen the reinforcements we need to preserve responsible government and our economy.

The information follows:

WHY TAX BILLS HURT

I know I don't have to remind anyone that this week marks the filing deadline for federal income tax returns.

But as we observe that sorrowful occasion, I wonder how many American taxpayers sincerely trust that federal bureaucrats will spend their hard-earned dollars judiciously. Or that Congress will obligate them wisely.

I'm sorry to report that the record is pretty miserable on both counts.

Unless taxpayers get more friends in Washington, I fear that bureaucrats with a helpful shove from liberals in Congress will continue the squandering waste and misuse of tax dollars that take place here. With this year's gigantic tax haul, they may go bananas altogether.

Federal bureaucrats who can spend \$375,000 with a straight face to study the way Frisbees fly could dream up almost anything. So could someone who spends \$121,000 to find out why people say "ain't." Or \$70,000 to study the smell of perspiration from Australian aborigines.

These projects are sadly not just the product of someone's fertile imagination. They are actual federal studies, commissioned by federal agencies and paid for with your tax dollars.

Can anyone stand a sampling of thousands more examples?

The Interdepartmental Screw Thread Committee, established as a "temporary" agency to speed the end of World War I, is still laboring to make nuts and bolts fit together. The cost: \$250,000 a year.

The federal government's Board of Tea Tasters sips along at taxpayers' expense, costing \$117,250 a year. Extra sipping is also done for those unhappy with this board's tea-tasting tests by the Board of Tea Appeals.

The City of Los Angeles got a \$243,740 federal grant for a project extending travelers' aid to migrants lost on the freeway.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare spent \$19,300 to find out why children fall off tricycles. Their official finding: "Unstable performance, particularly rollover while turning."

England's Queen Elizabeth II received \$68,000 from Uncle Sam for not planting cotton on her Mississippi plantation.

Animals are a particular curiosity of federal agencies, as these recent expenditures indicate: \$20,324 to learn everything possible about the mating calls of Central American toads; \$70,000 to classify and determine the population biology of Indo-Australian ants; \$20,000 to study the blood groups of Polish Zlotnika pigs; and \$6,000 to study bisexual Polish frogs.

And then there's the \$67,373 spent by the National Institute of Education for its three-day workshop on careers, attended by top degree-holding "scholars" at a posh Washington motel. The only result of the workshop was a grammar-poor tirade against sex bias in job titles.

The workshop's report called for a thorough cleansing of sexual connotation in names for certain jobholders. For example, mailmen, pressmen, chambermaids and busboys would become letter carriers, press operators, lodging quarters cleaners, and waiters' assistants. I'd hate to see the NIE price-tag for something worthwhile, like a way to reduce the high illiteracy rate among high school graduates.

Finally, there are the federal officials who waste thousands of tax dollars on monuments to their own vanity and comfort. Such as Postmaster General E. T. Klassen's new \$800 marble-topped lavatory, which was one small item in his recent elaborate \$149,100 office refurbishing.

Not to be outdone at office plushness, U.S. Attorney General William Saxbe ripped up all his predecessor's new carpeting as soon as he moved to the Justice Department, simply because he didn't like the color. Then the decor of his entire suite had to be coordinated, for a total cost to taxpayers of \$79,500.

It is little comfort to any of us as we send in our tax returns to the Internal Revenue Service that the average cost of federal programs for every man, woman and child in the U.S. is about \$1,500—more than double the cost per person in 1965. Since tax cheaters can be fined and jailed, perhaps federal bureaucrats guilty of squandering our money should be as well.

All these silly projects I have mentioned, plus others too numerous to list, add up to millions of dollars in unnecessary government spending, boosting the rate of inflation and the national debt. Somehow, some way, those of us in the Congress speaking out on this vital pocketbook issue will one day make up the majority and put a permanent stop to this nonsense.

Unless we do, instead of the average American working two hours and 38 minutes every eight-hour working day just to earn enough money to pay all his taxes, he'll become a year-round slave of the spend-crazy government monster, with no freedom for any choices of his own.

A PARTIAL SUMMARY OF U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE FINDINGS REGARDING REPORTS ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

PENTAGON FRISBEE STUDY—\$375,000

The Department of Defense awarded contracts to Honeywell (\$79,997) and Denver Research Institute (\$108,902) to conduct a self-suspended flare study. In-house costs for the project were \$186,931, bringing total expenditures to \$375,023.

The objective of the study was to develop an improved aircraft-launched flare for naval applications which would be safe, consumable, cheap, and reliable. Initially funded in FY 1968, the study determined the concept feasible, but two major problems were encountered: The flare as developed had a burn time of less than one minute, and launcher complexity required added development and additional aircraft maintenance. The entire program was terminated in the fall of 1970.

RESEARCH ON THE SMELL OF PERSPIRATION FROM AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINES—\$70,000

This is one of 16 subprojects concerned with "zoophysiology in Alaska," and funded by the National Institutes of Health. The purpose of the subproject was to learn about the adaptation of man to his environment and involved a comparison of the Alaskan Eskimo with the Australian aborigine and their stress reactions to climate. The project has not been funded since 1971.

BOARD OF TEA TASTERS—\$117,250

According to the Food and Drug Administration, this board meets twice a year—once to set standards on tea importation and a second time to review and decide on all appeals arising from disputes over regulatory actions. A recent amendment to the FY 1974 appropriations bill restricts tea importation regulatory activities to the amount of earnings from fees charged of importers by the government, which is about \$57,500. The figure of \$117,250, the amount originally requested by the FDA, includes all regulatory costs, such as chemists' salaries and expenses, analysis and compliance costs, and so forth.

GRANT TO THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES TO EXTEND TRAVELERS' AID TO MIGRANTS LOST ON THE FREEWAY—\$243,740

A grant of \$243,740 was awarded by the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency of Greater Los Angeles (now the Greater Los Angeles Community Action Agency) to be applied during a two-year period from 1965 to 1967. The federal money was, in turn, given to the Traveler's Aid Society in Los Angeles, a social service agency. The primary purpose of the grant was to aid migrants moving into Los Angeles. Approximately \$10,000 was allocated for the use of freeway vans—trucks traveling the freeway in search of stranded motorists and others who might need help. The vast proportion of the OEO funds was spent on operating a main office of Traveler's Aid and a smaller office known as the Newcomers Center in South Central Los Angeles.

STUDY TO FIGURE OUT WHY CHILDREN FALL OFF TRICYCLES—\$19,300

About four years ago, the Bureau of Product Safety in the Food and Drug Administration conducted a study of children's hazards. This study included the hazard of children operating wheeled vehicles. The study's objective was to determine what safety standards were needed for "off-the-road" vehicles. Approximately two-thirds of the study concentrated on the stability of minibikes and trailbikes, and one-third of the study dealt with three-wheeled vehicles, including tricycles.

PAYMENT TO QUEEN ELIZABETH II OF ENGLAND FOR NOT PLANTING COTTON IN MISSISSIPPI—\$68,000

Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) and Great Plains program payments in 1972 include a subsidy of \$67,795 to Delta and Pine Land Company, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Courtald's, Ltd., a British company in which Queen Elizabeth and the Royal family are major stockholders.

STUDY OF THE MATING CALLS OF CENTRAL AMERICAN TOADS—\$20,324

The "Investigation of Mating Calls and Paratoid Gland Secretions of the Central American Toad" was conducted under a National Science Foundation grant for \$21,000, awarded in 1963 for two years.

STUDY OF INDO-AUSTRALIAN ANTS—\$70,000

A study of Indo-Australian ants was conducted at Harvard University from 1964 to 1966. The three-year study was funded with a \$70,000 grant from the National Science Foundation. NSF officials claim that because the project ended several years ago, they are not able further to describe the purpose of the research.

STUDY OF THE BLOOD GROUPS OF POLISH ZLOTNIKA PIGS—\$20,000

This five-year study was conducted at the Agricultural College in Poznan, Poland, and completed in 1967. The \$20,556 project was funded by the U.S. Agriculture Department, and involved research investigating red blood cells and serum antigens in this new racial group of swine.

STUDY OF BISEXUAL POLISH FROGS—\$6,000

Estimated FY 1974 expenditures for this Smithsonian Institution project are \$6,000. The project is an attempt to properly classify *Rana esculenta*, which is either a hybrid or

a separate species of frog, by enzyme and protein analysis, and to allow Polish and American scientists to share the latest techniques in species identification.

ODOR MEASURING MACHINE PURCHASED FOR THE TURKS—\$29,361

This Agriculture Department project, titled "Development of an odor measuring instrument for use in inspection and grading of foods," was conducted from 1963-65 at Robert College Research Center in Turkey. USDA officials claim machine developed also has applications in the U.S.

CONDOM STAMP PROGRAM—\$47,000

The Office of Economic Opportunity awarded a \$47,000 initial grant to Population Services International for sex training and subsidized condoms for teen-age boys in Philadelphia and Cleveland.

STUDY TO TEACH MOTHERS TO PLAY WITH THEIR CHILDREN—\$576,969

This National Institutes of Health study was first funded in 1968 with a \$149,000 grant to the University of Florida's Institute of Development of Human Resources. The overall title of the study is "Home Learning Center Approach to Early Stimulation." The project is still active with total direct and indirect costs amounting to \$576,969.

DICTIONARY OF WITCHCRAFT—\$46,089

The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities has awarded grants totaling \$46,089 to support the gathering of information for a reference book titled "American Popular Beliefs and Superstitions," which the Foundation claims is a standard work for use in the fields of linguistics, mythology, and folklore. The latest grant for \$24,134 was awarded on Feb. 15, 1974.

STUDY OF LIZARDS IN YUGOSLAVIA—\$15,000

Estimated FY 1974 expenditures for this Smithsonian Institution project are \$15,000. The project aims to show how a more vigorous and adaptable species of lizards can gradually colonize and displace a less hardy species.

STUDY OF WILD BOARS IN PAKISTAN—\$35,000

Estimated FY 1974 expenditures for this Smithsonian Institution project are \$35,000. The project aims to help the Pakistan government control the wild boar, which does extensive damage to crops. In Muslim countries, the boar, like the pig, is considered an unclean animal, and its numbers are therefore not controlled through regular cropping.

STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF RURAL ROAD CONSTRUCTION IN POLAND—\$83,000

Estimated FY 1974 expenditures for this Smithsonian Institution project are \$85,000. The project aims to determine what happens to a village or rural area previously isolated from the outside world when a road is built. Emphasis will be on the impact to the community's people, culture, families, patterns of trade, immigration, emigration, and so forth.

STUDY OF AMERICAN AND INDIAN WHISTLING DUCKS—\$5,000

Estimated FY 1974 expenditures for this Smithsonian Institution project are \$5,000. The project aims to show why Indian whistling ducks, anatomically almost identical to American whistling ducks, have apparently survived habitat changes caused by human encroachment while others have become extinct.

SENATE—Tuesday, June 25, 1974

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. GAYLORD NELSON, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who rules over men and nations, we beseech Thee to guard the President of the United States in body, mind, and spirit on his special mission. Grant to him and his counselors wisdom and grace in every endeavor for true peace.

We pray that Thou wilt support the Congress in its manifold tasks. Uphold all who are in the service of the Nation that daily work may be performed with diligence and in fidelity to our heritage under God. Raise up leaders to whom the people may rally, and grant that all may unite in serving Thee with their whole heart and mind and strength.