

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 15850. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide service pension to certain veterans of World War I and pension to the widows of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 15851. A bill to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971 in order to increase the Federal Government's share of the costs of State boat safety programs during fiscal year 1975 and thereafter, and to increase the authorization for appropriations for such programs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.J. Res. 1086. Joint resolution relating to the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 20th anniversary of the food for peace program; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.J. Res. 1087. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation designating January of each year as "March of Dimes Birth Defects Prevention Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.J. Res. 1088. Joint resolution to proclaim October 1974, as UHF television month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 559. Concurrent resolution to provide additional copies of hearings and the final report of the Judiciary Committee on

the impeachment inquiry; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RUNNELS (for himself, Mr. RABICK, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. MELCHER, and Mr. THONE):

H. Con. Res. 560. Concurrent resolution to declare the sense of Congress that Smoky Bear shall be returned on his death to his place of birth, Capitan, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEELMAN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. BEARD, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. POWELL of Ohio, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. FINDLEY, and Mr. CEDERBERG):

H. Res. 1222. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Resolution 988; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. POBELL, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. GILMAN):

H. Res. 1223. Resolution expressing the

sense of the House of Representatives concerning the rights and civil liberties of the Irish minority in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas:

H.R. 15852. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to sell certain real property, in the vicinity of the Lewisville Dam, Tex., to the person or persons from whom the United States originally acquired said property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 15853. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to Brig. Gen. Charles E. Yeager; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 15854. A bill for the relief of Ricardo Bardales-Alfaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 15855. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to Brig. Gen. Charles E. Yeager; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### THE 1975 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 4, AS OF JULY 3, 1974

#### HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting for the information of Members, their staffs, and others, excerpts from the "Budget Scorekeeping Report No. 4, as of July 3, 1974," as prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. The report itself has been sent to all Members.

#### EXCERPTS FROM 1975 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 4

This Budget Scorekeeping Report No. 4 is published in abbreviated form. It shows the impact of congressional action on the President's revised 1975 budget recommendations through July 3, 1974.

This report includes analysis of the scorekeeping highlights together with the main scorekeeping tables. It also includes summarized background information with respect to the revised budget requests and certain other significant budgetary factors and, on tables 4 and 5, the current status of appropriation bills and necessary authorizing legislation. Reference to an earlier report in this series is suggested for full detail and historical comparisons. (See 1975 Budget Scorekeeping Report No. 2 as of June 7, 1974.)

It should be understood, of course, that action on significant legislation is still pending and may be expected to materially affect calculation of the impact of congressional action on the President's fiscal 1975 budget authority and outlay requests.

#### SCOREKEEPING HIGHLIGHTS

##### Fiscal year 1975—Outlays

The impact of congressional action through July 3 on the President's fiscal year 1975 budget outlay requests, as shown in this report, may be summarized as follows:

	[In millions]		
	House	Senate	Enacted
1975 budget outlay estimate as revised and amended to date	\$306,312	\$306,312	\$306,312
Congressional changes to date (committee action included):			
Appropriation bills:			
Completed action.....	-269	+198	-195
Pending action.....	-779	-13	
Legislative bills:			
Completed action.....	+899	+1,186	+1,325
Pending action.....	+487	+2,335	
Total changes:			
Completed action.....	+630	+1,384	+1,130
Pending action.....	-292	+2,322	
Total.....	+338	+3,706	+1,130
Deduct portion of congressional action included in May 30 revisions.....	+135	+135	+135
1975 budget outlays as adjusted by congressional action to date.....	306,515	309,883	307,307

Completed actions: A summary of major individual actions composing the \$1,130 million total outlay impact of completed congressional action to date on budgeted 1975 outlays follows:

#### COMPLETED ACTION OF BUDGETED OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES)

Bills (including committee action) and congressional changes in 1975 budgeted outlays

[In thousands]

Appropriation bills:	
Special energy research and development .....	+\$20,000

Second supplemental, 1974 (1975 outlay impact).....	-\$215,000
Further urgent supplemental, 1974 (1975 outlay impact) .....	-30
Legislative bills:	
Veterans educational benefits—extend delimiting period .....	+759,100
Child nutrition and school lunch .....	+225,000
Civil Service minimum retirement .....	+172,000
Veterans disability benefits increase .....	+134,800
Postponement of postal rate increases .....	+45,200
Food assistance and special milk programs .....	+40,000
Civil Service survivor benefits .....	+4,600
Civil Service—early retirement, hazardous occupations .....	+3,400
Congressional Record, reduced postage fees .....	-8,486
Military flight pay incentive .....	-16,700
Rejection of salary increases for federal executives .....	-34,000

Total, 1975 outlay impact of completed congressional action..... +1,129,884

Pending actions: The major pending legislative actions affecting 1975 budget outlays which have passed or are pending in one or both Houses of Congress are shown in detail on Table 1, and are summarized below. It should be noted that incomplete action is shown for nine of the fourteen regular 1975 appropriation bills and some major legislation has not yet reached the reported stage.

MAJOR PENDING ACTIONS ON BUDGETED OUTLAYS  
(EXPENDITURES)

Bills (including committee action)	Congressional changes in budgeted 1975 outlays (in thousands)	
	House	Senate
Appropriation bills:—Cont.		
Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection	+ \$65,000	
Public Works and Atomic Energy	+32,000	
Legislative Branch	-5,400	- \$13,000
District of Columbia	-15,000	
HUD, Space, Science, Veterans	-30,000	
Treasury-Postal Service	-77,000	
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary	-79,000	
Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare	-315,000	
Transportation and related agencies	-355,000	
Legislative bills (backdoor and mandatory):		
Veterans educational benefits	+195,500	+977,500
Housing and Community Development Act	(1)	+553,000
Emergency energy unemployment	Rejected	+500,000
Military retired pay—re-computation		+288,000
Civil Service survivor annuity modification	+202,000 (2)	
Public safety officers death gratuity	+43,700	(2)
Hopi and Navajo Tribes relocation	+28,800	

1 Undetermined at this time.  
2 Action taken last session.

## Fiscal year 1975—Budget authority

The impact of congressional action through July 3 on the President's fiscal year 1975 requests for new budget authority, as shown in this report, may be summarized as follows:

	[In millions]		
	House	Senate	Enacted
1975 budget authority requests as revised and amended to date	\$325,749	\$325,749	\$325,749
Congressional changes to date (committee action included):			
Appropriation bills:			
Completed action	+66	+16	+32
Pending action	-649	-4	
Legislative bills:			
Completed action	+899	+1,224	+1,363
Pending action	+2,247	+5,532	
Total changes:			
Completed action	+965	+1,240	+1,395
Pending action	+1,598	+5,528	
Total	+2,563	+6,768	+1,395
Deduct: Portion of congressional action included in May 30 revisions	+135	+135	+135
1975 budget authority as adjusted by congressional action to date	328,177	332,382	327,009

**Completed actions:** A summary of major individual actions composing the \$1,395 million total impact of completed congressional action to date on 1975 budget authority requests follows:

## COMPLETED ACTION ON BUDGET AUTHORITY REQUESTS

Bills (including committee action) and congressional changes in 1975 budget authority requests

[In thousands]	
Appropriation bills: Special energy research and development	+ \$32,361
Legislative bills:	
Veterans educational benefits—extend delimiting period	+759,100

## Bills (including committee action) and congressional changes in 1975 budget authority requests—Continued

[In thousands]	
Child nutrition and school lunch	+ \$225,000
Civil Service minimum retirement	+172,000
Veterans disability benefits increase	+134,800
Postponement of postal rate increases	+45,200
Civil Service—early retirement, hazardous occupations	+41,100
Food assistance and special milk programs	+40,000
Civil Service survivor benefits	+4,600
Congressional Record—reduce postage fees	-8,486
Military flight pay incentive	- \$16,700
Rejection of salary increases for Federal executives	-34,000
Total, 1975 budget authority impact of congressional action	+1,394,975

**Pending actions:** The major pending legislative actions affecting 1975 budget authority which have passed or are pending in one or both Houses of Congress are shown in detail on Table 1, and are summarized below. It should be noted that incomplete action is shown for nine of the fourteen regular 1975 appropriation bills and that some major legislation has not yet reached the reported stage.

## MAJOR PENDING ACTIONS ON BUDGET AUTHORITY REQUESTS

Bills (including committee action)	Congressional changes in 1975 budget authority requests (in thousands)	
	House	Senate
Appropriation bills:		
Public Works	+ \$63,159	
Legislative Branch	-5,878	- \$4,033
District of Columbia	-16,600	
Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection	-27,168	
HUD, Space, Science, Veterans	-41,519	
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government	-73,052	
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary	-100,355	
Labor, Health, Education and Welfare	-106,456	
Transportation and related agencies	-341,400	
Legislative bills (backdoor and mandatory):		
Federal Home Loan Bank System—temporary increase in standby borrowing authority		+2,000,000
Housing and Community Development Act	+1,500,000	+1,650,000
Veterans educational benefits	+195,500	+977,500
Emergency energy unemployment	Rejected	+500,000
Civil service survivor annuity modification	+362,000	(1)
Military retired pay—re-computation		+288,000
Private pension protection	+100,000	+100,000
Public safety officers death gratuity	+43,700	(1)
Hopi and Navajo Tribes relocation	+28,800	

1 Action taken last session.

## Fiscal year 1974

The impact of Congressional action and inaction in the current session on the President's revised fiscal year 1974 requests for budget authority and budget outlays, are summarized below. This report shows final congressional action relating to fiscal year 1974, ended June 30, 1974.

[In millions]

	House	Senate	Enacted
1974 budget outlay estimated (revised May 30)	\$269,546	\$269,546	\$269,546
Congressional changes to date (current session):			
Appropriation bills	-875	-775	-880
Legislative bills	+162	+151	+151
Inaction on legislative proposals	-93	-90	-380
Total, changes	-806	-715	-1,109
Deduct: Congressional action included in May 30 revisions	+161	+161	+161
1974 budget outlays as revised and adjusted by Congressional changes to date	268,579	268,670	268,276
1974 budget authority requested (revised May 30)	308,683	308,683	308,683
Congressional changes to date (current session):			
Appropriation bills	-1,722	-1,455	-1,799
Legislative bills	-27	-38	-38
Inaction on legislative proposals	-2,996	-3,105	-3,394
Total, changes	-4,745	-4,598	-5,232
1974 budget authority as revised and adjusted by Congressional changes to date	303,938	304,085	303,451

The scored impact of completed appropriation and other legislative action and inaction this session affecting fiscal year 1974, ended June 30, 1974, includes the following major items:

[In millions]

Bill (including committee action)	Budget authority	Outlays
Second supplemental appropriation bill	- \$1,798,756	- \$880,000
Unemployment benefits extension		+161,000
Veterans educational benefits	+44,800	+44,800
Social security benefit extension for presumptive disability		+24,000
Rejection of salary increases for Federal executives	-7,000	-7,000
Military flight pay incentive	-21,200	-21,200
Veterans disability benefits increase	-49,600	-49,600
Inaction on legislative proposals:		
Consolidated education grants	-2,851,985	
Payment to Postal Service fund	-284,667	-284,667
Asian Development Bank	-120,635	-9,600
Other	-137,100	-85,600

Congress was asked to act this session on proposals to increase 1974 revenue by \$1.2 billion, mainly the windfall profits tax on the oil industry. Such action was not taken. The \$1.1 billion impact of Congressional action and inaction on 1974 budget outlay proposals this session, and the failure to act on \$1.2 billion in revenue proposals, have the combined effect of increasing the 1974 deficit by about \$100 million.

The May 30 revised 1974 deficit estimate of \$3.5 billion already reflected congressional inaction on \$1.2 billion in revenue proposals. Giving effect to a net reduction of about \$1.3 billion in congressional action and inaction on outlays not reflected in the May 30 deficit revision, a 1974 deficit level of approximately \$2.3 billion is indicated.

## BALANCED BUDGET: A MUST

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on numerous occasions during this Congress, I have remarked on the need for a balanced Federal budget. Six times I have co-



sponsored legislation to require the President to present Congress with a balanced budget. As Senators will recall, on one such occasion this legislation was tabled by only three votes.

The lack of fiscal responsibility on the part of Congress, and the Federal Government generally, has contributed substantially to the current rate of spiraling inflation. I am convinced that the unstable condition of our Nation's economy is one of the primary problems facing America today.

One need only glance through the business periodicals to understand the growing concern of the financial sector with this condition. Senators need only listen to their constituents to learn of the extreme difficulty involved in obtaining a home loan. Business financing is becoming increasingly less available. Interest rates continue to soar. Corporate stocks continue to decline.

There is only one ray of hope in this entire dismal situation: An increasing public awareness of the problem and a desire for a solution. Of course, the only real solution is reduced Federal spending and a balanced budget. The American people now realize that the promise of deficit spending, the proverbial "free lunch," is indeed no more than an assurance of continued inflation. We cannot persist in spending more money than we take in without courting economic disaster.

Congress has passed budget reform. We have set up a mechanism to help us manage the budget problems of the appropriations process. But the budget reform system will not in and of itself produce less spending and a balanced budget. We will still need to impose fiscal discipline upon ourselves, the discipline of a balanced budget. The public is demanding such discipline, and it is reflected in public opinion in the State of North Carolina. Two recent newspaper editorials call upon Congress to exert such discipline, and I call them to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Dunn Dispatch of June 24, 1974, as well as an editorial from the Charlotte Observer of June 25, 1974, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dunn Dispatch, June 24, 1974]

#### BALANCED BUDGET NEEDED

When Congress finally moves to implement the law it is now preparing to establish control over its own spending habits it will learn one hard fact of life. Over the years Congress has taken away from itself much of its own capability to control spending.

That, however, is not usually the picture that the national legislators try to project. As a result, the generally accepted stereotype is that the powers of the president have increased so much in this century that Congress doesn't have a chance to do much more than exercise general supervision over each appropriations bill and hope that everything balances at the end of the year.

Undeniably the president has acquired immense powers over national spending, particularly since the New Deal days of the 1930s opened the door to Pandora's box of social experimentation regardless of price. On the

other hand, however, Congress has hardly done much to assert its authority or to streamline its antiquated fiscal procedures.

The measure in the House-Senate conference committee seeks to remedy this longstanding oversight. One aspect of the law would prevent the president from impounding any funds appropriated by Congress unless the legislative body gives its approval.

Another aspect of the proposed law would establish in Congress for the first time a professional budget staff comparable to the Office of Budget and Management in the executive branch. The congressional office and a new agenda for the budgetary process should give Congress a total picture of the budget at any time during its progress through the House and Senate and, hopefully, a chance to bring it into balance before it is approved.

The intention of Congress cannot be faulted. If Congress overhauls its backward procedures it will be better able to strike a balance with the executive branch during annual budgetary drills, particularly if the president and the majority of Congress are of different political parties.

However, everybody is familiar with the common fate of good intentions. Improved procedures alone won't necessarily achieve the results that Congress is seeking if individual members of the body do not have the will to bite the economy bullet.

The preset situation has developed precisely because the liberals in Congress did not want to risk the disciplines and responsibilities of an efficient budget-making process, preferring the back door approach for the mountain of social programs that are mainly responsible for the annual federal red ink.

All of the good procedures in the world will not help unless the majority in Congress is of the mind that the budget just be in balance, whether it takes ruthless suppression of the appetite for spending or an equally ruthless increase in taxes.

[From the Charlotte Observer, June 25, 1974]

#### BIG SPENDER—CONGRESS SHARPENS ITS KNIFE

Before he leaves for Moscow this week, President Nixon will be asked to sign a bill relinquishing part of his supremacy over national fiscal affairs. After two years of study, Congress has passed the much-needed Budget Act, aimed at reasserting the legislative branch's control over the purse strings.

The President is said to dislike many provisions in the bill, especially those that severely limit his ability to impound money appropriated by Congress. But he would veto the bill at his peril; it passed the House 401 to 6 and the Senate 75 to 0, margins clearly indicating that a veto could be overridden.

In drafting the bill, Congress took the President at his own word. He repeatedly has complained about "reckless spending" by the legislators and criticized Congress for not paying greater attention to national fiscal policies.

Previously, congresses have spent money through some 26 different committees and without giving much overall attention to the total effect of that spending upon taxes, the economy or the national debt. This was a product of the way the Congress is organized; no single committee was charged with oversight for the entire federal budget.

The Budget Act will create such a body. It will also create a Congressional Budget Office to rival the executive branch's Office of Management and Budget. The Congressional Budget Office will be staffed and equipped to challenge the claims of the thousands of executive branch spokesmen, who in years past have often overwhelmed legislators with their expertise and computerized information. The Congressional Budget Office will have computers and expertise of its own.

In terms of changing congressional procedures, the bill promises to be more far-reaching than any that Congress would have been expected to approve this time last year. It calls for dramatic reform of the appropriations process. Chairmen of the 26 independent appropriations committees (13 in each house) must surrender their power over parts of the federal government to one committee with authority over all the budget.

The proposal also is likely to encourage fiscal changes in the private sector. For instance, it calls for changing the federal fiscal year from a July-to-June calendar to an October-to-September calendar. Accounting convenience may force local and state governments and many private corporations, especially those doing business with the government, to adopt similar fiscal calendars.

There may be some conflict and confusion at first, but if the result is a more stable appropriations process, one that relates federal expenditures to federal revenues and uses the federal budget to manage the nation's economy, the inconvenience should be worthwhile. With a national debt approaching \$500 billion and world concern over the American dollar, Congress has to find a better way to conduct the public's business.

EARL WARREN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat ironic that at a time when the Supreme Court is confronting the momentous case of the United States of America against Richard Nixon, one of that body's greatest leaders has passed away. For no Supreme Court Justice confronted and brilliantly dealt with more momentous cases than Earl Warren. Today, I join with my colleagues in Congress and millions of fellow Americans in remembering and paying tribute to a truly important individual.

In his 16 years as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, from 1953 to 1969, Earl Warren presided over a judicial body that significantly changed the texture of American society, by interpreting the Constitution in the direction of justice and equal rights for all. The many decisions of the Warren Court stand out as landmark actions of boldness and fairness.

In 1954, the Brown against Board of Education Supreme Court decision declared "that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place." Written by Warren, the decision helped give birth to the fight for civil and human rights that would grow to maturity in the 1960's.

A decade later, the Chief Justice wrote opinions for the Court in deciding cases which gave urban districts the same voting and political representation as the rural districts. Termed "the one-man, one-vote law," the Court directive helped promote a degree of political and legislative justice in the United States.

In 1966, the famous Miranda decision afforded arrested persons the right to be told their legal rights by the law enforcement officer involved in the arrest. In this and other decisions, the Warren Court respected and acted to defend the

full rights of the suspect in criminal cases.

Earl Warren brought to the Supreme Court and to this country an overriding urge to do what was morally right. Of Warren, Anthony Lewis wrote:

Justice consisted not of providing a fair mechanism of decision but of seeing that the right side, the good side, prevailed. . . .

At a time when laws are ignored in the White House, when personal principles are abrogated in the halls of Congress, and when decency is apparently no longer a virtue to strive for, Earl Warren stands as a lonely example of what America should and could be, but is often no longer about.

FORMER CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I join with many of our colleagues and others throughout the country in mourning the loss of the former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Earl Warren.

During his 16-year tenure as the Nation's chief magistrate, Earl Warren played a leading role in correcting many of the social inequities which plagued the country and in affirming numerous individual rights. Certainly one of the greatest landmarks in American jurisprudence was the historic Brown decision of 1954 and equal educational opportunities began to be made available to all citizens. It was particularly appropriate that the Chief Justice himself wrote the Court's opinion, which had the unanimous concurrence of the other members of the Court.

Another major decision occurred a decade later when the Supreme Court ruled that district lines for congressional and State elections must be drawn in such a manner as to give urban citizens representation equal to that of those in rural areas. The "one-man, one vote" decision was reportedly considered by Mr. Warren to be the most important during his tenure.

The right of the individual defendant was vigorously protected by the Warren Court and the basic guarantees of the Bill of Rights were actively defended and reinforced by several major decisions made during Earl Warren's service as Chief Justice.

As Alan Barth so aptly observed in his article on Mr. Warren's death in this morning's Washington Post:

By nearly every standard that can be said to measure judicial stature, Earl Warren must be counted among the great chief justices of the United States—the greatest, in all probability since John Marshall.

This is a statement with which very few can take issue and I believe that Mr. Warren has left a very positive and permanent mark on American jurisprudence. The Supreme Court under Earl Warren gave new vitality to the Constitution and actively guided the Nation in properly adjusting to the changes of a

developing and maturing society, primarily during some particularly troublesome periods. Mr. Warren's loss is great, but the outstanding contributions he made to his country will serve as a lasting monument to his work in the Supreme Court.

DR. PHIL THOMSEN CITED FOR 40 YEARS SERVICE

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, a very good friend of mine, Dr. Philip Thomsen, was recently honored for his 40 years of service at Thomsen Clinic in Dolton, Ill. I wish to extend my admiration and best wishes to Dr. Thomsen. The following article from the Star-Tribune should be of interest to my colleagues:

DR. PHIL THOMSEN CITED FOR 40 YEARS SERVICE

Dr. Philip Thomsen of Thomsen clinic on Lincoln avenue in Dolton, was honored at a surprise gathering of almost 800 friends and patients at the Lexington House, for his 40 years of practice.

Dr. Thomsen, a physician and surgeon on the staff at St. Francis hospital since 1935, not only has won respect within his medical practice but for his involvement in political and community affairs as well.

Among those honoring him were dignitaries such as former governor Richard Ogilvie, guest speaker; Representative Edward Derwinski, who presented the doctor with citations from President Nixon and Vice President Ford and Representative Thomas Miller who presented him with a citation from the State of Illinois that was adopted in the 78th General Assembly of the House of Representatives. There were many Dolton, Riverdale and South Holland officials present also.

Serving as Master of Ceremonies was Frank Stewart, immediate past president of Riverdale bank. The program included the invocation by Rev. Matthias Hoffman, a family friend; a speech by Ogilvie and presentation of gifts by Eugene Scherba, president of Thomsen clinic.

Entertainment was provided by "The Tiffany's" quartet of the Sweet Adelines, Inc. and winners of the national quartet competition.

Two cakes, baked by Delores Peters, were replicas of the "Then Clinic" where Dr. Thomsen began his practice in Riverdale on Indiana avenue, near 138th street, in a rented home from the Schmidt family in 1935 and the "Now Clinic" built in 1947.

An Indian Ink sketch of the clinic was made by Frances Deady and provided the cover for the program. A larger copy of the sketch will be framed and hung in the clinic.

The tribute to Dr. Thomsen was made possible through the efforts of Ann Russell, planning committee chairman, Frances Deady, co-chairman, Jean Berschinski, clinic administrator and the planning committee.

True appreciation by all for Dr. Thomsen's efforts may be summed up in the letter from President Nixon to Edward Derwinski on behalf of Dr. Thomsen; "It pleased me greatly to know that you will be taking part in a special tribute to your good friend Dr. Phil Thomsen. I certainly share your own admiration for the professional skill and humanitarian spirit that marks his outstanding service to the people in your area. His dedication to the Dolton community has richly earned him this expression of appreciation by the fellow citizens he has served.

I hope you will take this opportunity to convey my personal high regard for him and for a practice so replete in selfless devotion to others."

The marquee outside the Lexington House tells it all, "Thanks, Dr. Phil Thomsen." It was signed, "Your many friends."

THE ECONOMY AT MIDYEAR

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include my Washington Report entitled "The Economy at Midyear":

THE ECONOMY AT MID-YEAR

At mid-year the vaunted American economic machine appears stalled. After a slide during the first 3 months of the year, production is neither rising nor falling, as the worst peacetime inflation in history rages and interest rates have reached record heights. The slowdown is not uniform, however, because the business sector looks good, and many plants are running flat out. The imbalance in the slowdown caused one economist to remark that the recession did not look like a recession.

Economic forecasters, who have had a tough year in 1974, don't really seem to know when production will pick up or where the prices are headed. They are not even sure if the danger is inflation or unemployment. The present combination of inflation and stagnation in the economy presents an awful dilemma for economic policymakers: should economic policy be stimulative to head off higher unemployment or restrictive to check inflation?

The President has been preaching restraint in spending and a tight monetary policy. His Secretary of the Treasury has even suggested that the right economic medicine at the moment might be a budget surplus. This approach risks a recession to curb inflation, and it represents a change from the attitude at the first of the year when the President and his economic advisors were talking of further stimulus to the economy. Others, including some Congressmen and Senators, fear a rise in unemployment and want to cut taxes. They argue that, while inflation is serious, it may not get worse if selective measures are taken to stimulate the economy. The rise in unemployment can be softened through unemployment insurance and public employment programs, public spending could rise, and taxes could be reduced. The risk of this approach is over-stimulation of the economy and even more rapid inflation.

Since World War II the government's response to a sluggish economy has been to cut taxes and raise spending in order to increase demand. It may seem strange for the policymakers to plan increasingly tighter fiscal and monetary policies just as the economy is stagnating, but inflation is the obvious reason for the restraint. Policymakers are afraid moves to stimulate the economy by more spending or a reduction in taxes would increase inflation. Efforts to reduce taxes in the Senate have been decisively defeated, and most officials apparently believe the slow pace of the economy should be accepted for the moment in the hope of reducing inflation.

The chances of getting inflation under control quickly, however, are not favorable. Industrial wholesale prices have exploded (up 36% from January to May of this year), strikes have proliferated, and wage settlements have moved up to the 9% or 10% level. At best, prices in December may be climbing by 6% or 7%—a pace previously incon-



ceivable in peacetime America, particularly during a year of slow growth like 1974.

On this prime issue of how hard to crack down on inflation there is no ready-made solution. To put the economy through a stiff recession would stop inflation, but at a fearful cost in unemployment. Other steps, like wage and price controls and steps to improve the structure of the labor market, have not met with resounding success.

The choice between these broad lines of policy is based partly on the economic forecast for the balance of 1974 and partly on a judgment of the social costs of unemployment and inflation. The Administration expects a rebound in the second half of 1974, while the critics believe decisive steps are required to get the economy moving.

My view is that appropriate policies can at least curb inflation without resorting to steps that would result in a long recession and high unemployment. The case for a tax cut does not look strong, and it would not be prudent to cut taxes now. There is plenty of evidence that the tax burden is inequitable and that lower and middle income persons deserve a tax reduction, but the net effect of any tax change on the federal budget should not be a reduction in revenues. Fiscal and monetary policy should be marked by restraint, and more attention should be given to how money is spent. Expenditures which are wasteful and counterproductive should naturally be eliminated. Unemployment, which should not be allowed to increase above present levels, must be cushioned by unemployment insurance programs to try to protect unemployed workers, and public employment programs, targeted for areas that have been particularly hard hit by the slowdown, should be extended. Experience in recent years with public employment has been favorable. The strategy is to try to ease the impact of economic problems on those least able to deal with them. Much more effort must be directed toward increasing supply and forestalling shortages with sensible export, import, subsidy, and market policies.

Finally, the economy should be constantly and carefully monitored because changes in policy may become quickly and urgently required.

#### ON THE APPOINTMENT OF RICHARD D. HEFFNER

**HON. EDWARD I. KOCH**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn of the appointment of Richard D. Heffner as chairman of the Rating Board of the Motion Picture Association of America. Mr. Heffner is eminently qualified for his new position, bringing to it a vast amount of practical experience in the communications media as well as a distinguished academic career.

A pioneer in public broadcasting, he was instrumental in the acquisition of channel 13, WNET, as New York's educational television station. He was responsible for putting channel 13 on the air and served as its first general manager. In his earlier work in commercial television, Heffner had produced and moderated "Man of the Year," "The Open Mind," and other prize winning television program series, and had served as director of public affairs programs for WNBC-TV, channel 4, in New York. He also was

CXX—1432—Part 17

director of special projects for the CBS television network and editorial consultant to the CBS, Inc., Editorial Board, and had been a radio newsmen for ABC.

Beginning his career as an historian, Heffner taught at the University of California at Berkeley, Sarah Lawrence College, Columbia University, and the New School for Social Research, New York. His many reviews and articles have appeared in such publications as the New York Times, Saturday Review, and the American Historical Review. He is currently university professor of communications and public policy at Rutgers University.

This appointment also pleases me because I consider Richard Heffner a good personal friend. It is gratifying to see a friend with such an outstanding background receive the recognition he deserves. I am certain that his intelligence and sense of good judgment will insure the fairness and integrity of the motion picture rating system. My best wishes go with him.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN J. ROONEY

**HON. GEORGE H. MAHON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago when our distinguished colleague from New York, JOHN J. ROONEY, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary, announced that he would not seek reelection, I had occasion to make some remarks in the RECORD concerning his outstanding career.

I have received an excellent tribute in regard to Mr. ROONEY from Rabbi Bernard Weinberger of Brooklyn, which I present for printing in the RECORD:

JOHN J. ROONEY

Those of us who live in the 14th Congressional District of Brooklyn, New York, were deeply saddened by the news that "our Congressman", John J. Rooney has, because of ill health, decided not to stand for reelection. Thus thirty years of unmatched service in the august halls in the House of Representatives will come to a close. Undoubtedly, it will be years before the full impact of the loss of John Rooney's services can be adequately measured, but already we know that we of the 14th District will be without the services of a man whose door was always open in moments of need.

The 14th Congressional District is made up of a constituency that is multi-racial, multi-ethnic and multi-religious. John Rooney was the rallying point around which all diverse groups could join hands in a common effort. He was a man of all seasons and a congressman for all people. Jews, Poles, Irish, Italians, Blacks and Puerto Ricans all were able to point to Congressman Rooney as their spokesman because he understood their needs and always had an attentive ear to the peculiar nuance of each group.

John Rooney met with Kings, dined with Royalty, knelt before Popes, received Clergymen of all faiths, mingled with the elite in Washington but never lost the capacity to commiserate and empathize with the lonely and the distressed, the disadvantaged and the poor. He wielded enormous power in watching over the expenditure of the U.S.

Government dollar, was an enemy of waste and yet, was lavish in his compassion for the impoverished.

In the last decade, John Rooney was challenged by a host of different adversaries but he enjoyed the loyalty of those he had served so well and was returned by the electorate fifteen times. No man could wish for more eloquent testimony of the esteem and regard with which he is held by his constituency.

We can only hope and pray that he now will enjoy together with his wife Katie, the tranquillity and serenity that he so richly deserves, in good health and in the knowledge that he leaves behind a constituency that remains eternally grateful for his remarkable career of services to the people.

#### THE SOCIAL SECURITY RIPOFF

**HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rusher's musings on his favorite Government hoax were of interest to me. I would like to share them with my colleagues in this Congress and the "workers of the world" to whom the author refers who might be among the readership of the RECORD:

"NEW DEAL" LEGACY: THE SOCIAL SECURITY RIPOFF

(By William A. Rusher)

Whenever my faith in human gullibility begins to flag, I spend a few minutes contemplating Social Security. Of all the hoaxes perpetrated on the American people by Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, this one is my very favorite.

It began, like most New Deal reforms, with the discovery and proclamation of a human need, in this case the need to provide for people in their old age. Thus stated, there was surely nothing wrong with the idea.

To this insight, the New Deal liberals added another—their own firm, paternalistic conviction that the American people are incapable of coping with the problem themselves. As an individualist I always found this a tough proposition to swallow, but I have finally managed to get it down. Unquestionably there are plenty of reckless types around who just don't have enough foresight—who will spend, all their lives long, every penny they can lay their hands on, and then wind up in a fearful heap on the city hall steps in their 60s or 70s.

From this it followed quite naturally, in the eyes of the New Dealers, that Big Daddy would have to do for people what they were too dumb to do for themselves: compel them to set aside a part of their savings as a retirement fund. So far so good.

At this point, however, the Houdinis of the New Deal got busy. If you can follow the pea from shell to shell the rest of the way I will paste a gold star in your book.

First, they brusquely removed a Social Security premium from every worker's pay before he even got his hands on the check—thus, they correctly calculated, dulling his sense of loss. Then they required the employer to match the employee's contribution—a piece of rigamarole that didn't cost the employer a cent (since it merely became an item in the total cost of labor, which continued to be negotiated freely as before), but gave the worker an obscure and meretricious feeling that he was getting something extra.

And then, instead of investing or even saving the money, they took the whole caboodle—employer and employee contributions alike—and spent it on the high purposes of

the New Deal, including their own salaries, trusting to future Social Security contributions, or general tax revenues if need be, to pay the pensions of the elderly when these started falling due in substantial amounts a quarter of a century later.

Beautiful. Simply beautiful. Even the side benefits were, from a social planner's standpoint, impressive. For example, every American must have a Social Security number, which tags him as efficiently as the tattoo on the forearm of an Auschwitz inmate—thus creating a potential for big brotherhood that even libertarians have only lately begun to dread.

Best of all, Roosevelt managed to sell this scheme, which is really just a ruthlessly regressive payroll tax, to the American people as one of the major "benefits" he was conferring upon them. To this very day, as Barry Goldwater discovered to his sorrow, an unkind word about the Social Security system is enough to convince millions that you are about to snatch away their only hope of a dignified old age.

And yet Social Security is, and always was, a ripoff pure and simple. There was no reason on earth why a system of old-age insurance had to be set up the way his one was. By 1977, the maximum Social Security payment (by employer and employee) will rise to nearly \$100 a month. A person, 21, paying this same amount for private insurance, would receive \$158,700 of immediate insurance protection, plus a cash value growing to \$96,600 at age 65, and dividends worth, if reinvested, at least \$150,000 at retirement. What's more, he could leave to his heirs any of the cash he didn't spend, and could earn as much as he pleased on the side. Does this sound to you very much like what he will get under Social Security?

Workers of the world! With friends like that you don't need enemies.

#### DOW CHEMICAL CO.

### HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend Dow Chemical Co. in Midland, Mich., for supplying Moltic, Inc., a manufacturing firm in Woonsocket, R.I., with a shipment of scarce high-density polyethylene resin.

Acute shortage of plastics materials still continues in the United States, and companies like Moltic, Inc., are confronted daily with supply problems which very often involve worker security. According to Emile A. Benoit, president of Moltic, Inc., 20 employees of Moltic were faced with dismissal, because of a resin, and it was only through the cooperation of Dow Chemical that these jobs were saved. I think that Dow Chemical should be complimented for taking an active interest in the future of small manufacturers.

Below is the letter I received from Mr. Benoit regarding this matter:

MOLTIC, INC.,

Woonsocket, R.I., June 17, 1974.

Congressman ROBERT O. TIERNAN,  
Congress of the United States,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: Although the above plant is not located in your congressional district, I thought I would write to you anyway to let you know that the Dow Chemical Company

of Midland, Michigan has sold us some scarce high density polyethylene resin just in the nick of time to salvage the jobs of 20 employees among whom are some very needy and underprivileged ones.

If you can cite Dow in some way for their cooperation, please do so.

Very truly yours,

EMILE A. BENOIT,  
President.

#### TECHNOLOGY IN AN URBAN ENVIRONMENT

### HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to read a most interesting and thought-provoking speech given by Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, president emeritus of the California Institute of Technology, at the University Club in New York under the sponsorship of Polytechnic Institute of New York. I feel sure that my colleagues will find Dr. DuBridge's comments to be of value:

#### TECHNOLOGY IN AN URBAN ENVIRONMENT

(By Lee A. DuBridge)

I am going to open my remarks by citing a truism: viz. that from the dawn of history—and even long before—the advance and development of human civilization has been closely intertwined with, profoundly influenced by and indeed, dependent on the advance of science and technology.

From the very earliest times the original transformation of Nomadic tribes into settled communities came as a direct result of the discovery of the technology of agriculture. Similarly, the invention of the controlled use of fire, the invention of the wheel, the domestication of animals as beasts of burden and sources of food, the development of techniques of hunting, the conversion of the weapons of the hunt into weapons of war, the improvement of human dwellings from the cave or tent to the more comfortable homes and public buildings of wood or mud, or stone or brick. All these things occurring over a period of hundreds or thousands of years, made possible the first towns and later the great cities of ancient times in which remarkable structures were built—some of them, like the pyramids of Egypt representing extraordinary feats of engineering skill and of human effort and ingenuity.

Long before the dawn of history also men made patient and painstaking observations of the sun, the moon and the stars from which they developed the concept of time, the hour, the day, the month, the seasons and the year. Thus were laid the early foundations of modern science. Even as early as 85 B.C., Archimedes had apparently developed an intricate clockwork mechanism of gears and wheels and indicators to measure time and predict eclipses of the moon. This remarkable mechanism discovered in artifacts recovered from a sunken Greek ship, and only recently analyzed and interpreted, was the forerunner of the modern clock and indeed, of many other types of modern machinery, including the differential gear of the modern automobile. It was, in fact, a pioneering achievement of modern technology.

We often think of technology as being a characteristic of very modern civilization, say, since the industrial revolution. But, in fact,

ingenious and inventive technology was one of the earliest achievements of ancient man and enabled him to live a better life than his predecessors. Indeed, early man survived in the evolutionary struggle against competitive creatures largely because he learned to use tools—clubs, knives, hammers, fire—the early products of technology.

It is true of course that the discovery and use of the principles of mechanics, the use of heat energy (as in steam) and of electricity have produced even more profound and more rapid changes in civilization in the past 300 years. So now we live in a technological age which would have been inconceivable, or even unbelievable, to our grandparents. Today technology is inextricably linked to almost every aspect of our daily lives. It is technology which has made our lives different from those of the caveman, but this has always been true.

Now some people don't like all this. They apparently think that being a caveman would be better than living in a, well I won't mention any place names.

Others of us take all this modern technological world for granted. Like the elderly lady who was disgusted with some of the antics of young people and asked, in indignation, "Why can't they just stay home and watch TV as God intended they should?"

Yet, like it or not, technology is here to stay. And, in all truth there is really very little of it that we would want to give up even if we could. We really don't like to live like cavemen, or even like our grandparents.

And yet, we do have troubles. Bad troubles. We have traffic jams and pollution and overcrowded cities and power blackouts and gasoline shortages, highway wrecks and airplane hijackings, wars, and threats of wars—catastrophic wars perhaps. We are, on the whole, healthier and we live longer than our parents, but if we do get sick or injured, our medical bills may spell financial disaster. We can get from New York to Los Angeles in a fantastically short time, once we make it to the airport. We can talk easily by phone to anyone on the continent, but in case of a storm or a flood the whole system seems to bog down.

Has technology engulfed us, trapped us, dehumanized us—have our political and social institutions failed to keep pace with our scientific knowledge and engineering skills or have our ethical standards failed us just at the time when they were more vitally important than ever?

The answers are both yes and no, or possibly simply, we don't know.

I do know that technology is not an uncontrollable Frankenstein, bound to ride rough shod over all human values. Technology is a tool to be used. It is a product of human beings. The motivation behind its progress has always been, and continues to be, a desire to make a better life for human beings. And the uses of technology are determined and controlled by people, not by machines. Ignorant people sometimes, cruel people sometimes, selfish people sometimes, but generous, humane and farsighted people sometimes.

And all these people work through our social, political and economic institutions to put technology to work. Our challenge today is valid, human desires and ideals; and resistive to the cruel, or selfish, or thoughtless desires of the few.

Shall the ills of our society, some of which have been caused by the misuse of technology, be cured then by stopping technology, by stopping the search for new knowledge and its application? Certainly not. Even if we could suppress the curiosity and ingenuity of the human mind.

Our ills of population, environmental deterioration, the wastage of natural resources, the scarcity of food in a world of burgeoning population, the shortage of healthy, de-



cent living conditions for billions of people and the uncontrolled growth of population itself, all call for more and better technology and its intelligent use.

We have dumped our waste products into the air and the water for centuries because that seemed a cheap and harmless thing to do. But our air and water in many places are being saturated by growing burdens so we need better technology to dispose of wastes in other ways and to render them harmless or inoffensive.

Our resources in minerals found in the earth are limited and are being rapidly used up. So we need better technology to find new sources, to reclaim our once-used materials, to find substitute materials which are more plentiful or can be replenished.

Everywhere we turn we see opportunities for better technology based on more scientific knowledge and every day we see the urgency of bringing to the country's decision makers in government, business, industry and the professions, a better appreciation of the fact that the laws of nature cannot be changed by legislation; that new technological ideas cannot be brought into existence by waving a wand or even by appropriating a billion dollars. Yet, the advance of science and technology must be encouraged through the support and encouragement of new ideas.

New ideas come from the minds of people and they are put to use by imaginative people, well trained people, educated people, people with a sense of responsibility for the welfare of other people.

Where do we find such people?

Our colleges and universities, of course, are the source of young people who will be leading our country in the coming generations. Not every college and university! We may have tended in this country to worship too much a college degree from any college for its own sake as a passport to an affluent life. "It ain't necessarily so." For not all colleges are the same. It is no accident that institutions like Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Stanford, MIT and Cal Tech and others have turned out far more than their share of our country's leaders in science, in engineering, in business, law, medicine or public affairs and of course, in higher education itself. It is no accident that, here and there, a great institution has revolutionized the economic or cultural or industrial life of its community and of the nation. It is no accident that so many of the nation's thriving cities can boast of excellent educational institutions—Cambridge, Chicago, Palo Alto, Los Angeles—you can name others.

And what of New York?

Surely the greatest metropolitan center of the world deserves great educational centers. It must have them to remain great. And surely, such a city must support its great centers of learning generously, encouraging and supporting high excellence, in teaching in research, in the pursuit of new ideas, in many fields of human endeavor.

New York, indeed, does have some of the world's great medical centers. It has schools of business and law of great distinction and in Columbia University, an institution with a long tradition of excellence in many fields.

But what about science and engineering—the mainstays of our technological civilization? Is there an MIT or Cal Tech, or Stanford, or Berkeley, or Ann Arbor here in New York? Must New York depend on the rest of the country for its engineering leadership? Shall a city with the biggest engineering problems and opportunities in the world look elsewhere for its trained leadership?

It need not!

For across the river, in Brooklyn, there is an institution (formerly Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, now Polytechnic Institute of New York) which for 120 years has been quietly building a foundation of excellence in engineering, science and technology. For all

these years it has been feeding into the mainstream of New York's business and industrial life, thousands of highly trained men and women. It has produced more advanced degree engineers, by far, than any other institution in the state. One single company in this area now employs 1600 Polytechnic graduates. Polytechnic has provided more graduates to the Bell Telephone Laboratories than any other college or university in the country.

And has the City of New York recognized its debt to this fine private institution by providing it with adequate private financial resources to pursue and improve its work?

Not quite!

Poly has a minuscule endowment, an inadequate and partially obsolete physical plant and extremely low level of annual giving. In spite of this, Poly has a distinguished and devoted faculty, highly motivated students and, in certain fields, teaching and research of the highest distinction.

It is a private institution—not a part of a New York State system. As a private institution it has the opportunity to rise to new levels of distinction. For in the American system, private institutions have been the leaders and innovators of educational progress.

But Poly must seek far greater levels of private support than it has ever had before. Poly's lively and imaginative new president, George Bugliarello and his associates have new visions of Poly's future which deserve the backing of the entire metropolitan area. An investment in the future of Poly is an investment in the future of New York City—an investment sure to pay rich dividends.

I have personally been a part of two of the greatest technological universities of the country—MIT and Cal Tech. I have seen the contributions which they have made to their communities and to their country.

I have also had the opportunity in recent weeks to get better acquainted with the Polytechnic Institute of New York. I have talked at length with members of the faculty and administration. I have had an opportunity to look at the past achievements and the present potentialities of that institution. I have seen the way in which, for many years, Poly has addressed itself to the many urban problems of this area—the development of sound engineering building codes, investigating the problems of pollution and an active program of fire prevention research. I know of Poly's many achievements in Polymer Chemistry, in Microwave Electronics and in Aerospace Engineering. I have seen excellent departments in mathematics, physics, electrical engineering and others. I have seen the way in which Poly is integrating studies in the humanities and social sciences into an engineering curriculum, to make better engineers and better citizens.

I have seen how Poly has quietly and continuously contributed to the technological advance of this area. I have seen too their problems, their inadequate resources, their new responsibilities to become not just Poly of Brooklyn, but Poly of all New York. I have seen the steps they are taking to meet these responsibilities and opportunities.

But the Polytechnic staff cannot do it alone anymore than could MIT or Cal Tech or any other fine university of science and engineering. Poly needs the understanding support of the whole community. And surely this great city as it sees the opportunities ahead, will respond, in the light of self-interest alone, to the chance of building here one of the greatest technological institutions of the country. Nothing less is good enough for New York. Nothing less will meet the needs of this city in the years to come.

The next few years will be decisive ones in the history of technological education in New York City—decisive years for the history of the whole city. In only a few years it will be clear whether the people of New York have

met or have failed to meet this great opportunity. I shall continue to believe that you will not fail.

## THE KISSINGER SYSTEM

### HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, not only has Dr. Henry Kissinger served his country well in securing a cease-fire in the Middle East, a lifting of the oil embargo by the Arabian nations, and by securing a détente with Russia and peaceful relations with the People's Republic of China, he is also building the State Department into an energetic, forward-looking, and effective arm of our Government.

I include for the RECORD the remarks of the erudite editorialist, Marquis Childs, taken from the Washington Post of July 9, 1974:

[From the Washington Post, July 9, 1974]

#### THE KISSINGER SYSTEM

(By Marquis Childs)

We are three-fourths of the way through this grimmest of centuries that marked, after 1940, America's rise to unparalleled power. Whether given our deep domestic divisions we can use this power wisely to keep the peace in a world with the fearful overhang of nuclear annihilation, is still in uncertain balance.

In 1900 those two dour brothers, Brooks and Henry Adams, the last intellectual lights of the great New England family, examined Brooks' prophecy of America's coming economic supremacy. They took a dim view of our capacity to hold the line against war and anarchy as the British had held it for the preceding century.

To this observer, a test of our maturity turns on the fate of Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger and the future of the Department of State over which he is attempting to preside. The question is not merely whether he is to be brought down by those chivying him over the wiretaps.

Under the star system for which the press and Kissinger himself are responsible, it is made to appear that the Secretary of State is the end all and be all of American foreign policy. If he resigns in the fall, and those close to him believe the chances of this are 50-50, then the glue factory, as the Department is known by its more contemptuous critics, falls into a great big hole in Foggy Bottom.

For several reasons this is deeply disturbing. First, it is simply not true. In the nine months he has been Secretary, Kissinger, despite his long absences from Washington, has moved in several respects to make the Department a more effective agent to implement foreign policy.

He has put able career officers into important posts. For example Joseph Sisco, with a broad background in the Mideast was persuaded to refuse an attractive outside offer and stay on to be Under Secretary for Political Affairs. Others in assistant secretary posts are carrying on the work of the Department.

Whether Kissinger is in the Mideast, in Russia or wherever, they work at the liaison task with Congress—16 separate appearances during the Secretary's latest absence—so important to the continuity of policy. That is another reason to correct the impression that Kissinger's departure would leave a void for the remaining two years

of the administration; foreign governments would feel that they had no place to turn in their relationship with the United States.

Unlike his immediate predecessors, Kissinger keeps in close touch with the most important elements of policy while he is away. A large volume of traffic passes both ways through the efficient communications system. Increasingly Kissinger leaves decisions to associates.

One problem is the duality of his roles as Secretary and adviser in the White House on national security affairs. The NSC staff he heads has been reduced in size with several members brought into the State Department. At a meeting in the White House just before the latest SALT talks, Acting Secretary of State Sisco sat next to the President while Kissinger in his NSC role sat across the table.

Ever since the United States moved into the big power orbit, the State Department has been a scapegoat with foes and even friends blaming the messenger for the bad news. Before 1940 it was a tight little operation dominated by a few senior foreign service officers. Except for the five years under Dean Acheson, morale in the sprawling colossus has been low.

Returning to Washington with presumably six to eight weeks at his desk in the Department Kissinger will spend a certain number of days before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the investigation he requested into his previous testimony on the wiretaps. He will also be interrogated about his association with David Young and the plumbers unit in the White House. In the opinion of this observer, an objective inquiry will absolve him of the insinuation of perjury and similar charges hurled at him at his press conference when he returned from the Mideast.

Kissinger, the immigrant, has served his country well. The uses of power in a divided and chaotic world are often abhorrent to idealistic Americans. The blame has been heaped on Kissinger as an agent of that power. The American dilemma is whether any agent can serve confronted by a nation divided over the legitimacy of the power role.

#### HEW REPORTS SURPLUS—TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET NOW

### HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Star-News of July 3, 1974, Mr. Cramer's "9 to 4:30" column reported the astounding revelation that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will wind up the current fiscal year with \$3 billion unspent. No one should need further convincing of the fact in our national budget. This \$3 billion reverted to the U.S. Treasury on June 30, 1974. Happily, this was \$3 billion not spent that did not contribute to inflation. I am asking Secretary Weinberger for a detailed report today which I shall also place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, when it is available. The article from the Washington Star-News follows:

#### COMPROMISE

The Federal Times reports that the Health, Education and Welfare Department will wind up the 1974 fiscal year with a high unbelievable \$3 billion unspent from its appropriation.

Social Security spent something like \$1 billion less than it had estimated, the bulk in Medicare, but part in old age and survivor benefits.

Spending by the Social and Rehabilitation Service was about \$200 million below estimates.

The Office of Education was \$60 million below.

Bureaucrats ordinarily find ways to spend all of their appropriations. Baffled HEW officials have organized an interagency task force, including members for Office of Management and Budget, Treasury and General Services Administration to find out just why their estimates went so far astray.

#### PROPOSED RECLAMATION FEE FOR H.R. 11500

### HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider H.R. 11500, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1974. Although not perfect in every detail, this is a reasonable and workable bill that comes to grips with a very technical and highly controversial subject. It will do much to assure that coal strip mining will not further degrade our Nation's land and water and that strip mined lands will be adequately reclaimed in the future.

But what about the devastation still left from coal mining in the past? According to the latest survey by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, over 2.5 million acres of stripmined lands lie unreclaimed. To correct these conditions would cost over \$9 billion at today's prices. In Ohio alone, it will cost \$750 million to reclaim the 370,000 acres of strip mined land and to correct water pollution caused by abandoned deep mines.

The bill, in its present form, would do little to restore these abandoned, unreclaimed lands. The small reclamation fee provided in the bill would require at least 45 years to solve this serious national problem. Forty percent of the fee collected would be turned over to the States for nonreclamation purposes. And for many years to come, the people who live in these blighted coal mining communities must continue to face the physical hazards and economic deprivation of their wasted land and polluted water.

#### TO DIG OR TO STRIP

What about the direction the coal mining industry will go in the future? Only 3 percent of the Nation's coal can be recovered by strip mining. The other 97 percent is too deep for stripping. Yet it is this 97 percent that constitutes the Nation's major energy resource. If we accept a strategy of maximum reliance on surface mining to expand coal production we will totally exhaust the surface mine reserves in the West by 1996.

The bill does little to revitalize the deep-mining industry, which has been plagued in recent years by increased costs added by Congress for health and safety activities and black lung benefits.

In fact, the reclamation fee amendment in the bill would further penalize Appalachian and Midwestern coal by favoring low energy content Western coal which industry plans to strip rather than deep-mine. And if the coal industry has its way, consumers throughout the East and Midwest will pay in the form of greatly increased rates for electric power if they must depend on coal hauled in from the West, at transportation costs already running as high as \$14 a ton.

This is not a mere threat, it is rapidly becoming a reality. In the June issue of the Mining Congress Journal, a vice president of Burlington Northern, Inc.—which has rights to a good share of America's large Western coal reserves—boasts of their plans to transport stripmined coal from Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to the East—including Appalachia which has some of our Nation's finest and richest coalfields.

Burlington Northern and other coal mining companies would rather make a fast buck at the expense of the Eastern consumer and the Western rancher or farmer. No matter that stripable coal reserves will be rapidly exhausted or that our children may be faced with a far greater energy crisis in the year 2000. The goal of the industry seems to be to do what is easiest and fastest, and most profitable, regardless of the consequences.

#### STAY EAST AND DIG DEEP

When H.R. 11500 comes to the floor, I plan to introduce a substitute reclamation fee that comes to grips with these serious problems. It would provide for reclaiming the abandoned mines in one-third the time required by the current bill and without imposing any significant burden on the coal industry or on consumers.

The substitute fee would also encourage the coal industry to stay East and dig deep. The basic fee of \$2.50 a ton would be reduced on the average to \$.94 per ton by credits for statutorily imposed costs of health and safety equipment and activities and black lung benefits and for reclamation activities required by the bill. The fee would take into account the energy content of coal without penalizing Eastern coal. Up to 16 percent of the gross fee could be deducted for any severance tax paid to States to support reclamation activities. In addition, 37.5 percent of the money would be returned to the coal mining States, giving prime consideration to the needs of communities which supply the major part of the workforce for coal mine operations.

These credits would tend to even out the regional differences in stripmine reclamation costs and Btu content. The result would be that the average reclamation fee for stripmine coal in each major mining area—Appalachia, Midcentral, and the West—will closely approximate the national average of \$1.60 per ton. The average for deep mines, with their high credits for safety costs, would be only 25 percent per ton. And mine operators would have a financial incentive to do a better job of coal mine safety.



## OHIO ILLUSTRATES THE NEED

To illustrate the need for this reclamation fee, I would like to insert in the RECORD a copy of an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 8, 1974, which describes the current situation in Ohio and how it must be corrected.

As the article points out, Ohio has a strong stripmine law, which took effect in April 1972. But the 4-cent reclamation fee provided in the Ohio law is too small, and the \$730 million price tag too large, for the State of Ohio to reclaim the 370,000 acres of stripmined land or to correct the water pollution caused by abandoned deep mines. Only a substantial Federal program which puts the burden fairly on the various sectors of the coal industry can do the job effectively and with a minimum of interference with normal competition. I am pleased with the support the substitute reclamation fee proposal has received in Ohio and elsewhere. The Plain Dealer article follows these remarks:

**THE \$730 MILLION TAB IS UNPAID—STRIP MINING LEAVES BIG BILL**  
(By Richard C. Widman)

ST. CLARKSVILLE, OHIO.—Sixty years of strip mining has produced a billion or more tons of coal while leaving Ohioans an unpaid bill for \$730 million.

According to a study commissioned by the Ohio General Assembly, it would cost that much to reclaim the 370,000 acres of 28 eastern and southeastern Ohio counties ravaged by strip mining and to correct water pollution caused by abandoned deep mines. Why reclaim the land?

"We have only one Ohio," said William B. Nye, director of the Ohio Department of Natural Resources.

"If it lies fallow and unproductive it is an economic loss to the state of Ohio."

Tough new strip mine laws which took effect April 10, 1972, provide some measure of protection of the land for the future. With strict enforcement of the law the abuses of strip mining's past history will not be repeated.

But it was too late for large areas converted to moonscape by the big shovels, too late for streams polluted by acid mine drainage and sedimentation.

That land will be needed someday for the sites of new cities, for parks, for forest products and other uses difficult to foresee now.

The legislation setting Ohio strip mining reclamation rules and standards created a Board on Unreclaimed Strip Mined Lands to guide restoration of lands and waters affected by strip mining prior to the effective date of the new law in 1972.

Members of the board are officers of the legislature and the Department of Natural Resources and others appointed by them.

Their report, compiled with the assistance of Department of Natural Resources experts and private consultants, states that more than 370,000 acres of strip mined land will require some form of reclamation.

Of this total, 24,000 acres are active mines and will be reclaimed by the mines, according to the report; 166,000 acres will require occasional spot treatment; the remaining 180,000 acres require major reclamation effort.

This effort will cost \$290 million, the board reported.

In addition, the board reported that abandoned coal mines discharge more than 1 million pounds of acid each day into Ohio streams.

Forty per cent of the acid drains from

strip mined areas and would be corrected with the surface reclamation treatment proposed in the \$290-million cost, but 60% of this pollution comes from abandoned deep mines and would cost an estimated additional \$440 million to eliminate.

The total cost would be \$730 million.

The board suggested the year 2000 as a goal for completion of the massive reclamation.

The state has not, however, moved to implement the recommendations. The money is not available.

The state mining reclamation funds established by the legislature in the new strip mining legislation, based on a severance tax of 4 cents on each ton of coal mined, is inadequate to do the job.

Raymond L. Lowrie, chief of the Ohio Division of Reclamation, acknowledged that no reclamation of land strip mined before the laws took effect in 1972 is being done, with the exception of several small experimental projects.

Nye said state officials are considering a suggestion that voters be asked next year to approve a bond issue to finance the reclamation program. But Nye's suggestion flies in the face of Gov. John J. Gilligan's pledge not to raise taxes.

Nye would not indicate how seriously a bond issue was being considered or when a decision might be reached.

The Appalachian Regional Commission, a federal agency dedicated to rehabilitating the economically depressed coal mining regions of the nation, could be approached for funds to pay for reclamation projects, Nye said.

However, Congress has been miserly in funding ARC, according to some critics.

Nye said the best hope lies in federal financing through the new strip mining legislation being considered by Congress.

A bill passed by the U.S. Senate last year would authorize \$100 million initially for a reclamation program.

Ohio would have a high priority for a large share of the initial funding and the moneys that Congress would set aside later for the purpose, Nye said.

But the chances of significant federal aid would dim if the coal companies and utilities are successful in crippling a House bill which comes up for a vote soon.

Lobbyists for environmental interests are fighting to restore to the bill an amendment sponsored by Rep. John F. Seiberling Jr., D-14, Akron.

Seiberling's amendment would create a federal reclamation fund, based on a tax of \$2.50 on each ton of coal mined, with the proceeds to be apportioned to the states.

Before the bill emerged from the House Interior Committee, Seiberling's amendment was stricken and an amendment was substituted that would base the coal severance tax on the amount of heat energy in each ton, producing an estimated 30 cents a ton.

Ohio officials favor and have testified for the Seiberling amendment which, some say, would help the Ohio coal industry by putting the industry nationally under strict reclamation standards similar to Ohio's while producing more revenue for reclamation programs.

Western strip mined coal, which the big coal companies and utilities are rushing to mine and which could put some Ohio mining industries out of business, is much poorer in heat value as measured in BTU's (British Thermal Units) than Ohio coal.

Some western coal has as little as 6,000 BTUs per ton, Ohio coal up to 15,000 BTUs.

A spokesman for Seiberling said last week the congressman will reintroduce his amendment on the floor of the House, with revisions that may meet some of the objections of the coal industry and utilities.

# RAGWEED ERADICATION GOAL OF NEW YORK GROUP

## HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, a nonprofit group in my district has established itself to put an end to the affliction many of us call "hay fever" but which in fact is ragweeditis pollenution. New York City took a step toward eliminating this problem by requiring property owners to cut down ragweed plants. No law, however, is any good without enforcement.

The Hay Fever Prevention Society, founded by Mr. Louis V. Fucci of my district is seeking to encourage enforcement of existing laws against the spread of ragweed and to promote similar laws in other jurisdictions. The following press statement sets forth the goals of this group:

### PRESS STATEMENT

Louis V. Fucci, founder, Hay Fever Prevention Society, Inc., 2300 Sedgwick Avenue, Bronx, sponsoring national hay fever ragweed eradication program, calls upon all airborne noxious pollen sufferers and humanitarian citizens for better health to unite to help the society to petition our cabinet and Congress to wipe out Ragweeditis-Pollenution wrongly called "Hay Fever" not caused by hay or fever, but chiefly by noxious ragweed pollen.

Now that the summer is here, the society calls the attention of property owners to the city's health anti-ragweed law which makes it a violation to permit weeds to grow to maturity during the months of June and July, especially after August 5. Reason: Because after that date the weed's beads open up and its dust-like noxious pollen, which is invisible to the naked eye, causes harmful sneezing and many miserable allergenic symptoms.

Imagine, there are 11,800,000 sick from ragweeditis pollenution, of which 30% are asthma sufferers in our nation, this according to government statisticians 1967 report to the U.S. Department of Allergies and Infectious Diseases. Prior to that date no authoritative estimate was available, except conjecture estimates of 3 or 5% of population. Notwithstanding, it is not a "problem", that it is feasible to solve. It is a man-made prolonged selfish project playing upon the misery of a preventive disease which is specifically a public health service to be exclusively administered by the U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare.

Yes, says, Louis V. Fucci, the Law of Physics proves where there is no ragweed, there is no ragweeditis and assures liberation from the harmful ragweed airborne pollen; witness the fact, we have free from ragweed resorts which provide relief from this chronic miserable culprit during the "good" old summertime for vacations not only to "keep physically fit", but to "Keep America beautiful" and healthier.

Further, Fucci proclaims this noxious pollen is a national menace, despite the fact we have a Federal Clean Air Control Law which includes the removal of harmful ragweed to humans and other species of weeds damaging vegetation. In addition hospitals, and allergy clinics are always filled and causes the doctors shortage. Is there room for the betterment of such?

The society, therefore, is calling for volun-

teers to obtain petition forms for signatures, which should get the authorities in our plight appeal when we show we are seriously concerned and care for our health. Shouldn't they be more realistic to do something about this national health menace? They can in the same manner our government in the past subsidized the eradication of swamps and mosquitoes, the cause of malaria, and it was a costly project because of water involved, whereas not ragweed and it is the land property owners responsibility to remove in compliance with the law. And no subsidizing. It is a self-service operation nationally. Result: Today we hardly hear of Malaria and we ragweed victims can help by sending a token donation to the Society, a state legal chartered nonprofit, all volunteers include officers. We never had a professional. Won't you join us and give our cause a day or two of your liberal time?

#### MORE DISHEARTENING NEWS FROM CHILE; STILL NO U.S. RESPONSE

### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post yesterday carried a very short dispatch from Santiago, Chile, which aptly described in three paragraphs just what kind of government has ruled in Chile since the military coup in September, 1973. The article reads:

Chile's military government ordered the destruction of the country's electoral registers, which contain the names of 4 million people eligible to vote in national elections.

A government spokesman said the 24 tons of documents were destroyed because the government of the late President Salvador Allende had introduced thousands of fake names onto the rolls to improve its position in congressional elections.

The spokesman said that a study on methods to avoid abuses in voting registration would start "in a few years," and that registration itself, when it came, would take "a long time."

The Junta obviously intends to rule in Chile for a long time without the hindrance of democratic elections or voter registration rolls. While all Americans who are concerned about the fate of democracy in the Western Hemisphere ought to deplore such activities, what I find even more appalling is the continued U.S. insistence that the ruling Junta deserves more military support. Even more than an insensitivity to fundamental political freedoms, such a policy reveals a basic contradiction that has plagued American relations with Chile over the recent past. It is precisely this kind of American activity—supplying arms to a military junta and encouraging internal instability in the process—that is at odds with our stated goals of world peace and hemispheric cooperation. As regards Chile, this policy deserves a thorough reexamination, so that we may learn the lesson that Chile is teaching us, as shown by stories like the one I have reprinted here.

#### CONTAMINATION OF LIVESTOCK

### HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, the agriculture industry in Michigan is currently faced with one of the most serious and exasperating problems it has seen in its history. Contamination of dairy herds, beef cattle, poultry, and swine may bring a number of farmers to the brink of economic disaster. I have introduced legislation designed to guarantee emergency loans to prevent the bankruptcy and demise of these farms. I would like to explain the background and purposes of this legislation.

The problem arose from the contamination of livestock feed with a toxic chemical fire retardant known as polybrominated biphenyl—PBB—apparently mistaken for the mineral supplement magnesium oxide.

Because of uncertainties about the effect of PBB contamination on public health, nearly 40 dairy and beef herds—as many as 5,000 sick cattle—130,000 hens and 150 swine have been quarantined. More contaminated herds and flocks may still be discovered. All milk from these contaminated herds had to be dumped and animals in the contaminated herds cannot be sold.

Ultimate blame for the toxic PBB reaching the farmers' feed has yet to be determined. The compound was sent by the Michigan Chemical Co. to the Farm Bureau Services, where it was mixed with other chemicals to form feed. The feed was sold to the farmers. Some blame the chemical company, others the Farm Bureau, and still others question why the proper State and Federal agencies did not prevent or discover the contamination. In any case, it is clear that the farmers themselves were not to blame. There was no way they could have discovered the presence of the contaminant.

Those dairymen with contaminated herds now find themselves operating at a great financial loss. They must continue to feed and care for their cows, even though the chemical action of the PBB is causing the cows to starve to death. The cows must be milked twice a day just like always; but the milk must be dumped. Not able to sell the milk or the animals, the farmers' main source of income for themselves and their families has been cut off. In sales of raw milk alone, it is estimated the dairymen are losing \$10,000 daily because of the quarantine. And when the 2,000 to 3,000 cows go to slaughter, the farmers will stand to lose \$400 to \$800 per cow. Owners of beef cattle, poultry, and swine face the same kind of problem.

These farmers are thus experiencing considerable operating expenses at the same time that their income has ceased. They cannot survive for long. Many of them are already mortgaged to the hilt and could not obtain emergency loans on their own to tide them over until they can get a settlement.

We hope that insurance claims against the guilty parties will eventually result

in full compensation to the farmers for their losses. The problem exists, however, if those farmers are to survive until those settlements are made. It is the purpose of my bill to provide emergency loans to cover the great losses during this interim period—to prevent these losses from driving the farmers out of business before they can receive compensation from those to blame for the chemical mixup. If we can keep these otherwise successful farms operating, we can assure a continued supply of milk and other products to the consumer and a continued flow of tax revenues from these farmers.

In response to the plight of these Michigan farmers, and all other farmers who may find themselves in similar situations, I have introduced H.R. 15603, the Emergency Livestock Loan Insurance Act of 1974. This bill would permit the Department of Agriculture to insure loans made by private lenders up to \$100,000 to those owners of livestock whose animals or animal products are condemned or quarantined for reasons of public health not the fault of the negligence of the owner. The interest rate of these insured loans would be limited to 5 percent annually, with the Department of Agriculture making up the difference between the interest rate charged by the lender.

H.R. 15603 would bridge a startling gap in Federal programs for the Nation's farmers. The Federal Crop Insurance Act, the Dairy Indemnity Act, and various programs under the Farmers' Home Administration all offer financial and other assistance to farmers in cases of crop disease, natural disaster, or economic hardship. Yet, none of these programs directly apply to the contamination of livestock as happened in Michigan. The Dairy Indemnity Act is inapplicable because PBB is not a registered chemical.

Farmers with quarantined livestock are thus in a financially troublesome and uncertain situation. In Michigan, the State legislature has just passed legislation authorizing the Department of Agriculture to condemn and destroy these contaminated cows. Thus, settlement of the insurance claims may be forthcoming. In the meantime, however, these farmers are reaching the end of their ropes. Also, this situation could happen again, elsewhere, and we should have a program to provide emergency relief to keep these otherwise profitable, taxpaying farmers in business.

Mr. Speaker, a bill to provide such loan relief for the entire cattle industry is currently pending in the House. The cause for this relief is simply the economic situation faced by the cattle industry. Surely, if we can provide such massive aid in this case, we can help those dairy farmers whose economic disaster was created by chemical mixups, a much more limited situation.

Through no fault of their own, livestock and poultry owners are confronted with pending bankruptcy, liquidation and economic disaster. There is no question about the immediate need for answers and action to help the farmers involved deal with the problems confronting them. Yet outright indemnity sets a bad precedent. Since 1965, more than



\$1.5 million has been granted in indemnity payments to dairy farmers and manufacturers of dairy products. I offer H.R. 15603 as an alternative to those bills that deal on a one-by-one basis with the losses periodically incurred by livestock farmers and commodity producers.

Yet, my bill establishes only a 2-year program of assistance. For the longer run, more permanent programs and regulations are needed to handle this problem effectively. Thus, I have cosponsored H.R. 15458, a bill directing the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the feasibility of a Federal insurance program covering livestock, sheep, swine, horses, goats, bees, poultry and their by-products not now covered by the Federal Crop Insurance Act. Specifically, the Secretary is directed to analyze whether the crop insurance program should be expanded to cover these additional agricultural products.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that my bill is not designed to "bail out" unsuccessful farmers, nor to subsidize them. Nor will it prevent those who are actually found negligent in this case from having to pay damages. This bill is designed to allow those farmers who have suffered these losses to cover their expenses while waiting for settlements. It will keep them in business, on the tax rolls, and insure a continued supply of milk and other products for the consumer.

Farmers should not be placed in the untenable position of having their livelihood cut off by governmental officials, only to be left to face the anguish of heavy financial losses, bankruptcy, and tremendous loan obligations. Moreover, without any governmental assistance, it is the small individual and family farms which will suffer the most, since they may not have access to other financial assistance.

The current situation clearly points to the need for programs and procedures to deal effectively with this type of problem in the future. For this reason, I offer this legislation.

H.R. 15603 follows:

H.R. 15603

A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to establish a loan insurance program for owners and processors of livestock or livestock products which have been condemned or quarantined by a Federal or State official for reasons of public health

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Livestock Loan Insurance Act of 1974".

SEC. 2. (a) The Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) is amended by redesignating subtitle D, and all references thereto, as subtitle E, and by inserting immediately after subtitle C the following new subtitle:

"Subtitle D—Emergency Loans for Owners and Processors of Livestock or Livestock Products Quarantined or Condemned for Reasons of Public Health

"SEC. 331. (a) For a period of two years from the date of the enactment of the Emergency Livestock Loan Insurance Act of 1974, the Secretary shall insure loans made by a lender other than the United States, or made by the Secretary and sold to such lender, to a borrower in any State who, as determined by the Secretary, is—

"(1) an owner of contaminated livestock or livestock products which have been condemned or quarantined on or after May 6, 1974, by a Federal or State official for reasons of public health as a result of causes other than the willful or negligent actions of the owner; or

"(2) a processor of livestock products who—

"(A) would have received, but for the quarantine or condemnation described in paragraph (1), the livestock or livestock products directly from the owner for the purpose of processing them for resale; and

"(B) did not contribute to the contamination of the livestock or livestock products through willful or negligent actions.

"(b) Loans insured under this subtitle must be expended for the purposes of—

"(1) financing the normal operations of breeding, buying, raising, or selling livestock, or processing livestock products; or

"(2) financing any special expenses resulting from the condemnation or quarantine described in section 331(a)(1).

"SEC. 332. (a) The amount of the principal of any loan insured under this subtitle shall not exceed \$100,000.

"(b) The aggregate amount of the principal obligations insured under this subtitle and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed \$3,000,000.

"SEC. 333. (a) The Secretary shall from time to time establish the interest rate which may be paid by any borrower on a loan insured under this subtitle, but such rate shall not exceed 5 per centum per annum.

"(b) Whenever the Secretary determines it necessary that a lender be paid a higher interest rate on a loan than is to be paid by the borrower on such loan in order for the Secretary to be able to enter into a contract of insurance with a lender with respect to such loan, the Secretary may contract to pay the difference between the interest rate to be paid by the borrower and the interest rate to which the lender is to be entitled under the contract.

"SEC. 334. (a) The Secretary shall determine whatever security he deems necessary for the obligations entered into by him in connection with loans insured under this subtitle.

"(b) When entering into any security instrument in connection with loans insured under this subtitle, he shall provide, whenever practicable, that such instrument constitutes a lien running to the United States even though the notes are held by lenders other than the United States.

"SEC. 335. Loans insured under this subtitle shall be insured, or made to be sold and insured, in accordance with and subject to sections 308 and 309 of this title.

"SEC. 336. For purposes of this subtitle—

"(1) the term 'livestock' includes beef and dairy cattle, sheep, swine, horses, mules, goats, and poultry; and

"(2) the term 'State' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

(b) Sections 331 through 344 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, and all references thereto, are redesignated as sections "341" through "354", respectively.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 308 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "and under subtitle D" immediately after "under this subtitle" each time it appears; and

(2) by inserting in subsection (a), "and under subtitle D" immediately after "hereunder".

(b) (1) Sections 309 (a) and (d) of such Act are amended by inserting "and under subtitle D", immediately after "under this subtitle" each time it appears.

(2) Section 309(c) of such Act is amended by inserting "and under subtitle D" immediately after "under this section" in the first sentence.

(c) Section 309(f)(1) of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "and under subtitle D" immediately after "under this subtitle"; and

(2) by striking out "The aggregate" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except for loans insured, or made to be sold and insured, under subtitle D, the aggregate".

SEC. 4. (a) Section 343(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as redesignated by section 2(b) of this Act, is amended by inserting "except for loans insured under subtitle D," immediately after "(a)".

(b) Section 343(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "and 321(b)(2), the county committee" and inserting in lieu thereof "321(b)(2), or loans insured under section 331, the county committee".

(c) Section 343(c) of such Act is amended by inserting "except for loans insured under section 331," immediately after "(c)".

## NOTEWORTHY GRADUATION

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of attending the commencement exercises at an exceptional high school—the Kendall Green Model Secondary School for the Deaf located in Washington, D.C. Dr. Malcolm J. Norwood of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped delivered the graduation address which was an inspiration not only to the students involved, but for those of us with the opportunity to join in this occasion. Dr. Norwood's remarks speak to the rich experiences and knowledge this high school imparts to its students. I was greatly impressed by this institution and by Dr. Norwood's presentation and feel it should be made a matter of record.

The remarks follow:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS: MODEL SECONDARY SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF, MAY 17, 1974

(By Malcolm J. Norwood)

It is a privilege and a great pleasure to be here with you this morning on this very special occasion. In fact I take much more than ordinary pleasure in my role as speaker because you are special. As high school graduates you represent a dream come true. Our first public school for the deaf in the United States was established in Hartford, Connecticut, in 1817. Our first college was established here in Washington, D.C. in 1864. It took only 47 years to go from our first school for the deaf to our first college, but we had to wait another 102 years before we had our first high school for the deaf.

And why is a high school so important? It is important because MSSD provides the missing link in the education chain for the deaf. At no time in our past history have deaf teenagers had the opportunity to experience a real high school environment which would make available opportunities to learn, to grow and to mature in the same way that hearing teenagers do. These opportunities have permitted you to develop self-confidence, self-motivation and self-determination. You have had the chance to be on your own, to accept the responsibility of deciding what kind of a person you want to be and to be better able to set your own future goals. You have shared with each other the ways

you can best live with deafness and how to make the most of what you have as individuals.

Today, it is particularly important to feel very deeply about these things not because it is your graduation day, but because it is May 17, a special anniversary. I reflect on this date because on May 17, 1954, exactly 20 years ago, today, just shortly before all or most of you were born, the Supreme Court of the United States made a decision that opened the door to greater public education for Black people. This was the beginning of the Civil Rights Movement which has as its promise—equal citizenship—absolute equality before the law and in the eyes of all men.

Deaf people, have been carrying on our own civil rights movement for more years than we can remember. The ultimate objective is the same, absolute equality. This goes back to Laurent Clerc, the first deaf teacher of the deaf in the United States, who convinced many people in high places, including Congressmen, that the deaf could learn, that we could compete with anyone, anywhere, anytime—if given the opportunity. We have had many giants in this movement, both hearing and deaf, but most important has been the direct involvement of deaf persons at all levels in affairs that concern our education, training and social development so that we all may achieve maximum potential.

In recent years this involvement has resulted in MSSD, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Technical Vocational Institute and a host of community college programs as well as programs such as at California State University at Northridge. It has also resulted in the fact that we are in charge of our own clubs and our own state and national organizations. Examples of national organizations are the National Association of the Deaf and the National Fraternal Society of the Deaf. Not to be overlooked is the Junior National Association of the Deaf which has provided an opportunity for young deaf people to prepare for civic responsibility and is doing much to equip young deaf persons with vital leadership skills.

Last month as the income tax deadline approached a friend said to me, "Pay your income tax with a smile." I told him I would like to, but the Government demands cash. My point here is that in this world of rapid change and progress, society does not stand still. You are our cash. Your high school education is like money in the bank which in time gathers interest and grows so that when it is needed, it is there to go to work for us.

Some of you will be going immediately into the world of work. Some of you will be entering technical programs, junior colleges or four year college programs leading to a degree. It doesn't matter which course you chose to take as long as you have a goal. As you graduate today, each of you will inherit the traditions of the past—for better or worse—and will become involved in our efforts to control our own destiny. One thing, however, we must all accept is that we are a minority. No power on earth can change this but we can, we have made and we will continue to make minority decisions which affect us. To succeed in making minority decisions we need to control our environment and this requires discipline, perseverance and faith in each other. Minorities are always on trial. For this reason each of us must always keep our best foot forward constantly keeping in mind that whatever we do to better ourselves as individuals will help our fellow deaf men. Whatever we do to hurt ourselves in the eyes of others will hurt our fellow deaf men. In other words we must let our conscience be our guides. We must not let temptation or personal greed permit us to do what our training has taught us is

morally wrong. Greatness at any level is the ability to make the hard decision because it is the right thing to do.

This requires discipline. Perseverance is the quality that will help us and others achieve recognition while faith is our trust in each other to work together for full acceptance by society.

The experiences you have had here at MSSD have prepared you for involvement and have taught you flexibility. Let us remember that each of us in our life time will experience some failure, some discouragement, some disappointment and some criticism. But let us also remember that involvement and flexibility can change failure to success, discouragement to enthusiasm, disappointment to happiness and criticism to praise.

Wherever you go, whatever you chose to do, continue to use well the lessons you have learned here. Continue to be involved and flexible. Continue to speak out in as many ways as possible on issues you know are right. Continue to show by action that you and others are capable. Continue to create a dialogue so that issues and your actions may be shared among yourselves and with society. The deaf community needs this kind of activity to continue to be recognized. This is the challenge that faces you and without doubt you will meet this challenge. Think about where you are going! Think about where you might have been if not for this high school, an important link in the chain of life experiences. With this, let me once again express my appreciation for being asked to share this wonderful occasion with you and to tell you that the future of the deaf community is in good hands. Good luck and best wishes to each of you.

#### BUREAU OF TRAVEL AGENTS REGISTRATION

#### HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, most of us can remember when Europe was merely a dreamy collection of magazine pictures—the Eiffel Tower, Trafalgar Square, and the Spanish steppes. Only wealthy Americans could afford to travel on romantic steamships and have their vacation dreams come true. All of us can remember when expensive plane travel was a limited extravagance for only a chosen few, who were considered both exotic and courageous.

Today, the travel business has boomed into a multibillion-dollar industry. Although millions of Americans can now travel abroad annually, the travel industry has remained antiquated in the area of consumer protection.

News reports have revealed frequent instances of fraudulent air-charter companies that have left Americans stranded in airports throughout the world. Deceptive and irresponsible charter agents have victimized students as well as organization members whose vacations were ruined because of the unscrupulous practices of unreliable agents. We must enact legislation to protect the traveling public which now includes a large and diverse cross section of our society.

On January 23, 1973, I reintroduced legislation to establish a Bureau of Travel Agents Registration within the Depart-

ment of Transportation. The purpose of my bill would be to register travel agents and promulgate a code of ethics for the travel agency industry.

On behalf of the 18 cosponsors of this bill, the traveling public, and the legitimate travel agents, I am deeply dismayed by the fact that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has not yet acted upon this legislation. I, therefore, call upon my colleagues, who serve on that honorable House committee, to respond to the needs of millions of Americans who will be traveling abroad in the near future.

We must update the travel industry to meet the growing consumer demand for efficient and reliable travel service. I am hopeful that the Travel Agents' Registration Act, H.R. 2752, will receive prompt committee attention so that Congress can fulfill its obligation to American travelers during this congressional session.

#### ALGONQUIN FOUNDER'S DAY HON- ORS PHYLLIS AND OSCAR KOEPEL AND ZERN LUSTED

#### HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the traditional Founder's Day celebration in Algonquin, Ill., in my congressional district is of special significance this year, the 25th anniversary of this community event.

In addition to the great local support and enthusiasm generated by this annual event, Algonquin Founder's Day attracts many thousands of visitors from surrounding areas in the Midwest to this attractive community, spanning the shores of the Fox River.

Mr. Speaker, the Founder's Day Committee has selected as Founder's Favorites for 1974, Phyllis and Oscar Koepel, who participated in establishing this significant observance. Oscar Koepel has been an Algonquin resident since his early childhood, and has spent almost his entire life there. He attended the Algonquin schools and graduated from the old Dundee High School in 1944. Married to Phyllis Field, formerly of Elgin, the Koepels are respected and beloved citizens of the Algonquin community.

Mr. Speaker, without recounting their many civic and community contributions, let me recall simply that they were selected as "Outstanding Citizens" by the Algonquin Jaycees in 1972. They have served on the Founder's Day Committee since 1969, and they developed and edited a "Founder's Day booklet" which is such an important part of the Founder's Day celebration today.

Mr. Speaker, I wish also, to call attention to the fact that Zern Lusted of Algonquin has been named as the Founder's Honoree for 1974. Zern's versatility is perhaps highlighted by his particular contributions to the Boy Scouts of America. Awarded the highest honor in Scouting in 1971—the Silver Beaver Award—



Zern Lusted holds many offices in scouting, and has made particular contributions in that area of community and citizen activity.

In the words of one of his neighbors:

Zern Lusted has made this world a much better place than he found it, because of all the boys out there who are much better men for having known him.

Mr. Speaker, my wife, Doris, and I intend to take part again in the Founder's Day celebration in Algonquin on August 10, at which time we will pay special tribute to Mayor Ray Bangert and to the citizens of Algonquin, including, particularly, the Founder's Favorites of 1974, Phyllis and Oscar Koeppel, and the Founder's Honoree of 1974, Zern Lusted.

#### BILL TO OUTLAW MANDATORY RETIREMENT

#### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I propose that this Nation begin its 200th year by outlawing an outrageous form of discrimination that weakens our society and depresses and debilitates millions of citizens each year.

In the first two centuries of our Nation's existence, we have outlawed discrimination based on religion, national origin, race, and sex. But one of the ugliest forms of discrimination remains, affecting virtually everyone—laws and policies which force people to leave their chosen occupation, or prevent them from securing a new job simply because they have reached a certain point in life.

I think this is outrageous. For this reason, I have introduced a bill to make illegal discrimination in employment based solely on advancing years. My bill would outlaw mandatory retirement at a predetermined age.

As we approach the year of our Bicentennial, which is the effective year of the act, it would be fitting for our Nation to reaffirm to older citizens the founding principle of the equality of all Americans, regardless of age. This principle is the very cornerstone of our democracy. But, until it is applied to every American, our Nation cannot be truly free.

If a mandatory 65-year-old retirement age were suddenly imposed on Capitol Hill, six Supreme Court Justices, about 60 Representatives, and fully a quarter of the Senate would be forced to retire by the end of this year.

Congress does not have a mandatory retirement age because we know that there are many other factors which determine fitness for public office. It would be absurd to dismiss a diligent Congressman merely because he has reached a certain birthday.

But is it not just as absurd to require other Americans to retire when they have reached their 65th birthday?

The disregard of the needs of our senior citizens and the rich national re-

source they represent is a national scandal.

Only in the United States is old age scorned to such an extent. In few other countries is an entire group of citizens arbitrarily forced at a predetermined age to seek a new occupation or accept, in effect, a sedentary life.

The leaders of American industry are being pushed from their board seats and the production people whose skill and hard work have made this country an industrial giant are being dismissed from the assembly lines. Not because of incompetence. Not because they cannot keep up. Not because they are too feeble mentally or physically to attend to their duties. But because they have reached the magical—some say doomed—age of 65. Their proven productivity and knowledge, drawn from years of experience, are lost to a nation which needs every resource now as never before.

Life does not end at 65. For many it is the prime of life. Many citizens, forced by mandatory retirement, push into new careers at age 65.

Senior citizens deserve the same opportunities afforded younger people. They do not want to be told that they are too old to work. They do not want to be put out to pasture.

If 65 is the age at which creativity ceases, when the brain calcifies and the intellect begins to dim, let us not tell Arthur Fiedler, Clare Booth Luce, Lowell Thomas, Pearl Bailey, Mike Mansfield or Hugh Scott.

These men and women, like thousands of others, have made some of their most important contributions to mankind in their post-65 years. Millions of others would like to do the same and continue their calling of a lifetime, but instead they must dolefully accept a wristwatch or a clock at a farewell party, and through misty eyes contemplate the pasture beyond.

Not only does forced retirement deprive industry and Government of proven valuable employees, it often has a tragic, traumatic effect on the individual.

The forced retiree often suffers depression, shortened life, low self-esteem, wasted talent and productive capacity, and lost income.

The American Medical Society has charged that forced retirement often leads to "physical and emotional illness and premature death."

At a time when our Nation is learning to conserve its limited resources, we must stop squandering this most precious resource of all—the skill and experience of senior citizens.

I believe that this resource should be nurtured and utilized. We will all benefit and it will be a richer and happier America for it.

#### NATION'S ELDEST PAPER CARRIER— MARY JOHNSTON

#### HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to call to the attention of

Congress the accomplishments of one of Coalgate, Okla.'s most revered citizens, Mrs. Mary Johnston.

Mrs. Johnston, who is 88 years of age, has been delivering newspapers for the last 34 years. She delivers the Ada Evening News and Sunday News, covering a distance of 5 miles six times a week in any type of weather.

The title of the Nation's oldest paper carrier belongs to Mary Johnston, according to the general manager of the International Association of Newspaper Circulation Managers, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Johnston's customers are some of the luckiest in the world. She carefully folds her papers each day and places them in their doors and mailboxes. They have at times tried to convince her to retire from her route, but she insists that it is the greatest contributor to keeping her limbered up and going.

This octogenarian is a fine example to all of us. She knows the value of honest work and has experienced its rewards and benefits. I take great honor in testifying to the Congress about this fine woman.

CECIL A. RUNYAN

#### HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, recently, one of the most distinguished and public spirited citizens of the 12th District of Michigan, Mr. Cecil A. Runyan of St. Clair, Mich., passed away.

Mr. Runyan was the chairman and chief executive officer of the Southeastern Michigan Gas Co. and, although he was 88 years old and had been in failing health for some time, Mr. Runyan had continued to be active in the affairs of his company and his community until his death.

Mr. Runyan's career in the gas utility industry spanned more than seven decades, for he had entered the business as a stoker at the age of 17, and a year later he had become a gas plant superintendent, the youngest person to hold such a post in the State of Michigan. He subsequently worked at almost every job in the gas business—from drilling wells to owning utilities in Michigan, Indiana, and Wisconsin. In addition, during his long and active career, Mr. Runyan had been the owner and manager of a hotel, a steamship line and a coal mine.

Cecil Runyan has been described by many who knew him as a towering figure in community life, and it is certain that he made a major contribution to the economic development of St. Clair County, Mich. In addition to the impetus which his own company gave to economic development, Mr. Runyan furthered the cause of economic growth by his service as a director of the Industrial Development Corp., which was organized to attract business investment to the Port Huron and Marysville area.

His contribution went far beyond the economic. Mr. Runyan was a member of the Advisory Board of Mercy Hospital in Port Huron, and was an active sup-

porter of, and advisor to, numerous humanitarian and charitable organizations, frequently contributing generously to their programs on an unheralded basis. At his death, Cecil Runyan willed his body to science and left a generous share of his wealth to the upcoming generation represented in Little League baseball.

One of the most fitting tributes ever paid to this fine man came in 1972, when Albion College presented him with its Distinguished Service award for "outstanding services to society." No man was more entitled to such an honor, for he was, in every respect, a servant to society.

Mr. Speaker, it was my personal privilege to have numbered Cecil Runyan among my closest friends. He was gifted with a gentleness of spirit, a boundless good nature and readiness of wit, and to these he added an incisive mind, a concern for his fellow man, and a steadfast loyalty to his friends.

I will deeply miss Cecil Runyan, Mr. Speaker. I will miss his counsel, which I confess I did not always take, and his friendship, which I possibly may not always have merited. Cecil Runyan was a good and kind human being, and the world is a shade the lesser now that he is no longer among us.

MARY McLEOD BETHUNE

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, today, July 10, 1974, marks the anniversary of the birth of one of this country's greatest leaders, Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune.

Dr. Bethune was born in Maysville, S.C., the 15th of 17 children. Her parents were former slaves turned sharecroppers. Although her impoverished conditions precluded her from initiating formal educational training until age 11, Dr. Bethune graduated from the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago. This was the first of more than 14 degrees awarded to Dr. Bethune by colleges and universities. In addition, Dr. Bethune was decorated for her notable achievements by several foreign countries.

In 1904, with no funding to speak of, Dr. Bethune founded the Daytona Normal and Industrial School for Negro Girls, which today is the Bethune-Cookman College. Dr. Bethune served as president of the college until 1944 when she was named president emerita.

Dr. Bethune was a remarkable person who overcame the burdens of poverty and racial and sexual discrimination to become one of the most vibrant and moving forces in the drive for racial and social equality. Her deep sense of pride in her race and womanhood serves as a hallmark for us all.

Today, the 99th anniversary of her birth, a statue of Dr. Bethune will be unveiled in the District of Columbia's Lincoln Park. This statue is the result of a 13-year fundraising effort by the National Council of Negro Women which Dr.

Bethune founded in 1935. It is the first such memorial of a black American or a woman to be dedicated in the Nation's Capital.

The 17-foot bronze statue depicts Dr. Bethune handing her legacy on to two children. This legacy, written 4 years before her death in 1955, bears a message of hope and love which bears repeating.

#### MY LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT

(By Mary McLeod Bethune, Ph.D.)

Sometimes as I sit communing in my study I feel that death is not far off. I am aware that it will overtake me before the greatest of my dreams—full equality for the Negro in our time—is realized. Yet, I face the reality without fear or regrets. I am resigned to death as all humans must be at the proper time. Death neither alarms nor frightens one who has had a long career of fruitful toil. The knowledge that my work has been helpful to many fills me with joy and great satisfaction.

Since my retirement from an active role in educational work and from the affairs of the National Council of Negro Women, I have been living quietly and working at my desk at my home here in Florida. The years have directed a change of pace for me. I am now 76 years old and my activities are no longer so strenuous as they once were. I feel that I must conserve my strength to finish the work at hand.

Sometimes I ask myself if I have any other legacy to leave. Truly, my worldly possessions are few. Yet my experiences have been rich. From them I have distilled principles and policies in which I believe firmly, for they represent the meaning of my life's work. They are the products of much sweat and sorrow. Perhaps in them there is something of value. So, as my life draws to a close, I will pass them on to Negroes everywhere in the hope that an old woman's philosophy may give them inspiration. Here, then, is my legacy.

I leave you love. Love builds. It is positive and helpful. It is more beneficial than hate. Injuries quickly forgotten quickly pass away. Personally and racially, our enemies must be forgiven. Our aim must be to create a world of fellowship and justice where no man's skin color or religion is held against him. "Love thy neighbor" is a precept which could transform the world if it were universally practiced. It connotes brotherhood, and to me, brotherhood of man is the noblest concept in all human relations. Loving your neighbor means being interracial, interreligious, and international.

I leave you hope. The Negro's growth will be great in the years to come. Yesterday, our ancestors endured the degradation of slavery, yet they retained their dignity. Today, we direct our economic and political strength toward winning a more abundant and secure life. Tomorrow, a new Negro, unhindered by race taboos and shackles, will benefit from more than 330 years of ceaseless striving and struggle. There will be a better world. This I believe with all my heart.

I leave you the challenge of developing confidence in one another. As long as Negroes are hemmed into racial blocs of prejudice and pressure, it will be necessary for them to band together for economic betterment. Negro banks, insurance companies, and other businesses are examples of successful racial economic enterprises. These institutions were made possible by vision and mutual aid. Confidence was vital in getting them started and keeping them going. Negroes have got to demonstrate still more confidence in each other in business. This kind of confidence will aid the economic rise of the race by bringing together the pennies and dollars of our people and ploughing them into useful channels. Economic separatism cannot be tolerated in this enlightened age, and it is

not practicable. We must spread out as far and as fast as we can, but we must also help each other as we go.

I leave you a thirst for education. Knowledge is the prime need of the hour. More and more, Negroes are taking full advantage of hard-won opportunities for learning, and the educational level of the Negro population is at its highest point in history. We are making greater use of the privileges inherent in living in a democracy. If we continue in this trend, we will be able to rear increasing numbers of strong purposeful men and women, equipped with vision, mental clarity, health, and education.

I leave you a respect for the use of power. We live in a world which respects power above all things. Power, intelligently directed, can lead to more freedom. Unwisely directed, it can be a dreadful destructive force. During my lifetime I have seen the power of the Negro grow enormously. It has always been my first concern that this power should be placed on the side of human justice.

Now that the barriers are crumbling everywhere, the Negro in America must be ever vigilant lest his forces be marshalled behind wrong causes and undemocratic movements. He must not lend his support to any group that seeks to subvert democracy. That is why we must select leaders who are wise and courageous and of great moral stature and ability.

I leave you faith. Faith is the first factor in life devoted to service. Without faith nothing is possible. With it, nothing is impossible. Faith in God is the greatest power, but great too, is faith in oneself. In 50 years the faith of the American Negro in himself has grown immensely and is still increasing. The measure of our progress as a race is in precise relation to the depth of the faith in our people held by our leaders. Frederick Douglass, genius though he was, was spurred by a deep conviction that his people would heed his counsel and follow him to freedom. Our greatest Negro figures have been imbued with faith. Their perseverance paid rich dividends. We must never forget their sufferings and their sacrifices, for they were the foundations of the progress of our people.

I leave you racial dignity. I want Negroes to maintain their human dignity at all costs. We, as Negroes, must recognize that we are the custodians as well as the heirs of a great civilization. We have given something to the world as a race and for this we are proud and fully conscious of our place in the total picture of mankind's development. We must learn also to share and mix with all men. We must make an effort to be less race conscious and more conscious of individual and human values. I have never been sensitive about my complexion. My color has never destroyed my self-respect nor has it ever caused me to conduct myself in such a manner as to merit the disrespect of any person.

I have not let my color handicap me. Despite many crushing burdens and handicaps, I have risen from the cotton fields of South Carolina to found a college, administer it during the years of growth, become a public servant in the government and country and a leader of women. I would not exchange my color for all the wealth in the world, for had I been born White, I might not have been able to do all I have done or yet hope to do.

I leave you a desire to live harmoniously with your fellow man. The problem of color is worldwide. It is found in Africa and Asia, Europe and South America. I appeal to American Negroes—both North and South, East and West—to recognize their common problems and unite to solve them.

I pray that we will begin to live harmoniously with the white race. So often, our difficulties have made us supersensitive and truculent. I want to see my people conduct



themselves naturally in all relationships, fully conscious of their many responsibilities and deeply aware of their heritage. I want them to learn to understand Whites and influence them for good, for it is advisable for us to do so. We are a minority of 15 millions living side by side with a White majority. We must learn to deal with people positively and on an individual basis.

I leave you, finally, a responsibility to our young people. The world around us really belongs to youth, for youth will take over its future management. Our children must never lose their zeal for building a better world. They must not be discouraged from aspiring toward greatness, for they are to be the leaders of tomorrow. Nor must they forget that the masses of our people are still underprivileged, ill-housed, impoverished, and victimized by discrimination. We have a powerful potential in our youth, and we must have the courage to change old ideas and practices so that we may direct their power toward good ends.

If I have a legacy to leave my people, it is my philosophy of living and serving. As I face tomorrow, I am content, for I think I have spent my life well. I pray now that my philosophy may be helpful to those who share my vision of a world of Peace.

#### GETTING AFTER THE GOUGERS

### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, according to the Associated Press, is going to take a giant step toward forcing the food price situation back into some kind of equitable balance. The organization is launching a campaign to identify the price gougers.

At a recent meeting in Columbus, 86 county Farm Bureau presidents lined up behind this effort. The idea is that, if the food markets charging unjust prices can be revealed to the public, then prices can be forced down, consumption stimulated, and, in the end, more money made available to the farmers.

I am certain the Farm Bureau people have much evidence on their side. The prices paid farmers have declined in recent weeks as surpluses have developed, particularly in beef, but those charged the foodstore shopper, in many cases, have not decreased proportionately.

Explained Mike Lafferty, spokesman for the Ohio Farm Bureau:

Farm prices have been down long enough, retail prices have been up long enough and it's time they got back into line.

The Ohio plan is to have Farm Bureau agents police retail stores, making lists of those with the highest and lowest prices, and fingering the price gougers. These lists, in turn, will become available to the public at the Farm Bureau's county offices, either to those who call in person or by telephone. If this plan does not work, Mr. Lafferty stated, the names of the gougers may be published.

Mr. Lafferty told the Associated Press that, according to the bureau's reckoning, prices paid farmers in Ohio have dropped 12 percent since the first of the year. Although some tickets in the super-

markets—at least many of them—have reflected the downtrend, food prices overall still are climbing.

Mr. Lafferty added:

No factory worker has taken a cut in salary, but a lot of farmers are being forced to take a big cut.

I believe the Ohio bureau has good economics behind it in this matter. If a justifiable margin of profit can be restored, then more food products can be sold and the farmer rescued from the price bind. The opinion expressed at the bureau's Columbus meeting was that the sharp beef price drop at the farm and feeding lot was caused in large part by declining consumption brought on by exorbitant prices at the meat counters.

The question raised in consequence of this Ohio drive on gougers is how much gouging actually is taking place. Certainly, in fairness, it must be pointed out that a great number of retailers are making conscientious efforts to get their prices in decent relationship with the new costs they are meeting in the wholesale markets. But there are exceptions, as any inflation-harassed housewife can tell you, and they need to be exposed.

We already have seen in this inflation era the practice of inventory markups exercised widely by merchants who owed their customers more consideration than they received. Constituents have brought to my attention food containers with higher price stamps applied over lower ones in arrogant defiance of fairness and customer goodwill. Millions, I am sure, have been run up in profits by this kind of business—the taking advantage of the public because circumstances have permitted it.

I commend the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation for acting boldly in the interest of their members. Price gougers in this critical economic time are internal enemies—the doers of great damage—and they need to feel not only the wrath of their customers but the penalties which should be in store for those who ill serve society. I hope the Ohio campaign against them succeeds and that similar campaigns take place in my State of Pennsylvania and elsewhere.

#### NEED FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION ON ABORTION

### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, since the Supreme Court's 1973 decision on abortion it has become apparent that some sort of legislative action is needed. Our society is becoming polarized on this issue and I believe that Congress must face up to its responsibility.

I do not favor abortion on demand. There is surely more sanctity to human life than that. There are instances, however, where I feel abortion is warranted: First, to save the life of the mother; and second, where rape, incest, or other overriding circumstances are involved.

The Supreme Court's decision is too rigid. Some sort of legislative action is needed to change the guidelines established by the Court. I am willing to support whatever action is necessary to mitigate the effects of the Supreme Court's decision so that standards similar to those that I have just mentioned could be adopted by the States if they so desired.

#### GEO THERMAL ENERGY

### HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, we have become a great country with great productivity and great reliance on fuels to supply energy to maintain the high living standards we have achieved. In attaining this greatness we have also seen the devastation to the environment of our country where we have mined the coal from our mountains, pumped the oil from our coastlands, and burned the fuel in our cities. Now we have reached the point where some of these fuels are in increasingly short supply. We must look toward the development of other energy sources. Let us look toward this development with an eye toward preserving our physical environment.

In looking for alternative energy sources, I cannot help noticing the many environmental advantages of utilizing geothermal resources. These advantages are evident when comparisons are made to the problems derived from other means of energy production. For example, where coal is mined great areas of the country have been stripped bare or men have toiled under hazardous conditions deep beneath the ground. This coal is then transported to our factories and cities where it is burned releasing particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, and other gases. Finally, after the energy has been extracted disposal areas must be provided for the residues of combustion.

Petroleum development also has its hazards. Valuable fishery areas and marshlands have been destroyed to extract natural gas and petroleum. Millions of dollars have been spent cleaning up the results of massive spills that occasionally occur. There are indications that through normal tanker operations vast areas of the oceans are already polluted with tar and oil residue. Petroleum also contains sulfur which must be removed if present in too high concentration.

Nuclear fuels have been offered as clean methods of generating electricity. They may be clean insofar as combustion products are concerned but they are not totally clean environmentally. Uranium must be mined and processed into suitable fuels. When these fuels are exhausted highly radioactive wastes remain. Safe storage of these wastes for great lengths of time has become a major concern. Furthermore, there is always a possibility of accidental loss of radioactive materials to air or water.

Geothermal energy has many environmental advantages. Geothermal development has no surface land disturbances as does mining. Geothermal fluids are extracted from the ground through wells and used onsite to generate electrical power or for heating. Since geothermal fluids cannot be economically transported more than about 1 mile, there are no attendant transportation hazards such as oil spills. Consequently, there is no need for investment in and no environmental damage from long-range transportation of the geothermal energy before conversion to electricity.

An additional land use benefit in the development of geothermal resources is that there is no need to provide additional areas for waste disposal. There are no ashes as from coal combustion, and no spent radioactive materials to be monitored for many years. After the useful heat has been extracted from geothermal fluids, they can be pumped back—re-injected—into the reservoir through return wells. This minimizes the environmental impacts of disposal problems.

Since there are no combustion products and no hazards from radiation exposure, air and water quality can be preserved through geothermal development. The other major options at hand: Petroleum, coal, and nuclear power cannot offer these environmental advantages.

Although I have emphasized the environmental advantages of geothermal energy, I should also point out that there are some problems, these include land subsidence at the geothermal well site; noise during geothermal field development; noxious gases escaping into the atmosphere from the geothermal fluids; thermal pollution of required cooling water; and stream pollution when waste fluids are not reinjected. These problems can be solved before the commercial exploitation of a geothermal field—and this bill will help assure timely implementation of these solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974. In the energy supply shortage that we face today we must develop our energy resources, but we must do so in the most environmentally acceptable manner. To do this we must balance one option against another and weigh advantages against disadvantages. We must relate development to total national needs. Geothermal energy will not supply the Nation's total energy requirements, but it will conserve other fuels and perhaps allow us to leave marginal fuel resources undeveloped in environmentally fragile areas.

THE LATE MRS. CHARLES H.  
WILSON

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1974

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, my wife and I wish to express our deepest and most

sincere sympathy to my colleague, CHARLES H. WILSON, and to the entire family on the untimely passing of Betty Wilson.

Betty was a close personal friend of my wife and a person that will be most deeply missed by the entire California delegation and their families, because of her outstanding leadership qualities. She was a tower of strength to her entire family as well as her husband in his service in the Congress and I am sure she will be greatly missed by them as well as by all of us who had the pleasure and honor of knowing her.

#### DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to my colleagues attention a recent release on an operation by the Drug Enforcement Administration. The described operation underlines the effectiveness of this organization and is a strong testament to the necessity of international efforts to control the flow of heroin.

I would also like to remind my colleagues of the recent decision by the Turkish Government to resume the cultivation of the opium poppy. National boundaries are easily crossed, and if this decision is not rescinded we will soon be faced with the necessity of far more serious and complex international efforts to prevent heroin from reaching our shores.

The release on the DEA operation follows:

#### DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

Drug Enforcement Administrator John R. Bartels, Jr., announced today the seizure off the coast of South Vietnam of a fishing trawler laden, not with fish, but with two-and-a-half tons of raw opium bound for Hong Kong.

Mr. Bartels said the seizure was based on information supplied by DEA and was the result of close cooperation between DEA agents and the Governments of South Vietnam, Thailand and Hong Kong authorities. The seizure was one of the largest ever in Southeast Asia, Mr. Bartels said.

The trawler was en route from Thailand to Hong Kong last Wednesday, June 26, when it was intercepted by a South Vietnamese Navy destroyer escort in Vietnamese waters. The trawler and its nine-man crew of Thai nationals were taken under tow on Thursday to Cat Lo Naval Base in South Vietnam.

Mr. Bartels said that a search completed early today disclosed that the contraband cargo consisted solely of 55 burlap sacks containing a total of 2,005 kilograms—about two-and-a-half tons—of raw opium.

The opium was taken by truck to Saigon and is stored in a Vietnamese government warehouse. The nine crew members are in custody in Saigon undergoing interrogation.

Generally, Asian opium is consumed by the local population. However, if the opium were converted into heroin (10 pounds of opium make one pound of heroin) it would bring about \$230 million on the streets of New York City at current prices, Mr. Bartels said.

Mr. Bartels said the joint investigation involved the Thailand Marine Police, the Vietnamese Navy and Hong Kong officials. He paid particular credit to Thai and Vietnamese authorities.

Mr. Bartels noted that, because of the close working relationship among DEA agents and government officials in Southeast Asia, prices of narcotics have doubled and tripled over the last 18 months, and many existing trafficking routes have been disrupted.

The previous largest seizure of opium in Southeast Asia came in April, 1973, when DEA and Thai officials jointly announced the seizure of 5,568 kilos of raw opium and 126 kilos of morphine on a trawler 300 miles from Bangkok.

#### LAND USE BILL—ANOTHER ENCROACHMENT

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Waterloo, Iowa, Courier of June 27 contained an excellent editorial on the so-called National Land Use Planning Act that was recently rejected by the House.

Because this is such dangerous legislation and because the Courier editorial effectively points out its major faults, I commend it highly and include it for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

#### LAND USE POLICIES NEED LOCAL CONTROL

There is both good and bad news in the recent U.S. House rejection of the National Land Use Planning Act.

The good news is that the bill was defeated. The bad news is the narrow seven-vote margin—211-204—which poses a bad omen.

This measure would have created a monstrous and costly new federal bureaucracy under the pretense of being a land use cure-all. It would have cost \$10 million to administer, plus a total tab of \$800 million for what amounted to a nationwide zoning plan.

But even worse, the bill would have continued the trend of over-riding local control—a trend which leads to ever-increasing governmental intervention into the daily lives of the citizens whom government supposedly serves.

Federal government—indeed, no government—harbors a monopoly on wisdom. Adoption of a federal land use policy would have put local government affairs even more firmly into the hands of a Washington bureaucracy.

Rep. William Scherle, R-Iowa, lauds the House action in killing the bill. He points out that legislators "were loath to turn over delicate questions of land use to those who could not see beyond the shores of the Potomac."

An especially bad aspect of the bill provided for what amounted to an abridgment or rip-off of individual property rights which most Americans have long felt were secured by the U.S. Constitution.

For example, land could have been tagged as a "critical environment area" and taken out of private control—without compensation to its owners.

Few can quarrel with the goals of wise land use planning and the preservation of treasured national resources.

But the tough questions of what is "wise" are best answered at the local level—as close to the people themselves as possible so that individual citizen input is more feasible and thus greater.

Rep. Scherle, incidentally, says that in



four years of committee study on the federal land use policy bill, "field hearings were never held and the indispensable input of citizens was totally neglected."

Furthermore, local and regional land use planning concepts already are being intensified and implemented across the nation, including Iowa where regional councils of government are involving themselves in helping local governments establish and coordinate such policies.

In this connection, there was earlier good news for Iowans when the last session of the General Assembly failed to adopt a land use policy bill. It passed the Iowa House by a 66-26 margin in April but didn't clear the Senate.

Unfortunately, it is likely that such bills again will come before the Iowa Legislature and the U.S. Congress.

And these measures probably will win approval eventually—unless Iowans and all Americans make it clear to their elected representatives that they want less, not more, bureaucratic encroachment into their daily lives.

#### MEDICAL GROUP AMENDMENT TO HEALTH MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATION ACT OF 1973

**HON. WILLIAM R. ROY**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, on December 29, 1973, the President signed the Health Maintenance Organization Act of 1973 into law. One important goal of the HMO legislation was to foster the growth and development of group medical practices which provide comprehensive health-care benefits.

The latter goal has been somewhat frustrated by the language in the final bill. This is because the definition of a medical group provides that the members of such groups as their principal professional activity and "as a group responsibility engaged in the coordinate practice of their profession for a health maintenance organization."

The requirement that physicians in group practices be principally engaged in the coordinated practice of their profession is desirable and an inherent and essential characteristic of group practice. I feel strongly that existing fee-for-service group practices offer a great opportunity for the development of HMO's. But to require that these groups convert more than 50 percent of their practice to an HMO is not reasonable.

The proposed regulations recently issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare ameliorate this problem by allowing a 3-year phase-in. Experience has shown that existing fee-for-service group practices can and have converted more, as well as less than 50 percent of their resources to prepayment, both with desirable and successful results. However, the mandate of the law requiring a majority of physicians' time to be for the HMO at the end of a 3-year time frame is unreasonable in that it requires an organizational commitment to a goal over which the professional group has little control and, in some cases, may be impossible.

Accordingly, I would offer an amendment to section 1302 of the Health Maintenance Organization Act of 1973. This amendment changes the definition of a medical group by deleting the words "for a health maintenance organization."

The amendment follows:

H.R. 15739

A bill to amend section 1302 of the Health Maintenance Organization Act of 1973 by redefining the term "medical group."

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that section 1302(4)(c)(i) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking the words "for a health maintenance organization."

#### THE 198 YEARS AND REASON FOR PRIDE

**HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on the Fourth of July, the 198th birthday of the United States, The State Journal of Lansing, Mich., ran an editorial which I commend to every Member of the Congress. In commemorating the founding of our Nation, the editorial discussed the meaning and challenges of a democracy and pointed up most convincingly that today, more than ever before, the system is working and the will of the people is being translated into action. In these days of uncertainty, that fact seems oft forgotten. I am grateful to the State Journal for declaring the message loudly and clearly—and with the same sense of purpose that our liberty was proclaimed almost 200 years ago:

#### THE 198 YEARS AND REASON FOR PRIDE

On this 198th birthday of the United States it is easy enough for the cynics to suggest there is not much to celebrate. The nation is clouded by the spectacle of its President under impeachment threat and many of his former aides in jail or facing that prospect.

There are the continuing problems of inflation and economic instability along with the sporadic outbursts of violence in the land.

Yet this nation can and must continue to demonstrate to the world that the principles upon which it was founded will prevail over tyranny and especially over those discouraged by failures who preach the doctrine of repression as the easy way to solutions. Democracy has never worked that way and it never will.

Americans, perhaps, become so preoccupied with the daily business of making democracy work and hearing the bad news of such things as Watergate, that we may sometimes forget that this is part of the process of making the goals of two centuries ago stay alive.

And for those in this nation who may long for the so-called good old days when everything seemed to be apple pie, when few voices of dissent were heard and all was "quiet and normal," perhaps they should look again. There has never been such a time in this nation because in a democracy it is a continual process of adjustment and change to meet the needs of all people.

We have recently witnessed a spectacle in the Soviet Union in which Kremlin leaders sent into exile a famous Russian author because he openly criticized government tyranny and demanded reforms. Had he been a lesser figure, no one doubts that Alexander Solzhenitsyn would have gone to prison—and not for the first time.

Shortly before this happened, a couple of Washington Post newspaper reporters who helped expose corruption in high levels of the U.S. government won a Pulitzer award. Their efforts helped set in motion the investigations and prosecutions to clean house in government.

The two episodes tell a great deal about why the founding fathers drafted the Declaration of Independence in 1776 and how they intended the new-found democracy to work even in this 198th year. It is working.

#### QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

**HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the following summary of the results of a questionnaire mailed to residents of the 35th Congressional District of California.

The 35th is a new district. Essentially, the population is concentrated around a dozen cities in the San Gabriel and Pomona Valleys and the west end of San Bernardino County. Nearly 28,000 responses were tabulated during April and May, and although this is the first time in recent history that these areas have been combined in the same congressional district, few significant variations in voter sentiment appeared:

#### THE 35TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. During the energy crisis, should we delay application of tougher emission requirements on autos?	Percent
Yes -----	50.9
No -----	49.1
2. Should federal taxes be used to finance political campaigns?	
Yes -----	34.3
No -----	65.7
3. Do you favor the elimination of price and wage controls?	
Yes -----	54.8
No -----	45.2
4. a. Should President Nixon resign?	
Yes -----	37.5
No -----	62.5
b. Should President Nixon be impeached?	
Yes -----	40.6
No -----	59.4
5. Should defense spending be increased to keep pace with Russia?	
Yes -----	63.3
No -----	36.7
6. Should we increase taxes to pay for more Federal medical care?	
Yes -----	37.5
No -----	62.5

7. Should oil prices be rolled back to redistribute oil company excess profits?

Yes ..... 78.3  
No ..... 21.7

(NOTE.—The questionnaire was mailed to approximately 100,000 homes in the 35th Congressional District. Its purpose was to obtain comments from the general public on current issues. The responses reported here, in are a simple tabulation of the returns and are not represented to be a scientific measurement of public opinion.)

On question No. 4, relating to impeachment or resignation, a majority of all people responding favored the President completing his term of office. A separate tabulation of approximately 500 ballots that were received after the transcript of taped White House conversations was published did not reveal any changes in voter sentiment. Approximately the same percentage of respondents continued to oppose both resignation and impeachment.

Increased spending for research and development of tactical military weapons—question No. 5—to keep our Armed Forces on an equal footing with the Russians received a strong endorsement.

The results of the poll leave little doubt that the respondents are opposed to the use of Federal moneys to finance political campaigns—question No. 2—or to pay for additional Federal medical care programs—question No. 6. Only a few percentage points separated the two issues as more than 60 percent registered their opposition to these programs if they result in higher taxes.

To identify problems that need congressional action, I asked each respondent to rank a series of priorities from 1 to 10. A tabulation of only the first priority resulted in the following chart:

Problem area and percentage voted as  
No. 1 priority

	Percent
1. Inflation .....	30.4
2. Integrity in government .....	20.4
3. Pollution .....	11.8
4. Crime .....	10.9
5. Defense .....	7.6
6. Welfare .....	6.5
7. Taxes .....	6.1
8. Energy .....	4.0
9. Unemployment .....	3.3

Taking all 10 problem areas into consideration in the analysis gives a slightly different perspective. Inflation remains the most frequently mentioned problem, closely followed by crime, integrity in Government, taxes, and pollution. These five categories account for more than 65 percent of the vote cast.

#### YEAR-ROUND DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

#### HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transportation, after making a study of the matter over the

last several months has come up with the conclusion that year-round daylight saving time is no good.

Many of us knew that all along. I personally am among those who think no scheme of daylight saving is any good. I express my sentiments about this in my weekly report to the people of the 15th District of Texas and would like to share my feeling with my colleagues by inserting in the RECORD this portion of my newsletter:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—To the surprise of practically nobody, and certainly of nobody in South Texas, the Department of Transportation has come out with a report saying that year round daylight saving time isn't a good thing.

After a months-long study the Department has concluded that the phony time has not made a significant contribution to energy conservation, may have caused an increase in gasoline consumption at certain times of the year, and was responsible for increases in the death of children during the early morning hours of the darkest winter months.

You might think DOT, in view of these findings, would recommend the abolishment of daylight saving time. But no. What it recommends instead is that, "as part of a continuing experiment," the Nation observe daylight saving for eight months of the year and standard time from the last Sunday in October of this year through the last Sunday of next February.

This isn't even half a loaf and it's not enough.

A number of House members, including me, have introduced bills designed to remedy this situation. My own bill proposes to exempt Texas from daylight saving completely. I am informed that the Chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has not yet set hearings on these bills and that when he does all of them will be considered. I'll be in there pushing for my own measure. Let's get rid of this fooling around with the clock once and for all!

#### MARINA GARCIA'S NEWER WORLD

#### HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, some individuals possess an extraordinary sensitivity to touch people's souls. Their mark is deep and lasting. To some touched by that impression, it means a whole new outlook on life—a door that opens or a mind that is never again closed. Robert Kennedy possessed this ability to enter one's consciousness and illicit will and purpose.

A constituent of mine, Marina Garcia of San Leandro, Calif., recently composed a song expressing some of her own impressions about Robert Kennedy.

In that Tennyson quote Kennedy was so fond of citing, the most telling remark alludes to a matter of time. It offers consolidation and hope to cynic and idealist alike that "it's not too late." It is not too late to strike out against injustice, stand up for an ideal, or act to improve the lives of those around us. On the contrary,

it is never too early for that brand of advocacy.

I commend to my colleagues, Marina's lyrical message and hope they will work to construct that newer world we all desire.

#### TO SEEK A NEWER WORLD FOR ROBERT KENNEDY

To seek a newer world, to seek a newer world  
Blue eyes shining, his brother beside him,  
He's gone to seek a newer world.

To seek a newer world, to seek a newer world  
He's the one who said it.

Those who love love can't forget it.

Open the door.

What did you think that it was there for?  
It's there to seek a newer world.

The old ones say turn away from this world.  
They say you can't recreate this world.

O but we won't play the hating game.

We know peace it ain't a waiting game.

And we won't, no we won't live in vain.

We're gonna seek a newer world.

—MARINA GARCIA.

#### TRAIN IS ON THE RIGHT TRACK AS WHITE HOUSE DERAILS

#### HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, time and again the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Russell Train, has stood alone in the administration in his support for strong legislation to protect our environmental resources and values. I commend the distinguished Mr. Train for his courageous stand and personal integrity in supporting H.R. 11500, the House surface mining bill.

Contrary to volumes of rhetoric circulated in Congress, H.R. 11500 remains a workable bill with requirements essential to the orderly development of Western coal in our arid lands. Today, Administrator Train will be in the Sheridan, Wyo., area inspecting existing strip mine operations.

Yesterday's Washington Post carried an article including his thoughts on H.R. 11500 and relating the support of North Dakota officials including our colleague MARK ANDREWS. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 9, 1974]

TRAIN BACKS MINE BILL WHITE HOUSE  
OPPOSES

(By George C. Willson)

DICKINSON, N. DAK., July 8.—Administrator Russell E. Train of the Environmental Protection Agency today broke with the administration and endorsed the House Interior Committee's strip-mining bill.

Train, in an interview during an airplane swing around the West to study environmental issues, said a "strong" bill is needed to regulate strip mining.

The EPA administrator said the bill reported to the floor by the House Interior Committee—sponsored by Rep. Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.)—offers the best chance to achieve the goal of obtaining additional energy while at the same time protecting the natural environment.



He thus took issue with the Nixon administration position as espoused by Secretary of the Interior Rogers C.B. Morton and Federal Energy Administrator John C. Sawhill.

Morton and Sawhill in letters to Congress said the House Interior bill would handicap the production of coal. Their assertions have been assailed by at least one Senate subcommittee chairman as "scare tactics."

Train himself, in a stop at Fargo said "surface mining should produce under very strong federal control."

As for the planned strip mining of the Northern Great Plains, Train told his North Dakota audience that "the lesson of Appalachia is, don't let it happen here in terms of unreclaimed areas."

Unreclaimed areas are places where coal companies have stripped away the coal in the mountains without filling in the cavities and otherwise restoring the landscape to something approaching its original condition.

Train's host in his travels through North Dakota today was Rep. Mark Andrews of North Dakota, a ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Committee. Andrews, too, endorses the House Interior Committee bill, but said he wanted it strengthened so that ranchers would have to give their permission before companies with mineral rights could strip-mine their land for coal.

The letters from Morton and Sawhill opposing the bill contained figures that Chairman Lee Metcalf (D-Montana) of the Senate Minerals Subcommittee has described as totally unwarranted and very misleading."

Metcalf faulted Sawhill for quoting the "maximum potential losses" of coal production from regulating strip-mining as the House Interior Committee bill recommended rather than using the lower estimates of "probable losses" made by the Bureau of Mines.

Complained Metcalf, "Your letter that the requirement for restoration to approximate original contour and the limitation on placement of spoil on the downslope would cause 'an immediate annual loss in production of up to 67 million tons' completely ignores Bureau of Mines estimates of probable losses of from 5.1 to 7.5 million tons a year."

Train, in discussing the pending strip-mining legislation, indicated that he, too, felt the production losses were overstated. But he did not criticize the letter sent by Sawhill and Morton.

Train has disagreed with the Nixon administration recently on two other environmental issues. He fought relaxation of clean-air standards as much as the White House had recommended to allow more industries to burn coal. On another occasion, he opposed transferring testing of new cars for mileage from EPA to another agency—something Roy L. Ash, director of the Office of Management and Budget, had been considering.

On coal, Train's position for some time now has been that most of it lies deep underground where it can be mined with a minimum disruption of the surface environment. Therefore, he has argued that the emphasis should be switched as quickly as possible to deep mining rather than take high risks in strip mining certain areas of the country.

At a luncheon stop in Beulah, N.D., Gov. Arthur Link, a Democrat, said that if it were not for the "needs of the country," it would be "a safe assumption" that people favor no strip mining at all in North Dakota.

The governor said he was insisting on "total reclamation" of any of North Dakota's rich agricultural land of deep black earth. His definition of "total reclamation," he said, is to make sure that the land stripped would produce "as good or better" afterward "as it does today."

## ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

## HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am appending material from Prof. Herman Schwartz's article entitled "A Report on the Costs and Benefits of Electronic Surveillance—1972" for the information of our colleagues. The material follows:

## C. THE RESULTS: CONVICTIONS, ARRESTS, AND INCRIMINATING CONVERSATIONS

Given this great and growing amount of electronic surveillance, the key question is of course whether the results warrant the costs, both in invasions of privacy and threats to individual and group freedoms, and in quite tangible dollars. As the discussion above shows, the dollar cost is very high indeed—in the heavy millions—and there is reason to think that not only are the costs indicated in the statistics incomplete, but many are implausibly low. First, however, the results, for that is where the claims are greatest.

There are three kinds of results in descending order of importance: convictions, arrests and incriminating statements. So far, the record as to convictions is at best poor, and probably not even that; the record as to arrests is spotty, and the record as to incriminating statements is varied and inconclusive.

The discussion here is probably best handled by treating state and federal eavesdropping quite separately, with the state surveillance discussed first, since that is where most of the electronic eavesdropping has been done so far.

## 1. THE RESULTS OF STATE EAVESDROPPING

## a. Convictions:

1968: It will be recalled that in 1968, state prosecutors—almost exclusively in New York—installed some 167 electronic surveillance devices, overhearing some 4250 people. From 1968 through 1970, no convictions were reported for any of these, but in 1971, the Westchester, N.Y. District Attorney reported some success in connection with two installations—7 convictions in a case involving a multiple crime (but no indication of what the convictions were for) and 9 convictions in a narcotics case. These are the only convictions reported for 1968 installations, but this may be the result of inadequate reporting.

1969: In 1969, it will be recalled that there were some 260 installations, involving the interception of about 10,400 people in some 136,760 conversations at a reported cost of \$470,000, with the actual cost figure probably much higher. By 1971, 55 of these 260 installations were associated with some 167 convictions. The breakdown was as follows, by offense:

Convictions	
Gambling	33
Drugs	32
Homicides	3
Kidnapings	0
Others	99

Total 167

Installations	
Gambling	17/78
Drugs	10/80
Homicides	1/19
Kidnapings	0/1
Others	27/82

Total 55/260

<sup>1</sup> For reasons to be discussed below, "associated with" is preferable to "resulted in" since the causal connection is uncertain.

The homicide convictions are for "attempted murder" and "conspiracy," not for a consummated homicide.

It will be recalled that these installations cost about \$470,000; the gambling and drug taps each cost an average of \$1303 and \$1453 respectively. The gambling taps thus each cost almost \$6000 per person convicted for wiretapping alone; the 10 drug convictions each cost an average of \$11,624 per person convicted, for the wiretapping alone.

Geographically, the convictions break down as follows:

Gambling	
Maryland	4
New Jersey	13
Georgia	1
New York	15
Total	33

Drugs	
New Jersey	2
New York	30
Total	32

Other	
Georgia	2
Maryland	4
New Jersey	13
New York	47
Rhode Island	33
Total	99

Pulling out the New York and New Jersey figures is particularly interesting, since they accounted for so much of the total state tapping: Of New York's 185–190 installations, only 39 were associated with a conviction; of New Jersey's 45 only 9 were.

The New York efforts in 1969 cost \$305,304; the New Jersey wiretapping effort that year cost \$85,226.

When we break New York down by important counties, we find the following:

	Installations	Installations with conversion	Conversions	Cost
Queens	49	17	29	\$39,960
Bronx	23	7	28	65,118
New York	19	8	14	70,685
Kings	19	1	5	53,300
Nassau	4	0	0	11,150
Total	94	33	76	240,213

1970: In 1970 there were 410 installations catching some 15,654 people in 234,085 conversations, at a reported cost of almost a million dollars (\$938,000). This eavesdropping was associated with some 332 convictions in 1970 and 1971, broken down as follows:

Gambling	212
Drugs	65
Homicides	1
Other	55
Total	333

The number of installations with which convictions were associated, set against the total installations, were:

Gambling	49/204
Drugs	20/84
Homicides	1/20
Other	24/95
Total	94/410

In some cases, several installations were related to each other—approximately 37. Thus, if we reduce the 410 figure by that, to adopt a very conservative position, the result is still 95/373, or about 25%.

Geographically, the convictions are divided as follows:

Gambling	
Florida	7
Maryland	2
Massachusetts	30
New York	109
New Jersey	64
Total	212

Drugs	
Florida	1
New York	55
New Jersey	6
Wisconsin	3
Total	65

**Homicides**  
New Jersey, 1 (murder).  
Extrapolating costs per conviction as was done with the 1969 figures is probably inappropriate at this time, since the 1970 returns are not yet all in. It appears that in federal cases—and it has been so stated by Senator Hruska—it takes some two years for convictions to be obtained; this probably applies to state cases, and it is thus likely that there will be more state convictions reported for 1969.

1971: For the reasons set forth in the prior paragraphs, the 1971 results are incomplete, and we are not likely to know most of the 1971 story until the 1973 figures are published in May 1974.

The tentative figures and results are that 511 installations overheard 17,410 people in 239,909 conversations, at a reported cost to date of about \$1.5 M, have so far been associated with 210 convictions in 43 installations. The breakdown is as follows:

Convictions	
Gambling	117
Drugs	55
Homicides	8
Others	30
Total	210

Installations	
Gambling	22/304
Drugs	11/104
Homicides	1/18
Others	9/84
Total	43/511

#### b. Arrests and Incriminating Conversations:

The figures for "results" here are of course much greater, but it is difficult to know what to make of them. For one thing, many arrests result in no convictions;<sup>1</sup> secondly, a wiretap order is not supposed to be granted unless and until there is already probable cause to believe that someone—generally the target of the surveillance—has committed or is committing a crime, or in other words, could be arrested. And as to "incriminating" conversations, this involves such ambiguous, subjective and self-serving judgments that it is difficult to know how much credence to give the figures.

All of these factors go to reduce the significance of any great claims about the number of arrests. As a matter of fact, however, the results in both arrests and incriminating conversations are quite meager; with respect to non-gambling and non-drug offenses, they are quite low.

1968: The figures for arrests associated with the 1968 interceptions, as of December 31, 1971, show the following:

Arrests	
Gambling	69
Drugs	97
Homicides	6
Kidnapings	7
Others	83
Total	262

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., *State of Md. v. Siegal*, — Md. —, A. 2d — (Ct. App. Md. 7/3/72).

Installations	
Gambling	14/18
Drugs	26/69
Homicides	4/20
Kidnapings	1/1
Others	18/60
Total	63/167

It will be recalled that we have almost no conviction figures for 1968—just 16 for 2 installations in Westchester, N.Y.—so that what these arrest figures really mean is unclear.

As to incriminating conversations, the proportion is very low indeed—the average number of intercepts overheard per installation was approximately 414, of which 98 were incriminating, or only 22%. In Brooklyn, for example, of 466 intercepts on 68 taps, 73 were incriminating; in the Bronx, only 45 out of 244 intercepts were incriminating. In Nassau of 911 intercepts, only 68 were incriminating; in Suffolk County, New York, of 400 intercepts, only 1 was deemed incriminating; in Georgia, of 506 intercepts involving 466, only 121 were incriminating. In Erie County, New York, on the other hand, 745 out of 760 intercepts were deemed incriminating.

1969: In 1969, state wiretapping was associated with 645 arrests. The breakdown per offense, and the numbers of installations with which these were associated are:

Arrests	
Gambling	302
Drugs	86
Homicides	41
Kidnapings	2
Other	218
Total	645

Installations with arrests	
Gambling	63/78
Drugs	27/80
Homicides	8/19
Kidnapings	1/1
Others	39/82
Total	138/260

The difference between arrests and convictions can be seen from a simple comparison between arrests and convictions for these same offenses, and of the number of installations associated with these convictions.

Convictions	
Gambling	33
Drugs	32
Homicides	3
Kidnapings	0
Other	99
Total	167

Installations	
Gambling	17/18
Drugs	10/80
Homicides	1/19
Kidnapings	0/1
Other	27/82
Total	55/260

The difference between the two categories may decline somewhat if more convictions are obtained on these 1969 cases, but if the normal lag is some two years, it is unlikely though possible that there will be very many more convictions.

It is quite unlikely, incidentally, that there will be substantially more arrests—these are likely to occur fairly soon, and the figures bear this out: the 1971 arrests came to only 40 out of the 1969 total of 645; the 1970 arrests, however, accounted for the lion's share—476, of which exactly half (238) were gambling.

When we turn to the "incriminating" conversations percentage, the figure is still very low—in 133 out of 260 installations, less than

20% of the conversations were incriminating. Broken down by offense, these were as follows:

Number of installations in which less than 20 percent are incriminating	
Gambling	20/78
Drugs	49/80
Homicides	11/19
Kidnapings	0/1
Other	54/82

Total 133/260  
For all installations, and using the figures in the Admin. Off. Rep. (total incriminating conversations less the federal share) we get some 31,452 incriminating conversations out of 128,771 state intercepted conversations, or about 28% overall.

It should be noted that there is a direct correlation between lack of success in convictions, and a low proportion of incriminating conversations: over half of all installations for Drugs, Homicide and Other offenses intercepted conversations of which less than 20% were incriminating, and these in turn had the lowest percentages of installations associated with convictions. Specifically, the arrests and convictions associated with these installations in which 20% or under of the conversations were incriminating, are:

	Total	Gambling	Drugs	Homicide	Kidnaping	Other
Installations	133/260	20/78	49/80	11/19	0/1	54/82
Arrests	156	45	41	11	0	60
Convictions	2	0	0	0	0	2

Furthermore, in 1969, there were 52 installations without any incriminating conversations. These overheard 862 people in 13,820 conversations.

The high proportion of non-"incriminating" conversations is significant not only with respect to the utility of electronic surveillance but also with respect to its controllability. A concession that over 70% of conversations overheard do not provide evidence of any crime—even where gambling accounts for a high proportion of the total surveillance—indicates that electronic surveillance is doing precisely what its opponents feared: overhearing numerous conversations and people who have nothing to do with crime. That a very high proportion of these are in the non-gambling area, together with the low success rate, shows how dangerous the device is, and this is borne out by whatever reliable information we have as to later years, though this information is still necessarily incomplete.

Incidentally, the figures for "incriminating conversations" may well be overstated, as the discussion of the facts disclosed in some federal cases indicates.

#### ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

#### HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, my conscience compels me to rise today to condemn the most unfortunate language which the U.S. delegate to the Human Rights Commission used in his discussion of the genocide of 1.5 million Armenians during World War I.

It ill befits the representative of a nation which has traditionally led the fight for human dignity to seem to rational-



ize such as offense to human dignity. Yet this is precisely what the U.S. delegate seems to have done in his attempt to draw attention to "the other side" of the story of the Armenian genocide. In his criticism of the progress report on a commissioned study of the question of the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide, the U.S. delegate urged the inclusion in the report of the genocide that "of a government engaged in a world war and under heavy attack." How can this statement not imply that the evil of genocide is mitigated by the condition of war? And how can the land of liberty and justice allow its representatives to paint any act of genocide in pastel colors?

I hold no bitterness for the heirs of the nation which accomplished the Armenian genocide. I do not wish to vilify them or anyone else. But I despise the crime of genocide, the systematic slaughter of a people, with all my heart.

Yes, let us study the crime of genocide so that we can learn to prevent it. But may we never allow a clinical curiosity to blind ourselves to the unspeakable evil of that most horrible act.

#### THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION ACT

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Legal Services Corporation Act was created for the purpose of providing support in non-criminal matters to persons unable to afford legal assistance. H.R. 7824 was passed by the house last summer, by the Senate in January and approved by the Senate in January and by the Senate-House conferees. It is now awaiting Senate acceptance of the conferees report.

I strongly support this legislation and urge the Senate to move expeditiously on this crucial matter. I would like to include at this point in the Record a statement issued by the New York State Bar Association, the Association of the Bar of the city of New York, the New York County Lawyers Association, the Legal Aid Society, the Community Law Offices, and the Community Action for Legal Services urging the immediate enactment of the Legal Services Corporation bill. This statement is followed by an editorial from the July 9 edition of the New York Times:

#### THE PROPOSED NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION (H.R. 7824)

We join in urging immediate enactment of the Legal Services Corporation Bill, H.R. 7824, as reported out of Conference on May 13, 1974, and passed by the House on May 16, 1974.

In earlier joint statements issued by our organizations in July and December, 1973, we urged the creation of a National Legal Services Corporation which

"(a) is adequately funded to meet the compelling need for legal representation of eligible indigent clients;

(b) permits legal services lawyers to provide the same representation to indigents

CXX—1433—Part 17

clients that the private bar provides to its clients;

(c) has sufficient flexibility in its personnel policies and in the use and application of its funds to permit an innovative attack on the problem of providing legal representation to the indigent; and

(d) is not restricted by statute in the kind of cases that it can take or the nature of the legal assistance it can provide to eligible clients."

We concluded in our July statement that H.R. 7824, as it passed the House, failed to meet the standards for an acceptable program. On the other hand, we did support, in our December statement, the version of the bill reported out by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, although it was in our view "only minimally adequate to assure an independent and professional program."

Provisions contrary to our standards were added in the Senate and the Conference Committee, so that the bill now contains several unfortunate restrictions on the kinds of cases that can be taken and on personnel policies. It does, however, preserve the basic structure of an independent corporation contained in the President's original bill and endorsed by the organized bar.

The current uncertainty over the future structure and funding of the legal services program is causing severe problems within local legal services offices; further delay in the legislation might imperil the continuation of the entire legal services program. We therefore urge speedy passage by the Senate of the legislation in its current form, and ask that the President promptly sign the bill, so that the future of this vital program may be secure.

New York State Bar Association: Ellsworth A. VanGraafelland, President; Edwin L. Gasperini, chairman Committee on the Availability of Legal Services.

The Association of the Bar of the City of New York: Cyrus R. Vance, President.

New York County Lawyers Association: Henry N. Ess III, President.

The Legal Aid Society: Orison S. Marden, Chairman of the Board.

Community Action for Legal Services: Marvin M. Karparkin, Chairman of the Board.

Community Law Offices: Stephen L. Kass, Chairman.

#### ACTION ON LEGAL SERVICES

As the Senate returns to work, it can tune up for its tough summer schedule by approving with dispatch the legal services bill, which is as ripe for final action as any measure could be. This legislation would create a corporation to house legal services activities and insure the continuation of that program.

President Nixon proposed in 1971 to preserve the program—begun initially in the Office of Economic Opportunity—by creating a corporation which would keep it out of politics and insure its efficiency. That year, Congress passed such a bill; but the President vetoed it, principally because he felt his role in selecting the members of the board to be too limited. The current version—passed by the House last summer, by the Senate in January and approved unan-

Joint Statement of New York State Bar Association, Association of the Bar of the City of New York, New York County Lawyers Association, The Legal Aid Society, Community Action for Legal Services, and Community Law Offices, July 1973, accepting the principles contained in a Resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the New York State Bar Association on June 29, 1973.

imously by the Senate-House conferees—now awaits only Senate acceptance of the conferees' report and the President's signature.

The arguments for completion of work on this legislation are overwhelming. Legal services has been viewed by many as the most effective and efficient of the programs designed to deliver services to the poor. In a sense, the program has wrought a revolution of elemental fairness. It has opened wide the doors of the system of justice to America's poor for the first time.

The compromise now before the Senate represents months of tedious legislative efforts to accommodate Mr. Nixon's reservations and those of conservative Congressional critics of the program. It does all of that and more. It is even more restrictive than the proposals sent up by the White House a year ago. It now needs only to be endorsed promptly by the Senate and signed into law by the President.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY—THE CRUELEST TAX

### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare prints a booklet entitled, "Social Security." In it there is a passage which describes this system. It states:

The basic idea of social security is a simple one; during working years employees, their employers, and self-employed people pay social security contributions which are pooled in special trust funds. When earnings stop or are reduced because the worker retires, dies or becomes disabled, monthly cash benefits are paid to replace part of the earnings the family has lost.

Rodger LeRoy Miller, writing in Harper's magazine, contributes significant information on the many misconceptions and inequities that have occurred in the social security system. Mr. Miller identifies a major problem with this particular system. He explains thus:

In fact, the higher the income, the lower the effective percentage payroll tax for social security. This particular tax is therefore regressive.

Mr. Miller adds further validity to the belief that the social security program isn't what it is reputed to be. He expressly amplifies his feelings on this program when he states:

To call social security an insurance scheme requires a special skill in deforming the meaning of words in the English language.

Mr. Miller is an expert in the areas of economics and the social security system. He is the author of over a dozen books in these fields. In addition, he is a professor of law and economics at the University of Miami.

It is my belief that Mr. Miller offers us some sound advice when he explicitly declares:

It is quite clear that some drastic changes are called for in the social insurance system as it now stands. The most obvious change is to cut out the rhetorical nonsense and let the American public know the true nature of social security.

It is in this vein that I wish to submit this article to my colleagues:

[From Harper's magazine, May 1974]

SOCIAL SECURITY: THE CRUELEST TAX

(By Roger LeRoy Miller)

"Your account number of your Social Security card identifies your old age and survivors insurance account. Your card is the symbol of your insurance policy under the Federal Social Security law." So reads the Social Security Administration's booklet *Insurance for You and Your Family*. Another booklet put out by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare tells us that "the basic idea of Social Security is a simple one: during working years employees, their employers, and self-employed people pay Social Security contributions which are pooled in special trust funds. When earnings stop or are reduced because the worker retires, dies, or becomes disabled, monthly cash benefits are paid to replace part of the earnings the family has lost."

Social Security, then, would seem to be nothing more than a compulsory insurance scheme for almost all employed and self-employed workers in the United States. Ever since its beginnings thirty-nine years ago, this compulsory "insurance" program has been considered a politically unassailable sacred cow. After all, isn't it right that everyone should provide for his or her old age? And after all, isn't it appropriate that families be protected against unexpected reductions in family income? Most Americans have answered yes to these questions. If the facts about Social Security had been known, however, it is doubtful that it would have continued, much less expanded, during these past four decades. Let the facts be known: Social Security is not an insurance program; contributions do not go into a trust fund that is used to pay you an annuity when you retire; furthermore, you are guaranteed nothing by "contributing" your social insurance payments every year. Perhaps the easiest way to uncover what's behind SSA propaganda is to separate the two basic aspects of Social Security: how it is financed, and what the benefits are.

#### THE POOR PAY MORE

In 1935, the basic Social Security payroll tax applied to the first \$3,000 of income earned in a year. At that time, approximately 95 percent of workers were making only this much or less. Today, in 1974, the Social Security payroll tax applies to the first \$13,200 earned, but today more than one in four workers makes more than \$13,200. Hence, more than one in four workers gets a break on Social Security taxes. The rate of "contribution" that the employee pays directly is 5.85 percent on that first \$13,200. If, however, the worker makes, say, \$26,400, the effective payroll tax, as a percentage of total earned income, drops by half. In fact, the higher the earned income goes, the lower the effective percentage payroll tax for Social Security. This particular tax is therefore *regressive*, unlike, for example, the individual income tax for which rates are higher and higher as incomes go higher and higher.

The regressiveness of the Social Security tax is even more than first meets the eye, for it allows no exemptions, as does the individual income tax, and it does not apply to interest, dividends, rent, or capital gains. It would be a fair statement, then, to say that the payroll tax for Social Security is perhaps the most regressive tax this nation has.

Moreover, while individual income-tax rates have been steadily falling, Social Security taxes have been steadily rising, at least since the 1950s. In 1974 total "contributions" may be well over \$60 billion. This sum represents almost one-fourth of all federal revenues. It greatly exceeds revenues from the corporate income tax, and is more than half the yield of the individual income tax. Compare this balance of percentages with the

years immediately following World War II, when in 1949, for example, Social Security taxes represented only 4 percent of total federal revenues. The fact is that the Social Security tax has increased faster than any other tax since World War II.

Perhaps one of the reasons that taxpayers have never rebelled is that the myth has been perpetuated that the employer pays an equal tax. For example, today—in principle—the worker pays 5.85 percent on the first \$13,200 he earns, and his employer "contributes" another 5.85 percent. It is naive, however, to assume that in fact the employer acts so benevolently. His contribution constitutes another cost to him, just like the cost of materials or anything else that he must pay for. Consequently, in the long run, workers' salaries are reduced by up to the amount that the employer is obliged to pay into Social Security. Hence, in 1974 Social Security tax on workers is not 5.85 percent, but rather 11.7 percent. (The myth of equally shared cost obviously affects legislators, too. The self-employed pay a rate of only 7.9 percent. Since this rate is probably on incomes over the mean, the result is more regressiveness.) A family with one person earning \$13,200 accordingly pays \$1,544 in Social Security payroll taxes. A family with two such income earners pays \$3,088. For many Americans, these taxes exceed those paid on personal income. In fact, for the 15 million Americans who pay no personal income taxes at all because their taxable income is not sufficient, the Social Security tax represents a major reduction in their income.

Ignoring for the moment the poverty problem and how it is exacerbated by Social Security, the relatively large payroll taxes might seem appropriate if in fact there were a relationship between what is "contributed" and what is received in return. In other words, if Social Security were truly an insurance program or pension plan, not unlike those provided in the private sector of the economy, there would be fewer grounds to complain about the particular way the system is financed.

#### WHO BENEFITS?

Those who view the payroll tax as a contribution to a trust fund would have trouble understanding how Social Security actually works. The trust fund in 1974 is approximately \$50 billion, enough to cover perhaps one year of benefits. A private insurance program or pension fund must by law have a trust fund which at any moment could finance all of the benefits promised to its members. But, actually, the benefits owed members of Social Security are valued at more than \$500 billion! Those who have suggested that individuals be allowed to voluntarily withdraw from the system have been lambasted by such supporters of Social Security as Nelson Rockefeller and the late President Johnson. Rockefeller predicted that such withdrawal would lead to the collapse of the Social Security system. If this is so, then we must conclude the system is not actuarially sound.

Rockefeller's prediction is unquestionably correct. Note, however, that at the system's inception in 1935 it was hoped that by around 1960 it would in fact be actuarially sound. The reason this hope was not realized was that the trust fund built up huge surpluses immediately. Thus, although in 1940 the Social Security tax was to go up, it did not. The increase was delayed for a long time. In fact, it was not until 1950 that it did rise to 3 percent (1.5 percent on each party). Additionally, coverage has been greatly expanded.

What is actually taking place is that those

who are working today are paying taxes to finance retirement payments to those who are no longer working. Each year there has been a slight surplus, which has been put into the relatively small trust. But what the trust really does with those "surplus" Social Security contributions is purchase U.S. Government bonds, thus helping to finance such things as military expenditures. If you and I were really contributing to a quasiprivate trust fund, such use of our contributions would be deemed inappropriate, to say the least.

If you contribute to a private insurance or pension plan, what you ultimately receive is based on how much you put in. There is, to be sure, a relationship between how much you put into Social Security and how much you get out, but it is a tenuous relationship at best. In 1971 the maximum wage-related benefit was about three times the minimum, whereas the maximum so-called average monthly wage on which benefits were based was eighty times the minimum sufficient to qualify. This is not even the correct range because it does not take account of the total number of years the worker has paid into Social Security. The fact is that the benefits received are much more closely related to a person's marital status or the number of children in the family than to how much money he has paid in.

There are other anomalies in the benefit payment system that could not be justified if Social Security were truly an insurance system. For example, the later you enter the system, the better off you are, because so long as you work the minimum number of quarters, you will receive the same benefits as someone else who has worked many, many more. Who profits by this? Generally, the more wealthy in our society benefit because they start work later. But this is not the only benefit to the high-income class. People with higher incomes generally have longer life expectancies and will therefore tend to receive payments for a longer period. Blacks are discriminated against doubly because they go to work sooner and die much earlier. And because of the regressive nature of the tax, the higher your income, the higher is the ratio of benefits received to taxes paid. It is not surprising that Social Security has been labeled the poor man's welfare payment to the middle class.

There are millions and millions of people who pay Social Security taxes and will never receive one penny in Social Security benefits because they do not work the requisite number of quarters or because they will receive payments in their capacity as a spouse. A wife or widow cannot receive Social Security benefit payments based on her earnings as well as on her husband's earnings.

What can be said about the benefits paid to Social Security members is the following: benefits received by individuals who have paid in "contributions" of exactly the same amount can be vastly different; conversely, benefits can be exactly the same for individuals who have paid in vastly different "contributions."

The government has on occasion contradicted itself when referring to the insurance principle of Social Security. More precisely, it has been selective in its invocation of that principle. For example, in a court test of the constitutionality of the rule prohibiting benefit payments to persons deported for subversive activities, the Social Security Administration rejected entirely the insurance concept: "The OASI [Old Age, Survivors Insurance] is in no sense a federally-administered 'insurance program' under which each worker pays 'premiums' over the years and acquires at retirement an indefeasible right to receive for life a fixed monthly benefit, irrespective of the conditions which Congress has chosen to impose from time to time."

<sup>1</sup> For an empirical verification of this assertion, see chapter three of the massive study done by J. A. Brittain, *The Payroll Tax for Social Security*, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

<sup>2</sup> *Fleming v. Nestor*, 363 U.S., 603 (1960).



There we have it. The insurance principle is officially endorsed in support of all Social Security taxes and rejected when benefits are denied.

To call Social Security an insurance scheme requires a special skill in deforming the meaning of words in the English language.

#### THE OLD STAY POOR

The government has recently raised not only the income on which Social Security taxes are paid but also the benefits to those now receiving retirement income. In addition, the government in all its magnanimity has decided to increase the allowable amount of income a worker between the ages of sixty-five and seventy-two can receive without losing Social Security benefits. Before 1973 the allowable amount was \$1,680. Now it's a whopping \$2,400. But what happens if someone in this age bracket earns \$2,401? He is then treated to an effective tax of at least 61.7 percent! Why? Because for every dollar earned over \$2,400, Social Security benefits are reduced by 50 cents. Moreover, Social Security taxes must be paid, even by workers over age sixty-five, on all income up to \$13,200. Add to these taxes whatever local, state, and federal taxes must be paid and people between sixty-five and seventy-two years of age end up with an effective tax burden that is otherwise experienced only by the highest-paid income earners in this nation. If, however, an elderly person is able to obtain so-called unearned income from dividends, interest, or pensions, he may receive millions and millions of dollars and still get his full Social Security benefits.

In a nation devoted for so many generations to the Protestant work ethic, it is odd that gainful employment by the elderly is so discouraged. It is difficult to imagine how it can be necessary to tax workers over sixty-five for the purpose of providing them with benefits later on. We know, however, that the "contribution" is a mere smoke screen for an ill-defined transfer system in which those who work transfer income to those who don't. Presumably the government wishes those fortunate enough to be able to work after age sixty-five to partake in this system. Actually, the government's attitude toward taxing gainfully employed workers over sixty-five is little different from its attitude toward taxing some of the neediest members of society—that is, very low-paid income earners. As I said earlier, the benefit program of Social Security favors higher-income classes. The payment plan, on the other hand, discriminates against lower-income classes, including the working elderly, for in 1971 the median income of those families headed by someone over sixty-five was fully 50 percent less than the median income for all families in the United States. Presumably, since one in every five older persons is officially designated as poor, the work disincentive aspects of Social Security are totally unjustified.

Although these disincentives of the Social Security tax per se on other poor people are certainly not as pronounced, they may be as important in effect. After all, the Social Security tax paid by the working poor in the United States is much greater than any income taxes they pay, and in fact may represent over one-tenth of their earnings. Moreover, the working poor, just as everyone else who works for a living, are given no choice in the matter. They are forced to "contribute" to Social Security. If the system were truly an insurance scheme, it would seem appropriate to allow at least the poorer members of our society the choice between present and future consumption.<sup>2</sup> Once it is realized, however, that the insurance analogy is a total sham, then Congress must be asked why it is forcing the working poor to

pay taxes that go to support the nonworking. Since Social Security is basically a transfer between generations, it does not require that every working member of the younger generation contribute to the retirement of older generations.

#### WORKING FOR OTHERS

The benefit system of Social Security is basically welfare, pure and simple. Those now employed transfer income to those who are unemployed. However, the current recipients of Social Security benefits are getting approximately two to four times what they put into the system. How is that possible? How can each generation receive so many more benefits than it put in? The answer is quite easy to ascertain once we realize that the labor force has been steadily growing, as has total income. Even if the Social Security tax were constant (as it evidently hasn't been), a growing work force and population would guarantee future generations ever-higher benefits. This is something that a private insurance or pension plan certainly cannot provide. The government's ability to continually muster increased taxes from the working population is what allows Social Security to yield such high benefits.

However, the benefits paid to you and me depend on what the Congress legislates, and presumably what the Congress legislates depends on the will of the people (at least in the long run). Hence, there is an implicit "compact between generations": each generation will provide for the retirement of each past generation. This is obviously not a trust fund, but rather a trust in our children and their generation to provide for our old age. This is a moral, not a legal, commitment of each generation.

I would predict that future generations, and maybe even those who are now in their thirties, will be in for trouble because this compact may disintegrate as the effective Social Security tax burden on future generations becomes greater. And the burden will become greater because this nation is tending toward (or is already at) zero population growth. Eventually, the work force will no longer be growing. Incomes may continue to grow, but, nonetheless, if Social Security benefit payments are to rise at the same rate at which they have been rising in the past, tax rates will have to rise even faster to make up for the reduction in the growth rate of the labor force. Today's young workers may find that the benefits they receive from Social Security will not be anywhere near two to four times what they put in.

We can safely predict that the public will realize what's happening by the year 2000. After all, what we've been discussing above is a form of chain-letter, or pyramid scheme. The government certainly got upset with Glenn Turner's Dare To Be Great cosmetic franchise empire based on just such a scheme, but when the government has a similar program, we're supposed to accept it. If current increases in Social Security benefits were to continue, they would exceed national income by the year 2000. Obviously, well before this happens there will be rapid rises (perhaps at an even greater rate than in the past) in Social Security payroll taxes coupled with declines in the growth rate of benefits.

#### A TIME FOR CHANGE

It is quite clear that some drastic changes are called for in the social insurance system as it now stands. The most obvious change is to cut out the rhetorical nonsense and let the American public know the true nature of Social Security. It is not an insurance program; taxes are not contributions to a trust fund in each individual's name; there is little relationship between contributions and benefits; there is no guarantee that benefits will be paid in the future; and the employer does not pay half of the so-called contribution.

Next, the regressive nature of the Social Security tax can be eliminated by eliminating the tax completely and making up for it by increases in the individual income tax. For a nation presumably committed to redistributing income from the nonpoor to the poor, it is certainly inappropriate to allow such a tax to continue.

However, perhaps an even better way to slay the sacred cow called Social Security would be to force it to make itself actuarially sound. The Old Age, Survivors, Disability, and Hospital Insurance fund embodies a huge implicit and largely unrecognized national debt today valued somewhere between \$500 billion and \$1 trillion. We should fully recognize right now the debt implied in the program and issue bonds from the Federal Reserve to the OASDI fund to cover it. Once this is done, we can allow anyone to opt out of the program when he wants to, as long as he purchases private protection (an annuity and/or survivors' insurance). This will force the Social Security Administration to be on its toes. It will also make Congress act in a responsible manner. Our lawmakers will be able to bring in new groups or increased benefits only by issuing bonds to cover the debt incurred. Nothing is wrong with making our parents and grandparents better off, as long as all of us are aware of the price we are paying.

If the SSA doesn't change its ways, I would want to opt for private, government-certified insurance. The facts speak for themselves. The chain-letter scheme is going to blow up in the face of the system just about the time I want to be able to collect on all my "contributions." If you happen to be middle-aged or younger, your conclusion might be the same.

#### THE NORTH CONTINUES THE WAR

##### HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, a series of three well-informed articles on the current situation in Vietnam has appeared in the Indianapolis News. The articles derive from a visit to Vietnam earlier this year by the authors, James Dornan, a staff aide to House minority leader John Rhodes, and Peter Hughes, a legislative assistant to Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Jr.

The first of their articles makes it clear that the North Vietnamese are only using those parts of the cease-fire agreement which will further their unchanged aim of conquest of the South—58,000 Vietnamese were killed in the first year of the so-called cease-fire, a year which saw a continuing pattern of Northern violations and terror activities. The article also shows how support in the South for the Vietcong and the North Vietnam regime is absolutely minimal, and how the morale and the effectiveness of the Vietnamese defense forces has improved considerably.

I insert the first article in the series as it appears in the Indianapolis News dated April 5, 1974:

#### NO END TO VIETNAM WAR

(By James Dornan and Peter Hughes)

"Gentlemen may say 'peace, peace,'" said Patrick Henry, "but there is no peace, the war has only begun."

Such is the situation in South Vietnam,

<sup>2</sup> Or allow them to pick a government certified plan from the private sector.

one year after the promulgation of the Nixon-Kissinger "peace with honor" in January 1973. To be sure, the massive and direct United States involvement has ended, and Vietnamese affairs, when covered at all by the national media, are now relegated to the inside pages. It is in the largest sense, as an unnamed State Department official recently asserted, now "their war."

In the year since the cease-fire accord 58,000 Vietnamese have been killed (more than America's total 12-year loss) and military contacts between the two sides have averaged at least 3,000 per month. For the Vietnamese, then, the war continues unrelentingly.

In 1973 more than half of the North Vietnamese enemy activity was in the Delta region (the so-called Rice War) as the Viet Cong have attempted to capture the rice supplies necessary to sustain their activities in the South.

Since the cease-fire agreement the North has infiltrated more than 30,000 troops into the South, bringing its total troop strength (as of December 1973) to approximately 270,000. But the Viet Cong political infrastructure in the South is in serious disarray. As a result the Viet Cong have had to resort to increased terrorist activities in an effort to stabilize their declining control (which Saigon officials now place at 5 per cent) over the civilian population in the South.

The North also hopes to rebuild its infrastructure through what has been called the "Third Vietnam" strategy, often discussed as a possible interim policy for Hanoi. Capture of a major portion of Quang Duc Province, plus additional advances in Phuoc Long, and Binh Long, would give the Communist forces control of a broad belt of South Vietnam stretching from the Parrot's Beak to the former DMZ.

This area could then be administratively consolidated with the extensive contiguous territories in eastern Cambodia and Laos now controlled by the North, and the existence of a new state formally proclaimed. A functioning political alternative to the Saigon government with full international status would therefore be established. It is perhaps with this end in view that Hanoi has recently resettled 40,000 civilians in areas near I Corps and farther South along the Cambodian border.

While no one doubts that Hanoi still intends to gain control over the South by force, recent U.S. intelligence data indicate the North does not now consider it the tactical time to attempt any major advances. Hanoi is handicapped by the shortcomings of its own rice crops, as well as its inability to exploit Sino-Soviet differences.

The North is also concerned that any blatant violations of the cease-fire accord would bring about the resumption of U.S. bombing. Thus, for the time being, the North seems content to continue its strategic raids, to attempt to expand Viet Cong control over both population and territory in the South, and to force Saigon to accept the North's interpretation of the cease-fire agreement.

For Hanoi and her Viet Cong allies the purpose of the Paris Truce was to eliminate American air power from the war, speed up the withdrawal of U.S. ground forces, and restrict, if possible, the flow of American military aid to the Saigon government.

If political arrangements which would insure the triumph of the People's Revolutionary Government could be forced on Saigon, so much the better; if not, the war could be resumed whenever and at whatever level seemed most likely to topple the Thieu government and bring a Hanoi-dominated Communist regime to power.

The effectiveness and morale of the ARVN are improving, and the armed forces of the South appear to have the capability to isolate and reduce the significance of many of the "leopard spot" zones during the months to

come. All of this, of course, depends on a continued flow of military aid from the United States.

#### DALLAS INVESTMENT ANALYSTS INITIATE SELF-POLICING

#### HON. ALAN STEELMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Dallas Association of Investment Analysts for taking the leading role among members of the Financial Analysts Federation in adopting strict new standards of professional conduct and ethics. All too often today we see attempts at industry self-regulation only after outside pressure threatens Government intervention. This sort of farsighted leadership would make Government regulation unnecessary in most cases.

I call to my colleagues' attention the following article from the Dallas Morning News concerning the actions of the Dallas Association of Investment Analysts:

#### DALLAS INVESTMENT ANALYSTS INITIATE SELF-POLICING

(By David Clark)

Equity Funding . . . United States National Bank . . . Investors Overseas Services . . . Penn Central . . . U.S. Financial . . . National Student Marketing Corp.

What do these organizations have in common?

One, they are all bankrupt.

Two, they went into bankruptcy under public disclosure of fraud and/or indictment of some of their top management.

Three, investors took a bath on their securities. In the case of Equity Funding, some 100 banks and many of the country's most sophisticated financial institutions were stuck with 2 million of its common shares. Their losses are estimated around \$100 million.

Four, institutional investors took that bath largely on the advice of a small cult of experts terming themselves "investment analysts". Some were not qualified to own that term: some were simply defrauded from doing accurately what that term implies; and a few took advantage of that term, and so-called "insider information", to defraud others.

This has not been pleasing to the larger cult of "real" investment analysts, some 13,000 strong in the Financial Analysts Federation (FAF). They daily advise banks, insurance companies, brokerage houses, pension funds, labor unions, corporations and individuals where to place billions of dollars of personal and collective wealth to see it do the most good—for themselves and their investment targets.

"Most good" is not the same as "least bad" in this function, because more is riding on the line than just the credibility of the analyst or the real value of the few hundred million dollars he may help manage. As Lippincott & Margulies Inc., financial communications consulting firm, observes:

"The reports the (investment) analyst delivers on what he sees can raise or lower the price of a company's stock, smooth or make difficult the road to financing, open or shut the door on mergers and acquisitions, turn loyal shareholders into drop-outs or vice-versa."

This is pretty heady stuff for most invest-

ment analysts—much less the general public—but a small band of the Dallas cult, called the Dallas Association of Investment Analysts, appears to be the first in the nation to have taken it to heart, officially.

That organization, at the end of May, became the first of many similar FAF affiliate associations across the country to adopt stringent new FAF standards of professional conduct and ethics.

These standards and ethics are self-administered, self-regulatory in nature, and as such, are subject to the same "ho hums" and "haw haws" that any organization meets when trying to minimize the compromising of its own idealistic principles.

However, as Ralph Waldo Emerson once capsulized, we learn geology the morning after the earthquake. Now, investment analysts nationwide, if not learning from the examples of Equity Funding and United States National Bank (San Diego), have at least learned that the Securities and Exchange Commission and the attorney general's office of the State of New York are hot to unlearn some of those practices that some of those in their profession have learned to damage the credibility of the entire group.

Consequently, on April 28 of this year, delegates representing the 13,000, including the approximately 220 members of the Dallas investment community, met to devise and revise standards which would improve the qualifications of investment analysts as a whole.

Meeting in Los Angeles, these delegates approved a plan whereby the standards of entry into the "fellowship" on investment analysts would be elevated, the standards of practice would be subject to continuous scrutiny of a national review board, and tough new enforcement against violations of those standards would be enacted.

In a letter to FAF member chapters, chairman Eugene H. Vaughan Jr. summarized: "The crux of the plan is to permit local societies to shift the burden of enforcement of professional conduct standards to the national level. . . .

"Higher professionalism is our primary goal. Considerable progress is being made but, along with numerous lesser factors, we are currently lacking two essentials:

"(a) entry standards, to keep the unqualified from passing themselves off to the public as investment analysts and money managers; and

"(b) effective enforcement methods to discipline and, when needed, weed out those who violate our standards of ethics and practice. . . .

"As a profession, we cannot afford to say with St. Augustine, 'Lord, give (us) chastity and self-restraint—but do not give it just yet.'"

The entry standards Vaughn talks of, while not quite enough to separate the wheat from the chaff, are at least enough to allow a corporation to establish that the man it is considering to manage its \$10 million to \$800 million investment portfolio at least knows the fundamentals of accounting, investment and economics. This knowledge is established through a day-long CFA-1 (Certified Financial Analyst—first level) examination, which requires one year's experience in the profession, almost six months of studied preparation, and in this community, is administered each June by staff of Southern Methodist University.

"If you blow one of these examinations, you've blown it for the entire year," David M. Reichert, C.F.A., vice-president of Southwestern Life Insurance Co., and immediate past-president of the Dallas investment analysts, summarizes.

The "C.F.A." behind his name means that he has passed CFA-1, 2, and 3 examinations, which require progressively higher experience (five years in the field before CFA-3) and knowledge (CFA-3 requires application



of analytic skills to portfolio management) before the awarding of the designation, started here in 1963.

About 65 members of the 220 in the Dallas chapter hold this designation. It appears to be the intent of Vaughn and others in the business that the designation carry the prestige of C.P.A. to accountants, C.L.U. to insurance agents, Realtor to real estate agents, and the like.

Right now, however, it simply means that one investment analyst can simply claim superior skills over another, with no claim as to his or her ethical standards in applying those skills.

The latter, however, may be changed by the creation of a national Investment Analysis Standards Board, which will be given free rein to upgrade qualifications, and a Professional Conduct Committee, which will be given free rein to police against abuses by FAF members, with benefit of insurance against lawsuits.

"Obtaining of inside information is the most frequent abuse" the conduct committee is likely to engage in, according to Reichert, and this is because it appears as the most frequent violation of ethics and standards. However, the Dallas chapter, since its 1951 founding, has not had a single disciplinary action on this or any other abuse, he noted to The News.

If it were to have a disciplinary action, however, it would likely come in the form of suspension from FAF, and automatic suspension from Dallas chapter, membership, he pointed out. The teeth that these suspensions would have would depend upon the esteem that outsiders, namely employers of investment analysts, would place on FAF membership.

And it is this esteem, or the promise of it, that the Financial Analysts Federation has used to stave off encroachment by the New York Attorney General's Office (which postponed legislative action scheduled for the spring) and the SEC (whose chairman, Ray Garrett, told the FAF he hoped its program "is approved and gets going").

If successful in getting program approval of 80 per cent of the represented chapters (only five other than Dallas have joined thus far, with New York, representing 25 per cent of FAF membership, not yet voting approval), investment analysts may get a crack at policing themselves.

DR. A. ALBERT BARBERIO

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, on June 8 of this year, a testimonial dinner was held in honor of one of the outstanding physicians in Union County, N.J. Dr. A. Albert Barberio has a record of service to the people of my district and community that is without parallel.

He has been a practicing physician in Union for over 30 years; he has conducted Union Township's Baby-Keep-Well station since its inception; and he was appointed a township doctor by the Board of Health, functioning in that capacity for many years. In addition, Dr. Barberio has been an active member of the Lions and Elks Clubs and is a past president of the Better Businessmen's Bureau.

Dr. Barberio's contributions to the community were recognized by the may-

or of Union, who presented him with a plaque commemorating his long years of service. The members of the Union Township Committee voted unanimously to award this plaque to Dr. Barberio.

Mr. Speaker, such outstanding humanitarians as Dr. Barberio deserve the recognition of their community. I am pleased that this has been the case.

But just as importantly, I would like my colleagues in the House of Representatives to be aware of this fine public servant and the time and talent he has contributed to the community.

The likes of men such as Dr. Barberio come rarely in one's lifetime. I am honored to join in this effort to applaud his record of service to Union County.

#### H.R. 11500—A BALANCED APPROACH FOR REGULATING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF STRIP MINING

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, last Monday the Wall Street Journal printed another editorial in support of H.R. 11500, indicating that the proposed legislation strikes them "as a reasonable attempt to reconcile environmental and energy needs."

Yesterday, the Washington Post carried a story reporting that Russell Train, the Administrator of EPA, endorsed H.R. 11500 stating that it offers the best chance of achieving the goal of obtaining additional energy while at the same time protecting the natural environment.

Both the editorial and news article follow:

#### COAL AND ITS CRITICS

On the page opposite we publish a letter from National Coal Association President Carl E. Bagge taking exception to our qualified support of the House Interior Committee's proposed strip mining control and reclamation act. We would like to add a few words to clarify some of the issues involved, and because clarification may say something about the coal industry's opposition to the act.

Longwall mining takes place in underground mines, and is done by huge machines that remove most coal in the deposit. After the machine passes, the underground passage is allowed to collapse, and the surface above the mine sinks, or subsides, in a rapid but controlled manner. The traditional room-and-pillar method leaves pillars supporting the mine roof, and subsidence often occurs when these collapse, after long and unpredictable periods of time.

The House bill contemplates rules "to prevent subsidence to the extent technologically and economically feasible." The word "prevent" led to fears, expressed by Secretary of the Interior Morton, that the effect would be to outlaw longwall mining, with its obvious subsidence. The Secretary estimated that if the bill passes, it would possibly cut coal production by 187 million tons; of this 117 million resulted from the assumption of a prohibition of longwall mining.

In fact, the bill's sponsors consider longwall mining ecologically preferable, and it and other methods of controlled subsidence are explicitly endorsed. So there is no dis-

agreement as to what the bill ought to say, and a few changes in wording would take care of the great bulk of Secretary Morton's worries about coal production.

As this rather simple controversy emerges in Mr. Bagge's letter, one might gather that the issue is whether longwall mining will be required, not whether it would be allowed. He manages to suggest, without of course ever quite saying so, that if the bill passes 1,849 continuous mining machines will grind to a halt. If anything like that were remotely possible, we would have thought that Secretary Morton would have taken note of it in his calculations of the possible effect on coal production. He might also have noticed if, as Mr. Bagge claims, the bill would close down "most" of the nation's surface mines.

Now, we are sure the House bill can be badly administered. We have worries about how approximate "approximate" contours will be when bureaucratic rules are issued. We know that a lot of environmental legislation has been half-baked, and that once in place it is difficult to modify. But even understanding all of that, the strip mining bill strikes us as a reasonable attempt to reconcile environmental and energy needs.

Indeed, it seems to us that if you were trying to think up ways to ensure that environmental regulations are unreasonable, the best one would be for industry to resist reasonable efforts by resorting to confusing the issue and crying doom.

#### TRAIN BACKS MINE BILL WHITE HOUSE OPPOSES

(By George C. Wilson)

DICKINSON, N. DAK., July 8.—Administrator Russel E. Train of the Environmental Protection Agency today broke with the administration and endorsed the House Interior Committee's strip-mining bill.

Train, in an interview during an airplane swing around the West to study environmental issues, said a "strong" bill is needed to regulate strip mining.

The EPA administrator said the bill reported to the floor by the House Interior Committee—sponsored by Rep. Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.)—offers the best chance to achieve the goal of obtaining additional energy while at the same time protecting the natural environment.

He thus took issue with the Nixon administration position as espoused by Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton and Federal Energy Administrator John C. Sawhill. Morton and Sawhill in letters to Congress said the House Interior bill would handicap the production of coal. Their assertions have been assailed by at least one Senate subcommittee chairman as "scare tactics."

Train himself, in a stop at Fargo said "surface mining should produce under very strong federal control."

As for the planned strip mining of the Northern Great Plains, Train told his North Dakota audience that "the lesson of Appalachia is, don't let it happen here in terms of unreclaimed areas."

Unreclaimed areas are places where coal companies have stripped away the coal in the mountains without filling in the cavities and otherwise restoring the landscape to something approaching its original condition.

Train's host in his travels through North Dakota today was Rep. Mark Andrews of North Dakota, a ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Committee. Andrews, too, endorses the House Interior Committee bill, but said he wanted it strengthened so that ranchers would have to give their permission before companies with mineral rights could stripmine their land for coal.

The letters from Morton and Sawhill opposing the bill contained figures that Chairman Lee Metcalf (D-Montana) of the Senate Minerals Subcommittee has described as "totally unwarranted and very misleading."

Metcalf faulted Sawhill for quoting the "maximum potential losses" of coal production from regulating strip-mining as the House Interior Committee bill recommended rather than using the lower estimates of "probable losses" made by the Bureau of Mines.

Complained Metcalf "Your letter that the requirement for restoration to approximate original contour and the limitation on placement of spoil on the downslope would cause an immediate annual loss in production of up to 67 million tons" completely ignores Bureau of Mines estimates of probable losses of from 5.1 to 7.5 million tons a year."

Train, in discussing the pending strip-mining legislation, indicated that he, too, felt the production losses were overstated. But he did not criticize the letter sent by Sawhill and Morton.

Train has disagreed with the Nixon administration recently on two other environmental issues. He fought relaxation of clean-air standards as much as the White House had recommended to allow more industries to burn coal. On another occasion, he opposed transferring testing of new cars for mileage from EPA to another agency—something Roy L. Ash, director of the Office of Management and Budget, had been considering.

On coal, Train's position for some time now has been that most of it lies deep underground where it can be mined with a minimum disruption of the surface environment. Therefore, he has argued that the emphasis should be switched as quickly as possible to deep mining rather than take high risks in strip mining certain areas of the country.

At a luncheon stop in Beulah, N.D., Gov. Arthur Link, a Democrat, said that if it were not for the "needs of the country," it would be "a safe assumption" that people favor no strip mining at all in North Dakota.

The governor said he was insisting on "total reclamation" of any of North Dakota's rich agricultural land of deep black earth. His definition of "total reclamation," he said, is to make sure that the land stripped would produce "as good or better" afterward "as it does today."

#### CONGRESSMAN RINALDO LAUDED FOR ANTI-INFLATION EFFORTS

#### HON. LINDY BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress who has long regarded excessive Government spending as one of the primary causes of inflation, I am always gratified when a colleague who shares my concern about this serious problem receives recognition for his efforts. This is why I was especially pleased to read the comprehensive and detailed editorial that appeared in the *Courier News* on June 14. It dealt with the efforts of my colleague, the Honorable MATTHEW J. RINALDO of New Jersey's 12th Congressional District, in the battle against runaway Government spending.

Because I believe that efforts like Congressman RINALDO's deserve commendation, I would like to enter this editorial into the RECORD.

The text of the editorial follows:

[From the *Courier News*, June 14, 1974]

GOVERNMENT, TOO, NEEDS FISCAL RESTRAINT

There's no quick or easy solution to the economic mess inflation has created for

America. If there were, government leaders surely would long since have grabbed the opportunity.

The grim fact is that inflation and its menacing side effects is like a fever for which no acceptable cure has yet been found.

It's an economic sickness confusing not only to its victims but the "doctors"—economists—too.

The Federal Reserve System, Chairman Arthur Burns says, "could stop this inflation dead in its tracks" by sharply slowing the growth of the nation's money supply. But as he cautions, that also would stop the nation's economy dead in its tracks—making the cure worse than the problem.

As things are, consumer prices have soared by more than 10 per cent in the past year, a rate not experienced since the Korean war. In this year's first quarter, the consumer price index rose at an annual rate of 14.5 per cent—the sort of double-digit inflation rate Americans used to think existed only in Latin America.

Suffering and damage caused by soaring inflation can be seen everywhere. There isn't a town in which families aren't having to reassess their spending patterns and living standards, cutting back on vacations and even on food purchases in an effort to make ends meet.

Some aren't making it.

The Mortgage Banks Association of America, whose members service 6.4 million home mortgages, reports the number of homeowners falling behind on mortgage payments reached a new peak during the last three months of 1973, the most recent period for which figures are available.

A similar trend has surfaced in installment loan delinquency. The American Bankers Association has found that during the first two months of this year the delinquency rate on installment loans for the purchase of cars, appliances, home improvements and so on rose from 1.89 to 2.69 per cent.

What's happening is clear: Many people are shuffling their monthly bills, deciding which they can afford to pay and which must be deferred. The result is an inevitable rise in foreclosures—a rise already being experienced.

Meanwhile, with mortgage interest rates being pushed higher and higher, the task of financing a home has become a perplexing challenge for millions.

While the price of houses in New Jersey has been rising during recent years at a rate of about 10 per cent a year—and higher in some areas—the cost of mortgages has risen at an even faster rate during the past year or so. At the same time the availability of mortgage funds has diminished.

Restraint in consumer spending will help battle inflation and for this reason must be encouraged. But there's an equal, if not greater, need for economy and restraint in governmental spending.

Suffering as they are, consumers have a right to expect elimination of wasteful spending at national, state and local government levels.

There have been encouraging signs of awareness in Washington and state capitals of the need to join consumers in belt-tightening exercises. But not enough.

What's needed now is a forceful public clamor against wasteful government spending, particularly at federal level. It needs to be more widely realized, for instance, that the average cost of federal programs for every man, woman and child has more than doubled to \$1,500 since 1965—a trend that feeds inflation and aggravates other adverse effects of federal deficit spending.

While taxpayers are struggling to cope with inflation and the dwindling value of the dollar, elected officials in Congress should be sharing the kind of pledge made by Rep. Matthew J. Rinaldo, R-N.J.,—a pledge to fight unnecessary government spending.

When reliable economists like Burns caution that because of inflation "the future of our country is in jeopardy," it's time for Congress to share the penny-pinching habits forced on so many taxpayers.

Rinaldo, whose district comprises much of Union and Essex counties, says that unless Congress clamps a tight lid on its wasteful spending, efforts to check inflation are doomed to failure.

The congressman has condemned what he describes as a "spending madness" gripping the federal government.

His call for massive economies in government spending is justified by a financial record showing that government costs have risen from the equivalent of 10 per cent of the dollar value of our national output in 1929 to 35 per cent today.

As part of a drive for more economy in government, Rinaldo has called for a reevaluation of more than 650 federal grant-in-aid programs that cost taxpayers \$45 billion a year and account for a third of the federal government's domestic spending.

Such a goal is commendable. But much more than this is needed. Cost cutting across the whole range of government spending is essential.

Some graphic examples of the kind of waste tolerated in government have been provided by Rinaldo. They include appropriations like these:

\$117,250 a year to the U.S. Board of Tea Tasters.

\$468,000 a year to England's Queen Elizabeth for not planting cotton on her Mississippi plantation.

\$302,979 to Los Angeles to extend travelers' aid to migrants lost on the freeways.

\$205,000 a year to the Interdepartmental Screw Thread Committee which was established at the end of World War I as a "temporary agency."

\$20,000 to learn about the mating calls of Central American toads; \$70,000 to classify the population biology of Indo-Australian ants and \$20,000 to study the blood group of Zlotnika pigs.

There's a lot more senseless federal spending Rinaldo will find as he keeps digging.

He'll find, for instance, that \$5,000 of tax funds went this year to study the evolution of the chin in Polish skeletal populations between 2000 BC and 1800 AD. More tax dollars went to pay for an analyses of U.S.-Canadian fur trade from 1770 to 1820!

Then there's an array of 868 federal assistance programs administered by 49 different agencies at a cost of more than \$100 billion a year. To think that all this goes on without waste and excessive staffing is to stretch the imagination in a way that might justify another federal survey.

Chopping away at government waste and at the same time reducing bureaucracy must be regarded as a key part of America's war against inflation. It's a war that needs to be waged at state and local government levels as much as in Washington.

There's no justification for lavish spending in government operations at a time when taxpayers, who foot the bill, are having to count pennies to make ends meet.

Rinaldo deserves a lot of company in Congress in his crusade toward the goal of reducing government spending "as one of the most effective ways of battling inflation and restraining the power of government over the lives of our citizens."

#### THE OIL DAILY

#### HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, the *Oil Daily*, the oil industry magazine of fair



play and the American way, has come up with an interesting set of statistics. These figures purport to show that we are really not paying much for gasoline at all; that if we ran our automobiles on cough syrup or after shave lotion, we would have been much worse off. The reasoning is obvious; anyone who drove into a service station and said, "Fill me with Thousand Island," only to be charged \$5.12 a gallon would flip his croutons. Could you picture John Sawhill and his boys over at the FEA grouped around a table discussing the shortages of hair spray and export controls on mouth wash? Or President Nixon delivering a nationwide address on the ketchup crisis now merely a buttermilk problem? King Feisal pounding his fist on a table and with a straight face demanding that the United States change its Mideast policies or he would cut off our supply of seasoned tomato juice?

Sounds funny? Well, the energy industry is replete with people who, according to the Oil Daily article, think with just such a reasoning. It is no wonder congressional accusations of excess profits, horizontal integration, and unlawful manipulation can be so easily ignored. Just think how lucky we are. For those Members of Congress whose spoiled, selfish attitude has precluded their realizing just how good we have it, the article is included:

**WEST COAST REPORT—GASOLINE CHEAPEST LIQUID AROUND**  
(By Stark Fox)

(Stark Fox, executive vice president of the Independent Oil and Gas Producers of California, subs for Bill Gregg in this week's report from the West Coast.)

By volume, gasoline at 60 cents per gallon, including a 14-cent total tax, is the cheapest liquid, or fluid, in common use that the Southern California resident can buy, with the possible exception of tap water.

Consider the cost of food-type liquids at Los Angeles market chains, each of which advertises that he offers the biggest discounts. A few items:

	Per gallon
Salad dressing	\$5.12
Vegetable oil	5.12
Ketchup	2.05
Milk	1.40
Buttermilk	1.16
Wine vinegar	2.56
Frozen orange juice (after a 3 to 1 dilution with tap water)	1.16
Seasoned tomato juice	2.52
Apple juice	1.79
Cola	1.53
Club soda	1.68

These prices were calculated from per ounce advertised prices in a recent edition of the Los Angeles Times.

A few other items, not in the food category, but somewhere in the bathroom or kitchen of most households:

	Per gallon
Blood builder	\$31.25
Antacid	20.16
Laxative	10.03
Cough syrup	59.31
Hair spray	7.78
After shave lotion	35.84
Hand lotion	14.08
Mouth wash	6.40
Shampoo	10.24
Liquid detergent	2.76
Disinfectant	3.20

And then, there is liquor:

	Per gallon
Beer	\$2.56
Wine	3.76

The average price of the foregoing 28 items is 9 cents per ounce. For teetotalers, the average of the 22 items excluding liquor is 8 cents per ounce.

None of the items is essential to the consumer. His life will go right on whether or not he makes individual purchases of any of them. It is his option, but so is his individual purchase of a gallon of gasoline at a service station, which costs him five tenths of a cent per ounce.

His life will go right on if he never buys another gallon.

It won't be the same, of course. The change in his lifestyle will be drastic, but the fact remains that he can get along even if he can't, as an individual, buy gasoline for his personal two-door hardtop or his RV. Consider the Amish.

None of this is to argue that, in today's world, gasoline is not necessary. It is, and it will be for the foreseeable future. It is merely to point out that, in their professed zeal to protect the consumer, the politicians have not only overblown the essentiality of gasoline, but have coupled that essentiality with a denunciation of its cost, which the foregoing tabulations show is minimal.

More broadly, the politicians use the blown-up essentiality of oil as a reason for slapping more controls on the industry. Witness the continued controls on oil prices, while everything else has been freed. The rhetoric goes like this: Oil is so essential to the nation's economy and the people's well-being that its management and direction can't be entrusted to private corporations; the public must be protected by the active intervention of the government, even to the extent of creating a Federal oil corporation.

There also is Washington talk of a bill to require a federal charter for all energy companies. A company would be required to disclose any and all information requested by a federal chartering board, which would grant a charter only if it found that the public interest would be served.

The bill reportedly provides for "public" members to be appointed to the board of directors of such chartered companies with an unrestricted right of access to all company records and a duty to initiate suits against the company to enjoin it from taking certain actions considered by the "public" board members not to be in the public interest.

The reason—make that "excuse"—for the bill? You guessed it: energy is essential.

Very well. Energy certainly is essential to today's economy. But what about steel? Steel is in short supply; steel prices have increased; the nation could not get along without it; isn't it time to create a federal steel corporation to make sure that the public interest is served? And a federal copper corporation? Isn't it time to charter those industries?

The purpose here is not to downgrade the essentiality of oil. It is, rather, to raise the question: Is oil the one essential in the complex economy of today's United States? If it is thought to be and therefore must be completely dominated by government, but then some other industry also turns out to be essential, logic demands that the other industry be dominated as well.

## VIOLENCE AND YOUTH

### HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the problems of violence and crime in our public schools and in our communities at large have posed serious challenges in our

urban areas. A most thoughtful letter on this subject was recently written by Mary L. Chrichlow, Queens director of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The "Open Letter to a Young Rioter" appeared in the June 21, 1974 edition of the New York Voice.

As community leaders search for solutions to the tragic incidents of violence in our midst, it is particularly important to improve communications with our young people. The "Open Letter to a Young Rioter" is such an attempt and for that reason I am inserting the text of the letter in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues in the House:

#### NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF

CHRISTIANS AND JEWS,

Floral Park, N.Y., June 14, 1974.

#### OPEN LETTER TO A YOUNG RIOTER

(By Mary L. Chrichlow)

Dear Johnny: Believe me, I am as sad as anyone about young Clifford Glover's death a year ago caused by a police bullet. His death, like any person's death, diminished us. And probably not unlike you I do not feel that ultimate and dispassionate justice was rendered at the recent trial looking into the shooting incident.

Where does this leave us—you and me?

I say let us gather all of the forces of good will, be they black or white, and by our combined strength bring about not only a more equitable system of criminal justice, but a whole revision of our social attitudes in which a human life is of supreme value and not lightly taken by the muzzle of a soulless gun.

You do not seem to see it that way.

You join your buddies in a combined hostility against practically everyone. Together you roam up and down New York and Sutphin Boulevards; you smash windows; you wreck cars; you stop the buses from running—and whom do you hurt? The little black man struggling hard to eke out a living so that he can send his son (perhaps you) to school; your tired parents, friends and neighbors desperately wanting to get home from an exhausting day of work.

If you consider yourself an avenger of injustice—and I still have a flicker of hope that there must be a morsel of rationality behind your actions—how can you justify your destructiveness that is not hurting anyone but your own?

But follow me one little step of reasoning further: Whom do you help, in which way do you improve "the system" by blindly lashing out against any passing white motorist innocently traveling through our neighborhood? What good purpose was served when the white police officer was injured and possibly crippled for life? Johnny, is white bad or black good—just because of white and black?

Allow me to be personal: I have struggled all of my life against prejudice, discrimination and racism. I had hoped that by now your generation had put such outmoded categories aside and come to think in human terms. I still harbor that hope for the majority of your generation. Could it be that you are just a throw-back to the past of violence and hatred, destructiveness and killing?

I wish so much that I could call on the better and nobler instinct and aspirations that I know are in you. If we only could sit down and reason together, I believe that none of you would get killed any more in riots and rebellions and just plain vandalism.

Now let me assume that you brush me aside as a sentimental woman who does not know what's happening—"what the score is." Well, here is the ultimate sadness and inherent tragedy of your riotous behavior:

You defy your own community with its own codes of behavior and strivings for de-

cent human relationships. Why should anyone in this community endowed with reason sympathize with you?

In the final analysis you riot and rebel against the society of which you are a part. I warn you not to believe that "revolution" is a romantic game. In every country in any corner of the world, revolutions and rebellions are put down with the utmost physical force. You could die for it.

Surely there have been revolutionaries willing to die for an ideal.

But what is your ideal?

#### CONSUMERS' BEEF

### HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, sometimes forgotten in the arguments pro and con over the "Emergency Livestock Credit Act" is the group which will pay most dearly if this singular example of misguided governmental largesse is enacted.

Many consumer groups have written me expressing their opposition to the bill which provides a \$2 billion Government guarantee on loans to cattlemen. They have pointed out that the real beneficiaries of this bill are the banks who are given a risk-free guarantee on loans at the current high prime interest rates. The bill represents a terrific way for the banks to recoup potential losses where the worth of collateral has gone down.

And all at the taxpayers' expense. This is another point they have made. Taxpayers are being called upon to support the same industry which already digs deeply into their pockets with the current high prices of meat.

The bill does nothing to solve the real problem of the industry. Consumers are simply unwilling to buy meat at the current prices. These prices are largely the result of beef stockpiling by middlemen who wish to keep supply down and prices high.

The bill does not address this problem. It simply maintains the status quo for another year—at the consumer's expense. This is the last thing we should want.

Certainly it is the last thing the consumer groups want. Among those who have registered their opposition to the bill are the Federation of Homemakers, Inc., the National Consumer Congress, the National Consumers League, Consumers Action, the Corporate Accountability Group, and Public Citizen. I insert their statements in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 15560, "THE EMERGENCY LIVESTOCK CREDIT ACT OF 1974"

(By Beverly C. Moore, Jr.)

The per capita consumption of meat in the United States declined by 7.1 percent between the fourth quarter of 1970, when consumption was at its peak, and the first quarter of 1974. However, meat consumption increased by 9.3 percent between the third quarter of 1973, when consumption hit its low point, and the first quarter of 1974. These fluctuations in consumer demand for meat are closely related to changes in the price that consumers must pay for this product. By the third quarter of 1973 retail

meat prices had climbed nearly 30 percent higher than 1972 levels. Consumers purchased less. By the end of 1973, however, beef prices declined by 9.4 percent, and consumption rose. Yet by the end of the first quarter of 1974 beef prices had again climbed to the high point reached in the third quarter of 1973. This increase signals a further decline in meat consumption in the near future, if there is any validity to something called the Law of Supply and Demand.

The above statistics indicate that there is such a Law and that it works. When meat prices declined, consumers bought more; when prices rose, consumers bought less meat, preferring to spend their limited purchasing power on other goods and services whose prices had not risen as much as the price of meat had. This process by which consumers adjust the quantities of their purchases of different products on the basis of relative changes in prices and quality is known as Maximizing the Value of Consumer Purchasing Power. It is facilitated by the Principle of Consumer Choice. Furthermore, when consumers determine, for any reason, including an increase in price, to permanently buy less meat, the same quantity of livestock can no longer be brought to market as had been the case when consumption was higher. Rather, fewer livestock must be produced, and this means that some meat producers must go out of business and others must cut back on the level of their production. The resources formerly devoted to producing meat which consumers no longer wish to buy will then be shifted into the production of other goods and services which consumers do wish to purchase. This is called the Law of Efficient Resource Allocation.

All of these laws and principles, together with other laws relating to vigorous competition, adequate consumer purchasing information, government non-intervention in the market mechanism, and the profit motive, form the basis and justification for an economic system labeled Free Enterprise Capitalism. It has been contended by various economists that this economic system is preferable to all others that have been proposed because of its ability to attain the greatest possible output from the limited economic resources available. It is, however, an economic system that is often preached but seldom practiced. Only a few powerless consumer groups and detached academics appear to be willing to allow the marketplace to impose temporary hardships on a few in order to confer far greater benefits upon the many.

Among the many examples of the success of special interest groups in thwarting the will of the market are (1) tax loopholes, regressive taxes, and untaxed inheritances; (2) price fixing and/or competition exclusion by the ICC, FCC, CAB, FMC, SEC, and USDA; (3) government granted monopolies for labor unions, farm cooperatives (milk), professional sports, and for lawyers, doctors, and other "professionals"; (4) tariffs, import quotas, and other trade barriers; and (5) various direct subsidies, loan guarantees, cost overruns, and other "bail-outs" such as have recently been seen with respect to Lockheed, Penn Central, and Franklin National Bank and proposed for TWA, Pan Am, and various railroad corporations. The consequences of all such payoffs are enormous economic waste and maldistribution of wealth.

It is in this context that the House Agriculture Committee, after deliberation lasting a full 20 minutes, has sent to the floor H.R. 15560, the Emergency Livestock Credit Act of 1974, already whistled through the Senate, by which U.S. taxpayers would guarantee meat producers up to \$2 billion in "loans" during the next year, so that they may continue to produce meat in amounts in excess

of the quantities that consumers are willing to purchase at the prevailing prices.

A principal justification advanced for this legislation is that the meat producers' present plight springs from the government's own unwise action in freezing beef prices, prompting cattlemen to withhold their animals from the market until the freeze was lifted and prices rose. What, of course, happened was that, after prices did rise, consumers cut back on their purchases and the supply withholding action did not reap the gains that the cattlemen expected. The argument founders on the point that this price increase and the subsequent decline in consumer demand would have occurred had there been no beef price freeze—and perhaps even sooner. The price freeze cannot be used as an excuse for the central problem that meat producers face, which is that consumers are not going to buy as much meat at today's higher prices as they bought at yesterday's lower prices.

To the extent that high meat prices are determined by high production and marketing costs, unless these costs can be reduced the least efficient meat producers are simply going to have to exist from the industry. And it is in the public interest that they do so promptly, so that they can begin using their scarce economic resources to produce something that consumers will buy at the prices charged, rather than being subsidized to remain in an industry that can no longer afford them. If there were any need for government guaranteed loans, it would be to help such meat producers to leave the industry rather than to stay in.

Much has also been said about supermarkets and other middlemen not fully passing along to consumers reductions in prices received by meat producers. But to subsidize the victims of monopoly is no way to deal with this problem. The solution is to break up the monopoly. Nor, incidentally, can the Justice Department justify turning its head while meat producers attempt to form their own monopoly, through agreement to withhold livestock from the market, in order to combat other alleged monopolies.

It will of course be argued that this legislation confers not "subsidies" but "loans" which will be repaid. So confident of this outcome are the bill's sponsors that they neglected even to specify any maximum interest rate above which the government will not guarantee their loans' repayment. However, if meat producers cannot obtain loans now, without government guarantees, it must be that bankers fear that meat producers will be unable to repay them. Simply having the government guarantee the loans does not increase the farmer's ability to repay. Only an increase in consumer demand and/or greater efficiency in meat production can enable the farmer to repay debts that, precisely because of the absence of these factors, are not extended by private lenders. Unless there is something wrong with the manner in which bankers make loan decisions, a problem whose solution must be addressed not to farmers but to bankers, it follows from the above premises that the "loans" provided by this proposed legislation will ultimately convert into subsidies.

It could be argued that farmers will be able to repay these loans because, given the government guarantee, banks will be able to extend credit at lower interest rates reflecting the elimination of risk, and that, indeed, the problem that meat producers face is not that they are unable to obtain credit at any rate, but that they are unable to obtain it at a rate which they are able to repay. But if this would be the effect of this legislation, it would still grant a subsidy, although one which in form is more hidden to the casual observer than the ordinary straightforward variety. This subsidy operates through a misallocation of credit. At a given point in time, there is only so much credit available to be rationed among competing applicants,



through interest rates reflecting the degree of risk associated with the projects seeking financing. A law which enables meat producers to obtain more credit at a given interest rate than they would obtain in a free market has the effect of reducing the amount of credit that is available to be rationed among competing producers in the rest of the economy, such as the construction of new housing and the development of new energy supplies. Because these other applicants for credit will have less to bid for, after the misallocation of capital to beef producers, they will have to pay higher interest rates (the Law of Supply and Demand), and these higher rates will of course be largely passed along to consumers in the form of higher prices for goods and services other than meat—and will also reduce the net economic output.

Aside from the resource misallocation waste of continued production of unwanted meat that is associated with this subsidy, there will also be income redistribution consequences. On the assumption that the subsidy operates through a misallocation of credit, as explained above, the general price level will rise to subsidize the price of meat. Income will be redistributed toward the wealthy to the extent that more affluent consumers spend more income on meat. On the assumption that the loans will not be repaid, so that the taxpayers bear the subsidy burden, and given that the overall tax structure is proportional rather than progressive, this legislation will also concentrate wealth. This will occur to the extent that meat producers are wealthier than the average citizen and to the extent that the wealthier meat producers obtain larger shares of the subsidy than the less affluent meat producers, which will inevitably be the case, since the larger a meat producer's net worth, the larger the secured loan, guaranteed by the government, he may obtain. In light of the fact that one percent of the population now holds 33 percent of the total private wealth, and five percent own 53 percent, measures to further concentrate wealth do not appear necessary at this time. It is, indeed, measures such as this that have refuted the proposition advanced by President Nixon that, in America, people get what they work for and work for what they get.

Because the enactment of this legislation will subsidize the continued production of meat, which will then be sold at whatever price consumers are willing to pay, consumers will ingest more meat, and thus more animal fat and cholesterol, than would be the case under a free market. There is strong evidence that the consumption of cholesterol and animal fat from meat is the leading factor in the arteriosclerotic process (hardening of the arteries) that leads to heart attacks. Heart disease is responsible for roughly half of all American deaths. There is also considerable evidence that fatty meats are responsible for many cancers of the colon, killing 50,000 Americans annually, and of the breast, prostate, pancreas, gallbladder, and bile duct, taking 75,000 American lives each year. Legislation which subsidizes the production of meat increases the incidence of these diseases. So do the free advertising services given the meat industry by Earl Butz & Company, in his nationwide television appeals to Americans to buy more meat, and the efforts of U.S.D.A. to shore up meat demand and prices by purchasing additional supplies for school children recently having embarked upon the decades long journey to arteriosclerotic heart disease.

It should also be noted that the production of livestock is an extremely expensive means of obtaining nutrients relative to such alternative sources as grains, fruits, and vegetables.

Although this legislation was initially aimed at bailing out the producers of cattle and hogs, it has been amended to bestow its largesse upon the producers of sheep, goats, swine, chickens, turkeys, and dairy cattle.

Although the sponsors of this bill would no doubt be appalled at a proposal to give *every one* a subsidy, such as Senator McGovern's retracted suggestion that every American citizen be given an annual grant of \$1,000, it is not explained why, if any subsidies at all ought to be dispensed, they should go to the producers of these livestock animals. There are others who are at least equally in need of such "loan guarantees", such as prospective house purchasers, supermarket shoppers, and even consumer groups, who could well use the money to lobby against legislation such as this. Despite their financial woes, meat producers do not appear to have run into great difficulty in amassing the resources required to ram this legislation through the Congress.

No Member of Congress who votes for this legislation can elsewhere champion the virtues of a free enterprise system without engaging in hypocritical conduct. Unfortunately, that will not deter them, for their constituents, among whom taxpayers always heavily outnumber meat producers, will be unlikely ever to learn of their elected representatives' inconsistencies.

PUBLIC CITIZEN,

Washington, D.C., July 8, 1974.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On Wednesday HR 15560, the livestock loan guarantee bill, is scheduled on the calendar of the Rules committee. For the good of both the American consumer and the national economy, we urge you not to grant this bill a rule. A few of the many reasons for opposing this legislation are:

(1) The notion that the government is somehow responsible for the cattle producers' misjudgment of their market is both unprecedented and could lead to a significant drain on the United States Treasury. William Simon, Secretary of the Treasury, has said of this legislation: "Who's next? Maybe I should bring down all my friends from Wall Street who have gone broke and get a subsidy for them too." (quoted in the Wall Street Journal, 7/3/74)

(2) Bankers rather than ranchers would be the great beneficiaries of HR 15560. Faced with the prospect of large losses if cattlemen go bankrupt, banks would, under the terms of this bill, be able to refinance existing short term obligations with the taxpayer guaranteeing 80% of the possible loss (90% in the Senate version, S. 3679).

(3) In rescuing overextended bankers, HR 15560 assists those at least partly to blame for any credit shortage in the cattle industry. Credit for cattle producers was the subject of a June 13, 1974 letter from Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns to Robert Mayo, President of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. Burns stated that "country banks may be reluctant to make adequate funds available locally because of the very high returns that can be obtained by them on money market instruments, including loans to city banks in the federal funds market." He instructed Mayo to "remind" the bankers that their "first obligation is to the credit requirements of their service area." Mr. Ralph Nader in a letter of July 3, 1974, called on Chairman Burns to explain to the public the Federal Reserve Board's position in this matter. Congress should not act until the full story of these banks' lending policies and the extent to which any credit shortage can be alleviated through traditional fiscal policy is known.

(4) HR 15560 would make consumer's pay twice. First it refuses to confront the true issue of decreased consumption and seeks rather to preserve the status quo of large beef stockpiles and high prices while producers await some unspecified change in consumer buying habits. Secondly, it leaves the taxpayer holding the bag for the cost of the inevitable construction in beef production.

(5) Although its supporters claim that HR 15560 is an emergency measure to assist cattle producers, this legislation could in fact provide loan guarantees to a broad spectrum of the livestock industry. Producers of virtually anything with fur, feathers, or hair could have their loans guaranteed under this bill. The potential for the inadvertent creation of an enormous agricultural welfare scheme is great.

(6) Many cattlemen are themselves against this legislation. A telephone poll of Idaho cattle producers by the Idaho Cattle Feeders Association released June 28, revealed unanimous opposition to this loan guarantee program. (Idaho Cattle Feeders Association press release, 6/22/74)

(7) HR 15560 is fatally vague in stating the financial conditions that trigger its benefits. Only where the guaranteed loans are sought to refinance existing obligations must the applicant certify that such refinancing is absolutely essential for him to remain in business. In addition, it is unclear whether the provisions of HR 15560 will apply only to the family farm unit or will be equally available to the largest agribusiness.

Perhaps the greatest irony of this proposal is that the same producers who blame their troubles on government economic policies now advocate further government influence on the marketplace. HR 15560 can only increase the uncertainty and disequilibrium of the cattle market and should be rejected as an unwarranted suspension of the laws of supply and demand.

Sincerely,

JOAN CLAYBROOK.

NATIONAL CONSUMERS LEAGUE,

Washington, D.C., June 28, 1974.

Congressman PETER PEYSER,  
Longworth Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEYSER: The National Consumers League, the nation's oldest consumer organization, is concerned about the passage of a bill that will aid neither farmers nor consumers. The Emergency Livestock Credit Bill (H.R. 15560) rather than benefiting the farmers during this critical time, will benefit the interests of the banking industry.

National Consumers League recognizes that the cattle producers are in a crisis situation, but, we are opposed to H.R. 15560 as a remedy to the situation. It will not alter the basic problems that have brought us to this point.

Consumers are opposed to subsidizing the already thriving banking industry, when both the producers and those who pay high prices for beef are in need of meaningful solutions.

Very truly yours,

ELLEN HAAS,  
Associate Director.

CONSUMER ACTION,

Washington, D.C., June 28, 1974.

HON. PETER A. PEYSER,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PEYSER: This is in response to your letter asking our comments on H.R. 15560, the Emergency Livestock Credit Bill of 1974.

It is not at all clear that any legislation is necessary. However, it is clear that this bill subsidizes the banking interests and not the farmers' interests. H.R. 15560 will neither help the farmer nor the consumer and should not in its present form be voted into law.

Thank you for expressing an interest in our views.

Sincerely,

JAMES S. TURNER,  
Co-Director.  
CATHY SULZBERGER,  
Co-Director.

NATIONAL CONSUMERS CONGRESS,  
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1974.  
Congressman PETER A. PEYSER,  
Agriculture Committee, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEYSER: The bill H.R. 15560, which was originally designed to assist the cattle industry in their present crisis, has become so diluted that it serves neither the cattlemen nor the consumer. If this bill is allowed to pass it is apparent that the only real benefits will be those accrued by the bankers.

The National Consumers Congress, therefore, joins you in opposing this legislation.

Sincerely,

AILEEN GORMAN,  
Executive Director.

FEDERATION OF HOMEMAKERS, INC.,  
Arlington, Va., July 1, 1974.

Re Opposition to H.R. 15560 and S. 3679—  
Taxpayers' Guarantee of Livestock Loans.

HON. PETER A. PEYSER,  
House Longworth Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEYSER: The officers of this grassroots organization are in accord with your common sense views on the ineffectiveness of H.R. 15560 to help solve the problems confronting the beef raisers who have withheld their cattle from market—hoping for higher prices, but instead now facing losses on over-fat cattle. The Federation's approximately 7,000 members would also join in opposition to this bailout type of legislation—since they endorsed this group's opposition to the cyclamate compensation bills, and recently opposed tax money for the poultry raisers who had to sacrifice their Dieldrin contaminated chickens.

This bill (H.R. 15560) appears—as you pointed out at the hearing of the full House Agriculture Committee on June 27th—to be beneficial mainly for the bankers who will be able to re-finance their loans to the cattle raisers at the current high interest rates, knowing their loans will be guaranteed at least 80% by the taxpayers. The House Bill has a ceiling of \$2 Billion but in conference with S. 3679—this ceiling could be deleted by the conferees—also the loans could be extended for a longer period than specified by the House legislation.

This emergency, bailout legislation has the taxpayers furnishing loan guarantees up to 80% but no promise, let alone a guarantee, that the marketplace prices of beef for consumers will be lower. It would appear this emergency financing might keep beef prices high for the harassed housewives. Unless the facts are faced squarely regarding this unhappy state of both beef producers and consumers and resolved the taxpayers can anticipate more bailouts of said cattle raisers. If the processors and the chain stores do not share their profits with the ranchers and feedlot owners—then the consumers will have to pay the high store prices for beef or forego it—as many are doing today.

The Washington Post for July 1, 1974 (Food Section, pgs E1 and E2) carries an article "Battling the Budget" by Mary Knight of the Christian Science Monitor of a survey of California housewives who are watching their food budgets carefully. This informal survey indicates that most of them buy roasts only for entertaining or special occasions. These California homemakers are serving fish and chicken regularly and also supplementing with egg and cheese dishes. Chopped beef is substituted for steaks and roasts. This has become a way of eating for these housewives and their families for more than a year. This survey indicates that until the processors and the huge supermarkets are willing to be reasonable in their dealings both with the beef raisers and the consumers the problem will not be resolved. Most shoppers will resist cuts of any meats which are inflated in price.

Warnings that meat prices will be still higher if the taxpayers do not come to the financial bailout of the beef raisers and their bankers will probably cause housewives to invent even more tasty recipes for serving fish, chicken, egg, and cheese—especially casseroles.

The term "livestock" is so broad in H.R. 15560 that dairy cattle, sheep, goats, swine, chickens and turkeys are included with cattle. The precedent of passing H.R. 15560 could result in taxpayers guaranteeing many other high interest loans for livestock as defined by said bill.

It is this Federation's understanding that the USDA is purchasing large quantities of beef and pork for the school lunch program—which should help this problem of disposing of excess quantities of beef. If Canada is persuaded to purchase USDA certified DES-free beef from the U.S. this too will temporarily aid this problem of surplus beef. When taxpayers help the beef raisers through USDA purchase of excess beef—they should not be asked also to bailout the bankers at current interest rates.

In behalf of its members, this Federation's officers have asked me to extend their thanks for your efforts in behalf of all consumers in opposing H.R. 15560, which would create a dangerous precedent.

Sincerely,

RUTH G. DESMOND,  
President.

#### PROGRESS IN MINORITY HOUSING

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, a week and a half ago, Dr. Gloria E. A. Toote, Assistant Secretary for Equal Opportunity at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, presented a major address to the National Association of Minority Contractors at their fifth annual convention in San Francisco.

In her presentation, Dr. Toote carefully examines HUD programs aimed to stimulate minority housing programs and minority business in general. Dr. Toote's substantive speech is now submitted for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues:

REMARKS PREPARED BY DR. GLORIA E. A. TOOTE

It is always a pleasure to be able to come to San Francisco, and a special pleasure today to have a part in this Fifth Annual Convention of the National Association of Minority Contractors.

Just about three months ago, in my column in San Francisco's Metro Reporter, I wrote:

"In 1963 minorities marched for 'Jobs and Freedom.' Entering into the promise of 1974, we have Freedom, but not the economic well being that should go hand in hand with meaningful freedom. Energy crisis or not, the thrust of our Nation must be to improve the economic plight of the minority American, keeping in mind a basic fact, 'The bottom must move for the top to go up.'"

If anything, this thesis is more pertinent today than when that column was being written last March. Then it appeared that the long-awaited turnaround in housing was about to become a reality. Since that time, however, we have seen that hopeful predictions, forecasts and analyses carry no guarantees of fulfillment. Inflation continued to rage, and the Federal Reserve had tightened the supply of money.

Interest rates had climbed to new highs,

and—after six months of net inflows to thrift institutions—savings banks and savings and loan associations reported a net outflow of close to a billion dollars in April.

The obvious result is that mortgage money had dried up again, and where it was available, it commanded premium interest rates that eliminated a large part of the market.

The situation was so forbidding that on May 10th President Nixon made available more than 10 billion extra dollars of mortgage money for the housing market during 1974. His actions included a 3.3-billion-dollar extension of the Ginnie Mae Tandem Plan beyond the 6.6-billion commitment made in January; a 3-billion-dollar commitment for the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation to buy up new conventional mortgages; and up to 4 billion dollars in advances by the Federal Home Loan Bank System at a rate below the current market.

These actions have indeed helped to alleviate a deteriorating situation, but it would be naive to expect that they can do much more than keep things from getting much worse. To commit many more billions to prop up the market would only be self-defeating; the resultant impetus to further inflation would more than wipe out any possible gains.

As Dr. Saul Klamman of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks put it recently, "Real help for housing will not be forthcoming until soaring prices and interest rates are whipped. The hard fact is that hope for housing is tied directly to hope for the economy."

Acknowledging these hard facts, what of the minority contractor, who in the best of times has to scramble. If majority contractors are hurting—and Lord knows they are—what hope is there for the minorities?

My purpose here today is to assure you that there is concern; to tell you that we in HUD—together with other Federal agencies—are doing a great many things to alleviate the obvious economic oppressiveness of the time, which you are surely experiencing. I'd like to advise you of some of the steps government has taken and suggest how you can take advantage of them.

In general, in the housing sector as in some other parts of the overall economy, there is a smaller pie to share at the present time. One of the deepest concerns of my office—and my personal commitment—is to make sure that minority enterprise is accorded its fair share of that pie. That is one of the vital aspects of Equal Opportunity; not that minorities get a piece of the action when everything is booming—but that minorities get a fair share of whatever action is available at any time, all the time.

The bottom must move for the top to go up—in good times and bad.

So we in HUD Equal Opportunity, and throughout the Department, ask one primary question: "How can we put dollars into the pockets of minority contractors and marginal firms?"

The fundamental answer, of course, is that we must set goals for that purpose—and then assure, on a continuing basis, that the goals are met.

I'm certain that some in this audience are about to sit back and ask, "So what else is new?"

And that is a quasi-valid question. Admittedly, good and earnest people in HUD before my time wrestled with this problem. Goals were set for minority contractors—in the Section 235 and 236 subsidy programs, as one example. They initiated a Registry of Minority Contractors. They worked with the Treasury Department on a Minority Banking Program.

However—and this is by no means a reflection on the scope or sincerity of their efforts—these kinds of things were done on a sporadic, spasmodic, hit-or-miss basis. The



old subsidized programs were in trouble, and the time was perhaps not ripe for concerted, continuous effort with comprehensive follow-through.

The Civil Rights movement achieved a momentum that cannot be denied; and in the wake of what I believe historians will call its greatest period evolved a grand strategy for minority enterprise that now not only is possible, but indispensable.

Government was challenged to design a comprehensive continuous portfolio of programs. President Nixon clearly called upon his administration to fulfill this mandate. Though embryonic, and called by some insufficient, the development is pervasive and wide-ranging.

For the first time in HUD, to begin with, we have finally established an 8(a) procurement program, in close cooperation with the Small Business Administration and in pursuance of Section 8(a) of the Small Business Act, for small minority firms. Goals have been set, in definitive quantitative terms that can be measured and assessed.

Obviously, to be meaningful, the goals we establish must be in some way quantifiable and measurable or else they are not true goals. Void of such measurement, there is no way to know whether government has attained its goals or not—or to determine how far short we may have fallen—or to know how to close the gap between what we meant to achieve and what we did accomplish.

Every Assistant Secretary at HUD has been assigned a goal of 15 percent of his direct procurement to be channeled to minority firms. To that end, each Assistant Secretary has a small business specialist on his staff; and each of our field offices is also staffed with an expert on small business.

How meaningful will this program be? Here is a clue. James Lynn, the Secretary of the Department of Housing & Urban Development, formerly was Under Secretary of the Department of Commerce and was responsible for the Minority Business Enterprise program. And let me tell you, he thinks he's still in charge by the depth of his commitment. You would believe he still feels responsible for the Program effectiveness. There is no question that all of us at HUD are determined to meet our goals, and I, as the Assistant Secretary of general programmatic responsibilities am committed to assure the Department's success.

As this fiscal year closes out—two days from now—my office will take a hard look and detailed review of our success; shortly thereafter new goals will be set for fiscal 1975.

Beyond direct procurement, my office was joined by the Assistant Secretary for Administration in encouraging each Assistant Secretary or program officer to contract when possible a good percentage of his general procurement activity to minority firms. I consider this vitally important, as many minority firms across the country were virtually paralyzed or destroyed during recent lean periods of Federal funding.

Another area of possible contract award within the Department is the grant and contract budget of the Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research.

His grant and contract budget for the upcoming years comes to 70 million dollars. The Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity has provided him with an extensive list of minority firms qualified to bid on research programs in housing, community development, energy matters, housing management, urban problems and a host of related disciplines.

My office also has an agreement and a close working relationship with the Assistant Secretary for Housing Production and Mortgage credit, who is also the FHA Commissioner. Jointly, we are extending the old construction goals program with a new emphasis on goals for Section 236 subsidized rental con-

struction and 221(d)(3) market housing construction. While we did not set quantitative goals for FY 1974, specific targets will be set for fiscal 1975. Lloyd Davis, Director of the Office of Voluntary Compliance, and staff are preparing recommendations for our consideration now.

All of HUD's field offices have been instructed to vigorously pursue minority contractor involvement in all their programs.

Other Assistant Secretaries are becoming increasingly involved in the minority goal program. The staff of the Assistant Secretary for Housing Management, for one, working closely with my staff, is engaged in establishing meaningful goals for training minorities and getting minority contractors involved in HUD's Property Disposition program. Assistant Secretary Crawford estimates a volume of home repair work of as much as 100 million dollars a year across the country. This year he initiated a series of workshops in six cities to inform contractors and local real estate brokers about this program.

Two weeks ago, the SBA, OMBE and HUD signed a tri-agency agreement to increase participation of minority and small construction contractors in our Property Disposition program. HUD provides the rehabilitation projects; SBA provides financing and surety bonding assistance; and the Office of Minority Business Enterprise offers technical and managerial support.

Actually, we accomplish two important objectives with this program. First, we reduce HUD's inventory of foreclosed properties—75,000 single-family dwellings alone. And, at the same time, we build the resources and skills of minority contractors so that they can more effectively compete and perform within the mainstream of the economy.

The second series of Assistant Secretary Crawford's workshops began in New York City on June 12th and Los Angeles on the 22nd. Others will be held in Kansas City on August 22nd, Philadelphia on September 18th, and in other cities with dates yet to be determined.

I am indeed encouraged, as you should be, by the great promise and potential of these kinds of programs. I am vigorously encouraging all of our Assistant Secretaries to fully cooperate in the Department's minority entrepreneurship program.

Also we have published a new Registry of Minority Professionals and Contractors—10 volumes with more than 8,000 listings—in all the fields connected with housing and community development. We have generously distributed copies to private sources and to most agencies within the Federal Government.

Now a Manual of Opportunities is in preparation—for contractors, subcontractors, developers, architects, planners, appraisers... the full spectrum. My office's intent is to provide a dual information program. With the Registry, those seeking minority contractors will have the best available information on minority resources available. And, at the same time, minority individuals and firms in housing and community development will have knowledge of available opportunities.

Then there is the Minority Banking Program, directed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Treasury Department certifies minority banks—our HUD field offices have been directed to encourage their funded agencies to deposit their money in minority banks.

Another approach that offers great promise is my office's Minority Distributorship Program. We encourage corporations involved in housing and community development supply products to look to minority firms as distributors, suppliers, feeders to the market area. This involves everything from doorknobs and bricks to major appliances—all of the myriad products that go into a residential unit—obviously such dis-

tributorship activities can be quite profitable.

So far—working with the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Association of Home Builders, the New York Urban Development Corporation, the Small Business Administration, OMBE and others—we have identified more than 100 corporations that could involve themselves in this very promising program. The success of this program has not been as rapid as I would like, however, our first sixth months of office involvement has been rewarding.

Now I suppose I should relate to Section 3, since the NAMC has requested priority consideration of this subject by HUD. I am delighted to be able to say that last October my office was finally able to get the Section 3 regulations of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 published in final form as most of you know, the "reg's" were published twice in the Federal Register for comment—with an extremely long delay before final publication. I am proud of the role my office played in securing the final publication. The Regulations are now out and the implementing HUD Handbook is being prepared.

My staff meets almost daily with the staff of other HUD program offices for appropriate inclusion of Section 3 in all Department programs. Just yesterday I received a staff briefing relative to Section 3 inclusion in the 701 program. To say that the implementation of Section 3 in all our programs is an intricate detailed matter is the understatement of the year.

In preparing my office goals for both FY'75 and '76, Section 3 is a priority matter. The cooperation of the Labor Department and other Federal agencies, and of course Congressional Appropriations, must be sought if Section 3 is indeed to be meaningful to America's poor.

In everything I've said so far, I think you can see that there is responsiveness internally and administratively at HUD. For the Federal government to truly be responsive to the needs of minority contractors, coordination and cooperation is essential within the total perimeters of the Federal government.

Some 15 departments and agencies were involved, for example, in the Interagency Task Force for Minority Construction, a program of the Department of Commerce, of which I was at one time the Chairperson. The Task Force was recently merged with the federal procurement task force. I am delighted to say that the specific goals set when I was chairing the Construction Task Force have been adopted for their minority construction Action Plan. We were able to "plant the seed," and it is now bearing fruit.

Finally, allow me, if I may, to offer my view as to the priorities that should be set by minority contractors for maximizing profits.

First, whenever possible, consider bidding on major projects. If your company is not large enough for this scale, consider joint ventures with other minority contractors. Or, as R. Eric Castro pointed out in his excellent article in the March-April issue of *Minority Builder*, joint ventures between minority and non-minority contractors also have advantages.

Second, if the large venture is not feasible, bid on smaller contracts within our capability to perform. It is certainly better to succeed small than to fail big. The important thing is to make a profit, have a viable business, and prepare yourself for better times and larger involvement.

And third, a final resort is property rehabilitation. In too many cases, the hiatus between abandonment of a building and all the intervening legalities leading to rehabilitation is so long that vandalism and neglect drive up the rehabilitation cost. Thus the potential profit is substantially reduced.

That is not to say that money cannot be

made in rehabilitation if your bidding acumen is sound. I have already mentioned the HUD/SBA/OMBE Property Disposition Program, and of course the Department recommends that LHAs provide minority contractors the opportunity for increased participation in public housing modernization programs. There are millions of dollars involved in both programs and goals set for minority participation.

Also, some thought should be given to substantial rehabilitation under the Section 23 program, particularly in cities such as New York with solid brick structures. If you do not bid too closely, allow for adequate profit, and for inflation factors, a reasonable profit can be made.

The assurance I wish to leave you with is that we do finally have at the Department a strategy for getting more dollars into the pockets of minority contractors. My office is aware of your needs, your concerns, and your commitment. I pledge to you the responsiveness of the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.

Economically, these may seem like the worst of times for anyone connected with housing. But from the point of view of opportunity, I am thoroughly convinced that minority groups are now entering the best of times. I urge you to make the most of them.

#### CONGRESSMAN RIEGLE AT WEU ASSEMBLY

#### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., a colleague from the Committee on Foreign Affairs and a member of the Subcommittee on Europe which I have the honor to chair, recently represented the House at the 20th session of the Western European Union Assembly which met in Paris last month. During the 4-day meeting, the WEU parliamentarians considered a number of major issues of importance to the United States in the context of the major defense issues of Europe which are the principal responsibility of the organization.

In the course of his participation, Congressman RIEGLE presented an excellent paper on the Atlantic alliance which I include below for the benefit of our colleagues:

#### RESPONDING TO NEW REALITIES WITHIN THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

(By Congressman DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.)

##### I—INTRODUCTION

It is an honor for me as an American member of Congress to be a guest at this Western European Union Assembly meeting—and to be given the opportunity to discuss with you several of the important issues within the general topic of Consultations and Decisions within the Atlantic Alliance.

The thoughts and ideas I would like to share with you are my own—and while many would be shared by my government—and my colleagues in Congress—I will not be presenting what anyone could properly call the American position.

But after 8 years in the U.S. House of Representatives—with 6 years of service on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee—and two years on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and its Subcommittee on Europe, I hope I bring a practical perspective on our Atlantic Al-

liance and the new realities we are facing together.

As one who has changed political party affiliation while serving in Congress (spending my first six years as a Republican and my last two years as a Democrat)—I would hope that I also reflect a certain bi-partisan-ship in addressing problems and issues of mutual interest.

I am here with certain very strong personal feelings concerning the past and future of Europe—and these feelings should, for reasons of clarity, be set forth early. To my mind, the best of Western civilization is rooted in the Atlantic Alliance—we, whether European or American, spring from a common heritage. Our love of life and liberty—our human values—our belief in justice, equity and freedom are a common blood line among us.

While I am an American—my mother's maiden name was Fitchett, a French name; my maternal grandmother's name was Waterman, an English name; my paternal grandfather's name, Riegle, is German. Like most Americans, my family heritage is European—and while the languages we now speak may be different—our concept of man and his destiny is a common bond that is indivisible across our national boundaries.

Whatever our national differences—we belong to the same family—and it is important that we start our discussions from this point.

##### II—POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGES

Never in the lifetimes of any of us in the room today, have international events moved so swiftly—or on such a massive scale. We must struggle to comprehend and respond to change of unprecedented dimension. In a period of months we find our world profoundly and permanently changed—not only have old crises been replaced by new ones—but we must follow the news on a daily basis to keep track of the new leadership assuming power in virtually all the Western countries. In America where we are in the midst of serious impeachment proceedings and other investigative inquiries—we may well also see a change in our national leadership before the year ends.

Along with enormous political changes, we have had to cope with other profoundly significant developments. The interruption of the energy supply—the huge increase in the cost of energy—the sharply higher price of food—and the readjustments of the dollar and the U.S. financial position in the world have combined to create difficult new realities. These new realities have necessarily contributed greatly to the difficulty of maintaining effective communication and consultation. Crises make shambles of good intentions—and we must now make a very special and concerted effort to talk candidly about our mutual problems—listening to, understanding and respecting necessary differences in individual and national viewpoint.

For these reasons and others, consultation within the Atlantic Alliance has not been adequate. That can and must change! I welcome the opportunity to discuss this vital issue with you—in a common search for answers that can help us all.

##### III—NO INSTANT ANSWERS

Before answers can be found to new problems however—whether within individual countries—within the Western European Union—within the Atlantic Alliance—or within the world community—we must first better understand these new realities. Only then can we work to formulate a process by which we can freely exchange our differing perceptions, develop an agenda of priority items for joint action, and then begin the careful and difficult work of adjusting our differences and begin to build a sound future that serves our common interests.

We would deceive ourselves if we sought instant answers—one-nation solutions—or

relied on one-man diplomacy. There are no short cuts or magic answers. Our common problems are brutally difficult and lasting—to find sound and equitable solutions will require lengthy analysis—full participation by all Western nations—and comprehensive institutional diplomacy that involves all levels of our respective national governments and private sectors. Finally, of course, everything we seek to do must come down to the level of the individual citizen—and more than ever before our respective citizens at the grassroots must be brought into the debate. We cannot hope to succeed without their counsel, creative genius and sustained commitment.

As Western nations, we face great threats in many forms—military, economic, political—and we find ourselves in a period where our historic Atlantic relationship has been bruised by careless talk, insensitivity and needless arrogance—sadly, much of it has been done by my own government.

##### IV—RECENT STRAINS IN ALLIANCE

I will not endeavor to review the long history of the Atlantic Alliance since World War II—the record is familiar to all of us. Let me refer only to the more recent history of the Atlantic relationship during the latter part of the '60's and early '70's.

During that period, American foreign policy, in my view, was substantially preoccupied with East-West questions and with our miserable involvement in Vietnam which drained away an enormous quantity of our physical and moral resources and most of our foreign policy energy. Many of our European friends saw the Indo-China issues differently than we did. This had a certain abrasive effect on our relationship. Perhaps it is a flaw in human nature that causes willful nations to resent well-intentioned advice from allies who wish to save us from self-defeating policies.

It is now well known that prominent Americans who dissented from the Vietnam policies and other practices of the Nixon/Kissinger Administration were placed on domestic "enemy" lists and subjected to harassment and intimidation. Having glimpsed that kind of reprisal psychology at work in the current Executive Branch of the American government, one should not be surprised to see that unfortunate behavior rears its head from time to time in matters of foreign policy. Hopefully, those days are now a part of the past.

##### V—GOVERNMENT OF LAW, NOT MEN

With the intent of trying to explain—rather than excuse such a tactic—I would add that while we in the Western world seek governments of law, rather than of men, we sometimes find that the administration of law is bent to express the particular character and will of the men in charge. As you know, we in America are now living through an extremely painful experience in this regard. But the lessons are important to all of us.

In overly centralized governments we frequently find excessive executive isolation—impatience with those who hold differing views—and secretly formulated international grand designs that can become dictatorial in tone and practice. When these tendencies occur, we must work to counteract them—for they are destructive to mutual cooperation and good will.

Perhaps now is as good a time as any for those of us who cherish our heritage of Western civilization and truly democratic institutions—to reflect upon the natural processes by which we come to know and express the collective will and conscience of our people. What constitutes legitimacy? At its heart it must be a collective decision-making process whether within nations—or between nations. The true strength of democracy is found in diversity—it is the sum of all the voices that finally gives true meaning to



what we do. Perhaps history's starkest lesson is that one-man rule—or one-nation rule—is a certain prescription for disaster.

#### VI—STRENGTHENING DEMOCRATIC PROCEDURES

As democratic governments have disappeared, one by one, around the world—and have been replaced by tightly centralized authoritarian regimes—we might well pause to consider how we can strengthen and preserve the essential character of our individual liberty and the integrity and effectiveness of democratic institutions.

While the leaders in the Kremlin—or any authoritarian regime—may be able to conduct efficient negotiations with outsiders—it is because individual liberties have been crushed and consolidated in an iron grip. By contrast, the democratic ethos of negotiation, consultation, and a search for mutual interest between democratic nations is more diffuse and timeconsuming—it requires patience, tolerance, good will, and respect for differing views.

There is no way to short-cut the full democratic process without killing part of its integrity. That is true within free nations—and in negotiations between free nations. Those who really understand and revere the democratic process know that it requires open and full consultation—truthfulness—a sense of dignity and honor—and collective decision-making.

#### VII—RESISTING SHORT CUTS

These qualities and principles legitimize all we do. We know that some among us would alter this process—arguing there is more to be gained by stealth, secrecy and blind faith—that the full-blown democratic process is too slow and cumbersome in matters of national security.

I believe we must resist the pleas of leaders who say to us: "This issue is too complicated to fully explain—give me the benefit of the doubt—I'll only do what is necessary—and we can sell it to our people later." There is more than the obvious authoritarian danger here—for in such cases we also forfeit broad public consensus based on full disclosure, open debate, and legitimizing expressions of national will. It is a classic and worrisome example of government from the top down—rather from the people upward. Why should we ever consent to become like our adversaries? I have no interest in a government that wishes to think for me—I seek one that wishes to think with me and with my fellow citizens.

#### VIII—LEARNING FROM THE PAST

Within the Atlantic Alliance, I believe we must also insist on the full democratic process—open and full consultation—truthfulness—a sense of dignity and honor—and collective decision-making. No head of state or foreign secretary, however brilliant or well-motivated, can ever speak for us—until he first speaks with us.

We have come a great distance since the 19th century when citizens were mere pawns in the conduct of foreign affairs—used at will by heads of state on a balance of power chess board. Much blood and effort has since gone to change that—to secure our individual freedom—to elevate us to the point where we are now self-governing—to free us from the imposition of grand designs devised by others.

I would hope that between us we could strive to elevate these guiding principles within the Atlantic Alliance—and within our respective nations. It is a matter that each one of us can do something about.

#### IX—FUTURE OF EUROPEAN UNION

There is much comment today—and some question about—the goal of complete European unity—of a consolidated Europe that is integrated militarily, economically and politically—a Europe which speaks with one voice. Who knows to what extent such ultimate consolidation is practical and possible?

Certainly we have already seen major progress in European cooperation and common purpose in recent years.

Much has been accomplished, and one senses that further consolidation is in the offing. From an American point of view, this seems a most healthy and encouraging development. A stronger more unified Europe is fully consistent with the moral, philosophical, strategic, and economic interests of the United States—and is so viewed by many Americans.

As an American trying to view the issue from a European perspective, I believe that there would be virtue and added strength in full European union. A united Europe speaking with one voice on strategic matters would have enormous influence—within the Atlantic Alliance and throughout the world. But clearly, full European union, if it is to occur, must be conceived and produced by Europeans. The initiative, creative genius, and will must come from this side of the Atlantic—from you and others. And while we Americans would welcome and encourage this movement, we Americans should be very sensitive to the fact that Europe must speak and act for itself—that true Atlantic partnership must preserve and respect the unique character and differing national interests found on both sides of the Atlantic. In adjusting our differences to reach a common interest or position—one voice should never be louder than the others. The stronger we are country by country—in Europe as a whole or in America—then the stronger our Atlantic Alliance will be. In the end, a strong Atlantic Alliance is essential to the peace, liberty, and future prosperity of the citizens of all our respective nations.

So we must not allow our vital cooperative efforts to be slowed or injured—whether by bad manners—excessive national selfishness—harsh outbursts of reprisal psychology—institutional sluggishness and short sightedness—or by clinging to familiar old habits and ideas that are irrelevant in the face of new realities.

The future of European political and economic union is closely related to the question of European defense. I believe there is a special responsibility for the countries of the European community to study, and if you judge it useful or even necessary, to propose initiatives in the area of improved European defense cooperation.

#### X—COLLECTIVE DEFENSE EFFORTS

Under the new circumstances of severe economic and political stress, one wonders how much collective military defense we will be able to afford within the Atlantic Alliance—and who will pay for it. It would appear that the economic pressures I cite below will force reductions in planned governmental spending in all the Western nations.

Yet we know that collective security within the Alliance requires a careful and rational balance of forces—properly deployed—with the cost distributed on a reasonable and just basis. We also know that whether we face good times or bad times we can never afford defense arrangements that fall short of our basic security needs. But just as clearly—and in light of the new realities we face together—we owe it to ourselves to provide these necessary defense arrangements at minimum cost. Multiple, overlapping and competitive weapons systems not only increase our collective cost, but also reduce the aggregate amount of security we are able to purchase with available resources. The same questions apply to the make-up and deployment of military manpower.

#### XI—IMPROVED DEFENSE EFFICIENCY

It seems to me the time has come for the members of the Atlantic Alliance to seriously work together toward the common goal of achieving a more efficient and effective West-

ern defense establishment. Such a step would of course require an honest exchange between Western countries on military research and development information—a sensitive but profoundly important necessity. It would mean working to achieve advance agreement on standardized weapons design—and opening up the procurement process to competitive bidding within an agreed-to framework that balanced contract production between member nations.

Economic realities, security needs and common sense would all seem to indicate that the time has come to formulate a unified Alliance defense procurement policy. Obviously this is a very complicated and sensitive task—but can we really afford to do otherwise? I think not.

#### XII—FUTURE OF NATO

Speaking as an American, I would first emphasize that the U.S. conventional defense forces stationed here in Europe and the nuclear shield we maintain for Europe and the free world exist for one purpose—to protect our individual and collective freedom. No knowledgeable person on either side of the Atlantic should doubt the permanence of that American commitment no matter what adjustments are discussed and mutually agreed to in our overall defense arrangements with Europe.

This leads to the question of the future of NATO. In reviewing the successful 25 year history of NATO—one wonders how the organization should be modernized and reshaped to meet new realities and changing conditions. History suggests that the next 25 years will require an integrated defense structure quite different from that which we have known in the past.

Current American preoccupation in other foreign policy spheres—and an apparent American complacency with existing NATO arrangements—have made it difficult for Europeans to engage the American government in direct consultation about the future structure and direction of NATO.

With recurring U.S. pressures for American troop reductions in Europe, and changing military and budgetary capabilities within the various Western European countries, it seems to me that the time has arrived for direct transatlantic discussions on the future of NATO. Repeated indications on the European side of the Alliance of a desire to move in the direction of seeking some consolidation and streamlining of European-based defense capability should be met by American encouragement and participation. Whether the European initiative centers itself within the Eurogroup—within the Western European Union or in some other separate institution—it is vitally important that the U.S. engage in a dialogue and provide clear signals as to its own future intentions in Atlantic Alliance defense matters.

Pressing economic considerations suggest that major cost efficiencies must be sought and accomplished in the overall areas of weapons systems and military manpower. Most observers feel that some fat has accumulated in the NATO defense structure—if so, we must determine where it exists—how much can wisely be trimmed—and how we can improve the ratio of our combat ready forces to support personnel—both within the U.S. manpower component and among all other allied manpower. These issues and others are both relevant and timely—and I hope that those of us who share these concerns can continue to apply constructive pressure to bring about direct transatlantic discussions on NATO arrangements and other military issues of mutual interest.

#### XIII—PUBLIC SUPPORT OF NATO

Another important issue directly affecting Atlantic Alliance defense requirements and capabilities is that of shifting generational attitudes toward large-scale and permanent

military mobilization. Europeans age 40 and over have a vivid recollection of World War II and tend to support more willingly the maintenance of ready military capability equal to any threat that might come from the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe. Those under the age of 40 tend to feel less alarm—and we are expressing a growing reluctance to bear the heavy financial and social burdens of continued large-scale military mobilization. With each passing year, the balance of public opinion is tending to shift away from support for full-scale military readiness—and one wonders how best to deal with this problem.

As one who was 6 years old in 1944—I, too, have difficulty fully visualizing the ravages of World War II—and while I support the maintenance of Western military force levels adequate to assure deterrence—my European and American friends over 40 do so with a passion born of searing personal experience.

This issue serves to illustrate why public policy in democratic societies must be fully and openly discussed—and finally hammered out in the public arena for all to see and hear. If we are to convince emerging generations to maintain military preparedness—it must come from persuasion—from open and full debate—from carefully building an informed public consensus that is durable. Diplomatic or political shortcuts around public opinion are self-defeating—for after all it is finally our citizens who must pay the bills, fight the wars—and ultimately provide the human energy for all our national policies. We must do more to bring our people into the debate on these important questions—and I especially applaud the new government of France for moving to lower the voting age to 18 years—for it is an important step in that direction.

#### XIV—WHY DEFENSE REFORM IS URGENT

It is critical that we realize that if we fail to engage the post-World War II generations in this process, we cannot hope to succeed in the urgent task of reforming our defense organization. We will either undertake this reform with the fullest support and understanding of those newer generations or we commit ourselves—as parliamentarians and as defense planners—to the sterility of increasing isolation from a majority of our constituents. Defense cooperation must be a democratically-based procedure or NATO, however successful today, will increasingly become a museum reflecting endeavors of the past.

If we, as parliamentarians, can help stimulate greater public interest and participation in the issues of national and foreign policy—we provide our governments with greater vitality, stronger collective purpose and national solidarity. If each country within the Atlantic Alliance is so strengthened, then the Alliance itself can achieve its maximum strength and potential.

#### XV—ATTITUDES IN CONGRESS

Let me now share with you my perceptions of current attitudes and realities within the U.S. Congress so that we might better understand how Congress in the months ahead might behave toward issues and policies affecting the Atlantic Alliance. First and foremost, all Members of Congress are today particularly sensitive to the urgent human problems they find within their respective districts across the United States.

In my own case, I represent an industrialized automotive community centered around Flint, Michigan. Over 80,000 of my constituents are members of the United Auto Workers Union. The energy crisis has had a devastating effect on my district—producing an unemployment level that has ranged from 12% to 20%. In addition, my people are struggling to cope with rampant inflation, running at an annual rate of 13.5% in the first quarter of this year.

Within the past two months I mailed a public opinion questionnaire to my 450,000 constituents—and some 25,000 citizens responded. In answer to a question asking, "What are the three most important problems facing you and your family today?", 91% of the respondents listed inflation as the major problem facing them, 31% listed taxes, and 23% listed energy problems.

You will see that the percentage responses to the question posed below reinforce the strong public concern about current economic issues.

#### Excerpt from questionnaire

As you try to look ahead for 1974, how concerned are you about the economic outlook? Which answer best describes your current feeling about the next 12 months?

a. Not too concerned—think it will turn out to be a pretty good year, 4.2%

b. Somewhat concerned—think things may be tough temporarily but will probably straighten out in a few months, 32.0%

c. I'm as worried as I've ever been—deeply concerned. I have real doubts about the economic future, 63.8%.

#### XVI—THE CITIZEN AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Clearly, my district is demanding national policies which will confront and solve these immediate problems. Citizen interest in foreign affairs is a distant second to the immediate problems of meeting the monthly mortgage payment on the house and car—and feeding one's family.

When my constituents are directly questioned about their attitudes on foreign affairs there are three principal concerns usually expressed: 1) that we avoid another Vietnam, 2) that we take steps to see that American jobs are not lost to foreign workers—particularly in the manufacture of automobiles, and 3) that the American government spend less time and money on foreign affairs—and put more emphasis on solving urgent domestic problems. There is considerably less interest at the citizen level about such distant and complex foreign policy issues as the SALT talks—MBFR—American troop levels in Europe—and international monetary policy.

For the moment the American people are angry about the sudden reduction of their living standard brought about about by rising prices—they are worried about their economic future—and they are demanding governmental action that will protect their economic well-being.

The U.S. Congress, suffering as it does from certain organizational deficiencies, does not as yet know how to respond to this condition. Normally a strong Executive Branch would take the national initiative in America and formulate a policy response—but Watergate paralysis has left the Executive Branch badly crippled and leaderless.

#### XVII—CONSTITUENT PRESSURES

If serious inflation continues, citizen pressure can build in a way that might ultimately force radical policy changes in the United States. As America's focus is drawn inward—toward immediate domestic problems—one can sense potential important negative foreign policy repercussions just over the horizon.

Should inflation continue at a high rate, for example, and the American agricultural harvest fall significantly below projected levels—we could expect to see mounting public pressure for governmental embargoes on the export of American food commodities. If unemployment rises further in America, one can logically expect growing pressure for restrictive foreign trade barriers—to keep out competitive foreign products. If Federal Government budget reductions are required to slow the inflation rate, one can expect increasing public pressure for cuts in American military expenditures abroad and for further

cuts in our already shrunken foreign aid program.

I suspect that most parliamentarians here today face similar pressures and problems within their constituencies; inflation, particularly, is a world-wide disease that spares no one.

If so, then we can see how citizen pressures in America to fight inflation and cut government spending are really no different from what we would find in European countries. As fellow parliamentarians, we will be called upon to exercise an extraordinary measure of leadership and legislative skill during this difficult period. Whatever answers are found must ultimately come from the parliaments of the countries in the Atlantic Alliance. It is an awesome responsibility that we face together.

#### XVIII—ADJUSTING TO NEW ECONOMIC REALITIES

As we in Western parliaments struggle then to understand and deal with the new economic realities facing us, there are certain inescapable agenda items that are vitally important to the relationships among our countries—and therefore bear on the future of the Atlantic Alliance.

The first of these is the need to move ahead in the development of a new international monetary system which will establish and maintain more stable currency exchange relationships among nations.

Secondly, as part of a new world monetary system, we must develop better mechanisms for handling the adjustment of balance of payments surpluses or deficits among nations, with the burden of adjustment more equitably shared than has been the case in the past.

A third matter concerns the need to better understand and take account of significant changes in the character of our trading relationships. The existing trading rules and patterns were developed in a period of relatively abundant and cheap raw materials. This situation has now changed. In coming decades the question of the adequacy of supply will receive as much attention as the question of the adequacy of demand, which has been the major preoccupation of recent economic policy. These changing world realities support the need for serious trade negotiations—and it is vitally important that the American Congress act this year on a trade bill and I believe we will.

A fourth item concerns the real and urgent needs of the less developed nations—and the fact that the industrialized nations must do more to assist them. The developing countries must participate in designing a new monetary system and new trade policies.

A fifth consideration concerns the need to undertake a fundamental re-examination of the basic premises of our traditional economic behavior. Economic growth has many virtues. However, growth in the future must be carefully weighed against other qualitative factors. The question of quality of life versus quantity of life is a real one which must be addressed.

We have reached a point where a number of potential obliterating forces have combined to suspend the very survival of mankind in the center of a delicately balanced equation. More of the old ways—arms races—wars—an exploding world population—unlimited resource consumption—continued harm to our environment—can only spell disaster for mankind. In short, we must change our ways if we are to avoid future chaos and misery.

#### XIX—MORE LEADERSHIP FROM PARLIAMENTARIANS

I have saved for the end the words of appreciation I wish to express for this opportunity to share my candid thoughts and observations with you.

While I have spoken at length about vital issues of mutual interest—and have sug-



gested some steps that might be taken together—I hope my remarks have conveyed the positive feelings of hope and promise that I have about the future of Europe and the Atlantic Alliance.

Working together I believe we are equal to all the challenges that confront us. While the way forward is not precisely clear—I believe that with full consideration and good will we can find equitable and sound ways to deal with the new realities facing us.

I would emphasize again the expanding role I believe parliamentarians must play in helping formulate new foreign policy awareness and support for the initiatives we finally take. As elected leaders privileged to have the most intimate and regular contact with our citizens—I believe we are best equipped to voice our national aspirations—and to thus help shape our collective aspirations—and actions within the alliance.

Of all the new realities—I hope a growing foreign policy role of Western parliamentarians will prove to be the most beneficial.

Thank you.

#### AMERICAN NO-SPEAK

### HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to an editorial by Walter Hauser appearing in the July 7 Washington Star-News. Mr. Hauser is a member of the history faculty at the University of Virginia and co-chairman of the South Asia Committee at that university.

The article eloquently states the need for continued funding of foreign language and area centers programs in colleges and universities across the Nation. It is foolhardy to think that the United States can remain a leader of the free world unless it has specialists trained in the language and cultures of the various countries in the world. As the article so aptly points out, the United States could not adequately deal with Vietnam problems because there were so few of our citizens who understood the culture of Southeast Asia and the motivation of its citizens.

Federal assistance for training in foreign languages and area studies is fully justified and I hope my colleagues in the House and Senate will share my views and together provide the necessary funding for this program.

The article follows:

#### AMERICAN NO-SPEAK

There is a Russian story about a mouse who dived into a hole in the wall for safety from a pursuing cat. Waiting for the cat to go away, the mouse heard a dog barking and came out, confident that the cat would not remain in the vicinity of a barking dog. Whereupon the cat, as he pounced upon the emerging mouse, said exultantly, "Ah, how useful it is to know a foreign language."

The story is pertinent in 1974, because there is a danger that President Nixon's budget proposals for foreign language and area studies may put Americans in the position of the untutored mouse as we move into an increasingly complex and interdependent world in the mid-1970s.

There is an irony in all of this at a time when the secretary of state and the President

are carrying their initiatives for peace and detente personally to the nations and peoples of the world. One might assume that these initiatives would be accompanied by increased levels of funding for international education not only to train specialists and technicians to provide the nation a pool of experts for work in government, business and education, but to create a broader citizen awareness necessary to support Mr. Nixon's programs for a peaceful world. That is not the case.

At a time when the administration is requesting nearly \$100 billion for the Pentagon in Fiscal Year 1975 for increased military expenditures, it is seeking to reduce funds for training language and area specialists under the National Defense Education Act to \$8.64 million. This recommended level is about \$4 million less than the Congress appropriated last year after the administration recommended no funding at all for this program. It is nearly \$10 million less than the \$18 million for Fiscal Year 1975 being urged by educational associations across the country. This figure is also less than the administration promised in 1970 through Patrick Moynihan, then special counsel to the President. Moynihan maintained that a level of \$18 million for foreign language and area study programs funded through NDEA would be supported until the establishment of the National Foundation for Higher Education. The foundation has not been created nor has the administration maintained its commitment. That is why the story of the cat and the mouse continues to have meaning in 1974.

In 1958, through the National Defense Education Act, administered by the Office of Education in HEW, the Congress made a clear statement about the importance of languages in providing for the education of future citizens and specialists trained to know something about other parts of the world. In 1974 the networks of our relationships with other nations are infinitely more complex than they were in 1958, both in hard political and economic terms and in the broad range of cultural contact, and other interactions having to do with the environment, health, space, science and technology.

The fact is, we will continue to have to make judgments about the Middle East, Africa, South Asia, East Asia, Southeast Asia, the Soviet Union and Latin America involving our specific national interests and the well-being of the larger community of nations.

If we learned anything from our grim experience in Vietnam in the 1960s it is that we were not in a position to make sensible judgments about the issue as it arose. This was in part because we did not have even a handful of people in this country who knew the language, politics or culture of Vietnam. Our decisions were made largely in ignorance.

Through programs such as NDEA and the Special Foreign Currency Program of the Office of Education we have begun to develop in the United States an educational capability in our colleges and universities to fill this gap and to meet our responsibility effectively. The need to enhance this capability is great, the importance of maintaining it is crucial.

The effects of reduced funding and program re-allocations can be seen both at national and institutional levels and the results are equally disturbing. For example, in 1972-73 there were 106 language and area centers in American colleges and universities assisted by the Office of Education under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act.

In 1973-74 the Office of Education funded only 50 language and area centers, and equally important, substantially reduced the number of National Defense Foreign Language fellowships for students engaged in

long-term specialized training programs in these critical languages and areas.

The reduction of the Office of Education Special Foreign Currency Program from \$3 million to \$1 million in Fiscal Year 1974 has had much the same effect, for example, reducing the number of fellowships for intensive summer language study in India and other fellowship programs of the American Institute of Indian Studies and similar agencies.

Any university exists to expand the limits of man's knowledge and understanding of the universe in which he lives. There is an intrinsic importance therefore in studying the languages and social, political and cultural forms of peoples and nations with whom we inhabit this planet.

Ultimately, however, there is also a national responsibility, a federal responsibility to share with the universities the cost of academic programs that are directed to meet specific national needs. The programs described here represent such needs, not only to train specialists and technicians to provide the nation a pool of experts for work in government, business and education, but to create a broader awareness of today's interdependent world at all levels of American society.

By any philosophy of government, however conservative, the federal government has a role to play jointly with the universities, the states and the foundations.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN D. CALAS, SR.

### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that recognition by one's peers is the highest accolade that can be accorded a person; and this is true, since only one's friends, associates, and colleagues know the true measure, the total worth, the faults, and the strengths of an individual.

According to this definition, the Honorable John D. Calas, Sr., mayor pro tempore of Carson, Calif., and a good friend of mine, has attained the "highest accolade that can be accorded" an individual, since he was recently recognized by both local and areawide citizens for his years of dedicated service in the Los Angeles locale.

Certainly one of the most influential and effective leaders in the area, John was honored by his peers as the "Democrat of the Year" in the 44th Assembly District; and as "Democrat of the Year" in the entire county of Los Angeles, including 79 incorporated cities, with almost 2 million registered Democrats—the first such award ever given a South Bay resident.

And, Mr. Speaker, the reasons that he was chosen to receive these awards are obvious when you examine his records of achievements covering nearly a half century.

A resident of Carson for the past 43 years, John Calas is a successful businessman and an active and dedicated leader in numerous State and local governmental, political, civic, educational, youth, and fraternal organizations.

John has devoted a great deal of his time and talents to the Democratic

Party on the city, county, and State levels. He is a charter member and president of the city of Carson Democratic Club, as well as a member of the Lakewood Democratic Club. Since 1970, John has served on the Los Angeles County Democratic Central Committee, and has ably represented our area for a number of years on the Democratic State Central Committee.

He was first elected to the Carson City Council to fill a vacancy, and was subsequently reelected to a 4-year term in 1972. He presently serves as the city's mayor pro tempore, as well as Carson's "Senior Citizens" representative in Los Angeles County. In addition, Mr. Calas is a member of Carson's Redevelopment Agency.

John D. Calas' record in civic affairs is a long and illustrious one, highlighted by his seven terms as president of the Carson Chamber of Commerce. In this capacity, and as a member of numerous ad hoc committees, he has worked tirelessly for the improvement of the Carson area, especially in the fields of health, safety, and education. He will long be remembered for his successful efforts in helping to establish California State College at Dominguez Hills in the city of Carson, and for his influence in the college's development.

Even with all his other activities, John D. Calas, Sr., has found time to zealously support philanthropic and charitable programs such as the United Fund, March of Dimes, Red Cross, Shriners Hospital for Crippled Children, and the City of Hope. He has also established a "Calas" yearly scholarship for Carson High School.

Mr. Calas' fraternal affiliations include life memberships in the Redondo Beach Elks Lodge No. 1378, the Redondo Beach Masonic Lodge No. 328, and the Los Angeles Al Maliaka Shrine Temple. He is a charter member of the Dominguez-Carson Rotary Club and the Carson Odd Fellows Lodge No. 500.

John D. Calas certainly could not have achieved this long list of accomplishments without the support and assistance of his lovely wife Kay. They have been married for 28 years and are the proud parents of Chuck, John, Jr., Frank, Jim, and Tom.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to honor a successful businessman, and Government, political, and civic leader—a truly fine and exemplary American—the Honorable John D. Calas, Sr.

#### HIGH PRAISE FOR MAYOR TOM BRADLEY OF LOS ANGELES

**HON. THOMAS M. REES**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago Tom Bradley became mayor of Los Angeles. In his 12 months in office he has not only become a leader in southern California, but indeed a national leader in seeking a better way of life for those who live in cities.

I include in the RECORD an article from the Los Angeles Times assessing Tom Bradley's first successful year in office: [From the Los Angeles Times, June 30, 1974]

**TOM BRADLEY: CONFIDENCE, WIT AND WARMTH**  
(By David Shaw)

Tom Bradley walks down the hallway of the new Central City Community Mental Health Center, having just had lunch with the men most responsible for building and staffing the center.

Bradley is going to be a few minutes late for his next appointment, at City Hall, but as he strides briskly toward his car, he hears the applause and squealing of young children.

"What's that?" he asks his escort.  
"Graduation. A grammar school."

"Which one?"  
"West Vernon."

Bradley grins and turns on his heels, away from his waiting car, toward the room with the schoolchildren.

As he walks in, the students and their parents and teachers rise to give him a spontaneous standing ovation.

Bradley steps on stage and speaks briefly to the students.

"I remember when I was where you are now," he says in those soft, measured tones. "There wasn't much hope for me or the others who went to 20th St. Elementary School then, but there's a great deal of opportunity for all of you now."

"The only thing that can stop you is you. Dream big dreams, work hard, study hard and listen to your teachers. Above all, get along with each other."

"You can be anything your heart wants you to be."

It is a short speech, entirely unprepared, but it is warm and moving.

On his way back to the car, Bradley pauses: "I just remembered. I should have thanked them. Last year, during the campaign, the students at that school got interested in me; they brought their pennies and nickels to school, and their teacher sent me their contribution."

"It came to \$4.36."

The Tom Bradley who walked, uninvited, into the West Vernon Elementary School graduation and delivered, unsolicited, that impromptu speech is a different man, in some small but significant ways, from the Tom Bradley who was inaugurated as mayor one year ago tomorrow.

The "old" Tom Bradley would not have walked into that ceremony.

Tom Bradley never really has been a public politician because he never really has been a public man. He's a very private man, in fact, a man who values his own privacy and so values the privacy of others.

He is uncomfortable intruding on others, as a campaigning politician is required to do almost constantly, but he is a little more willing to intrude now than he was a year ago—perhaps because he realizes that what may seem an intrusion to him is often a favor to others: A visit from a campaigning politician may be an imposition; a visit from the mayor is a compliment.

More important than the change brought about by Bradley's new status, though, is the change in the man himself.

Bradley always has been confident, but he has rarely projected that confidence in public. He always seemed stiff, awkward, ill at ease, unsure of himself.

Not now.

The Tom Bradley who spoke to the West Vernon graduates was supremely self-confident. You could see it in the buoyancy of his stride, hear it in the timbre of his voice.

It is the same with the Bradley sense of humor—heretofore rarely displayed in public, yet ever present in private.

Mayor Bradley, as opposed to Officer Bradley and City Councilman Bradley and candidate Bradley, has become quite a joker. Oh, he's no Buddy Hackett yet. He never will be. Humor has, however, become an integral part of his public posture, usually improvised, no longer strained or forced.

At a recent luncheon, Bradley noticed that a rapidly melting dessert of ice cream and strawberries was being delayed until after his remarks.

With a stern face, pulling himself up to his full 6 feet 4 inches, he gestured toward the waitresses and said:

"If I may lend some additional executive authority to these young ladies before they turn into schizophrenics, perhaps they could serve the dessert now."

Two nights later, when he was named "Man of the Year" by the Harvard Club of Southern California, Bradley told the club's 160 guests he was especially proud of so prestigious an award because it would prove to his wife how important he really is.

"You know," he said, "that behind every successful man, there's a woman saying, 'You ain't nothing.'"

A few days ago, speaking to a group of businessmen in Century City, Bradley said he was a little late because a radio broadcast in the car had mentioned a national hookers convention, "and we had quite a time convincing the two reporters traveling with me to come here first."

"I did promise them," he said, "that we'd try to get through here early so they could catch the tail end of it."

Even Bradley's aides were surprised by that remark. For all his loosening up, he has remained remarkably straitlaced for a man of 56, and they consider it a triumph of political strategy and humanization when they can prompt him to swear a little.

One aide who recently left her City Hall job was thrilled when Bradley told her, "I'm going to miss you like hell."

"For Tom," she said, "that's using bad language; it shows he really thought I'd done a great job."

Bradley is equally conservative about his dress, rarely taking off his jacket, even at his City Hall desk.

Another manifestation of Bradley's personal conservatism is his continuing discomfort with the rhetoric and hyperbole of the political arena.

Bradley is the kind of man who will look around on a hot and gloriously clear summer day and say quietly:

"It's a good day for the beach." Not a "great" day, mind you; not a "sensational" day or a "fantastic" day. A good day.

Thus, when Bradley was introduced at a Democratic Party reception last week as the man whose election marked a turning point in the party's history, he seemed clearly uneasy with the accolade. Similarly, when—moments later—he urged the party, "On to victory in November," it sounded more like an obligatory proclamation than a ringing call to arms.

In time, perhaps, even these scenes will become easy for Bradley to play. But for now, he's far more content being mayor than playing politician.

For Tom Bradley, being mayor means essentially three things:

Work. Work. Work.

The two keynotes of the Bradley administration have been activism and accessibility, and both require an immense investment of time and energy.

Bradley leaves his home by 8 a.m., often earlier, every day, and rarely returns before 11 that night—partly because he almost invariably insists on remaining for a full program, rather than leave as soon as he has made his speech or accepted or presented his award. ("Only a creep leaves early," he says.)

Bradley has been able to eat dinner with



his wife only about once every two weeks, and he has had only six days off in the last year.

Unless he has a noon meeting, he usually eats lunch at his City Hall desk—generally an egg salad sandwich and a glass of milk—without even bothering to take off his jacket.

"I have trouble keeping up with him," says one of the police officers assigned to Bradley's personal security force. "When I get home at the end of one of those 15-hour days, I'm beat. Thank God, we get a day off every three days. I don't know how he keeps going."

Bradley has a tight schedule, and he moves quickly from appointment to appointment, literally running up and down the three flights of stairs from the City Hall garage to his office, still agile on legs that ran the quarter-mile at UCLA more than 30 years ago.

"The only complaint I have about my job," Bradley says, "is that there just isn't enough time in the day to get all the things done I want to do."

That is especially true of those days—one each month—when Bradley visits different parts of the city to meet with concerned citizens.

Last Thursday, for example, was West Los Angeles' day. It began with breakfast, a short speech and a question-and-answer session with members of the Century City Economic Development Group. From there, Bradley visited a group of Indians, then walked in and out of several Hollywood Blvd. stores, talking to merchants and shoppers.

He next visited a church to talk about various community programs, had lunch with senior citizens and toured Century City stores to visit again with merchants and shoppers. After a two-hour work session in City Hall, he returned to West Los Angeles for a well attended community meeting.

Everywhere he went, people praised Bradley for his accomplishments and his accessibility.

"You're the first mayor we ever had who cared enough to come ask what we think," one shopper in Century City told him.

Bradley's aides think he may be too accessible.

"He'll talk to anyone about anything, sometimes without going through proper channels," says Dep. Mayor Maurice Weiner.

But that is exactly the spirit Bradley wants to foster in the city.

One day a couple of weeks ago, a new City Hall secretary walked into his private office, without an appointment, just to introduce herself. Bradley was delighted that she knew she could do that.

Accessibility requires patience, though. Often Bradley must endure long, boring visits from people he has neither the time nor the inclination to see.

Fortunately, the one quality, above all others, that he possesses in abundance—sometimes to his own detriment—is patience.

He may have a dozen pressing matters awaiting his attention—and six aides all but pounding on his door to get in—but he will sit calmly listening to a Canadian tourist drone on about the House of Lords, Canadian radio programming, her Scottish upbringing, long-distance telephone rates and the problems of old age.

He not only listened to the woman, seemingly with rapt attention, but asked a few questions, laughed at all the appropriate points and offered to have his picture taken with her.

Bradley says he thinks his accessibility—and visibility—are essential to his program for the city, and toward that end, he has been holding open house in his office once a month.

On "open-house" day, any citizen can come

talk to the mayor, without an appointment or any preliminary screening. The first open house drew more than 300 citizens. The most recent drew 189.

Bradley realizes that his frenetic pace and constant public activity give rise to the criticism that his first year in office has been all show and no substance. He resents that charge.

"For too long," he says, "people were given the impression that the mayor of Los Angeles didn't have the power to do anything. What we're doing is showing that just isn't true."

"We're laying the groundwork for what lies ahead. We've shown people that they have a working mayor who can and will get things done. We've shown them they have a mayor that anyone in the city can come see personally if they want to. We've established lines of communication and a spirit of cooperation that didn't exist before between the city and other levels of government. All that is very important."

Kenneth Hahn, chairman of the county Board of Supervisors, agrees.

"I don't think I ever was in Sam Yorty's office in 12 years," Hahn says. "I've been in Bradley's office four or five times already."

Beyond the intangibles of activism and accessibility and cooperation, Bradley points to "real accomplishments" by his administration in three areas:

Race relations.

The energy crisis.

Rapid transit.

"It took only about three months, at most," Bradley says, "for people to stop talking about me as 'the black mayor' and start talking about me as 'the mayor'."

Even the death threats Bradley receives reflect the fulfillment of his campaign promise to be "the mayor of all the people."

In the first few months of his administration, he received countless threats that called him "nigger." Like any public figure, he still receives threats. But now, says appointments secretary Phil DePoian, "They just want to kill him because he's the mayor." No more "nigger."

Bradley tends to bridle at questions about what it is like being a black mayor in a predominantly white city, but he does not ignore the issue. He even jokes about it on occasion.

Praised at an Indian function for arriving "on paleface time, not Indian time," Bradley grinned broadly and said, "What do you mean 'paleface' time?"

Many prominent conservatives who were apprehensive at the thought of Bradley in City Hall have come to accept and respect him. That respect was obvious one day recently when Bradley ate with a group of such men—known as the committee of 25—at Perino's.

"It began as relief," one committee member admits, "but now it's genuine respect. They see how hard he's working and what a good job he's doing."

One guest at the committee of 25 dinner was Harold Williams, dean of the UCLA Graduate School of Management. Bradley recruited Williams to coordinate the city's efforts during the energy crisis early this year, and the manner in which he was recruited tells something about Bradley's activism.

When Williams' name was proposed to him, Bradley called to make an appointment. Unfortunately, Bradley had a dinner engagement that evening, he told Williams. Williams suggested they meet the next day.

No, Bradley said, "How about later tonight? Can I come by your house about 10?"

Bradley was subjected to tremendous pressure during the energy crisis, especially by businessmen who saw imminent financial disaster in the Department of Water and Power proposals for a 50-hour work-week and rolling blackouts.

But the city survived the crisis, and Brad-

ley remained unflappable throughout—another of his dominant traits.

When he is angry, he speaks in more measured tones, and there is a slight tightening of the skin around the eyes. That's all. Even last week, when he repeatedly had to interrupt his West Los Angeles activities to answer newsmen's questions about his daughter's altercation with police over a traffic citation, he remained calm and imperturbable.

Once, when a television cameraman ran out of film in the middle of a question about the incident, Bradley not only waited for him to reload—rather than use the delay as an excuse to hustle off to his next appointment—he actually helped the cameraman reload.

"There's not another politician in the country who would have stayed around for that question," said one Bradley aide, his voice tinged with the awe and adulation so common to the Bradley staff.

The only subject Bradley was questioned on more frequently that day than his daughter's troubles was rapid transit. It is the same everywhere he goes.

"Rapid transit," he says, "is constantly on the front burner."

During his campaign last year, Bradley promised to break ground on a rapid transit system within 18 months after his inauguration.

That, he now realizes, is impractical. But he insists the passage of Proposition 5 earlier this month and the scheduled vote on another rapid transit financing measure this November "puts us right on schedule."

He can, he says, symbolically break ground somewhere if the November ballot measure passes. That would enable him to say he had fulfilled his campaign pledge.

"But that would just be a hollow political gesture," he says. "Passing the ballot measure will be a real symbol. After all these years and all those studies, it will mean Los Angeles is finally going to have a rapid transit system."

"Sam Yorty said the mayor didn't have the power to do anything about rapid transit. We're going to show that's not so. We've been meeting with city and county and federal officials and we're going to work for victory on the ballot in November."

Bradley is certainly not power-hungry—far from it—but he clearly enjoys the exercise of power for what he perceives as just ends. He's far more comfortable, he says, as an executive than he ever was in 10 years as a city councilman.

"The council debates used to bore me," he says. "That's why I had them install a special telephone on the east wall of the council chambers. I spent most of my time talking on the phone during the debates."

Bradley still spends much of his time talking on the telephone, and—unlike most top-level executives, in business or politics—he places all his own calls himself.

"I don't have time," he says, "to play the game of having my secretary call their secretary. It doesn't take all that much energy to dial my own phone."

There have been other changes in City Hall—a number of them winning Bradley converts among previously hard-core Yorty supporters.

One man who has been very close to both administrations and was initially quite hostile to Bradley now says simply, "I voted for the wrong man."

Tom Bradley has yet to use the helicopter that used to carry Sam Yorty to and from work, and he has been equally assiduous in avoiding some of the other trappings of his predecessor's regime.

He has greatly reduced the size and activity of mayor's press staff, for example, saying, "Their job is to communicate what we're doing, not promote me."

As a symbolic economy measure, he has also taken the telephone out of his official car and insisted that his press aides make coffee for themselves for press conferences, rather than buy it from the cafeteria.

"We don't even put out whole doughnuts for the press any more," laughs press secretary Bob Kholos. "Tom has us cutting each one in quarters now."

Bradley has visited Sacramento and Washington to lobby for the city, but he has traveled little outside of that, despite being president of the National League of Cities.

He has turned down all but a handful of out-of-state speaking engagements, for example, although the flow of invitations averaged 100 a day last year and still averages 50 a day.

There's enough to do in Los Angeles without going anywhere else," he says.

#### TRIBUTE TO LEWIS DESCHLER, HOUSE PARLIAMENTARIAN

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, to the many tributes accorded Lew Deschler on his retirement as our Parliamentarian, I wish to add my own deeply felt praise and congratulations as this outstanding public servant relinquishes what is generally regarded as the most important post on the staff of the House of Representatives.

His service has been long and of extraordinary distinction. Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives since 1928, Lew Deschler has been an integral part of the history made in this Chamber. He has made advisory decisions of momentous consequence in the conduct of the American people's business here in our Nation's greatest public forum.

He has risen to every occasion where his vast knowledge and eminent fairness have been sought to resolve difficult parliamentary matters. His reputation for wise counsel and impartiality has been an important part not only of the successful performance of his own complex duties but of the efficient execution of this body's lawmaking responsibilities.

Lew Deschler is retiring in his 50th year of House service. Appointed a House employee at the Speaker's desk in 1925, he became Assistant Parliamentarian in 1927. And Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives in 1928. At all times, he has served at the pleasure of the Speaker of the House and has done so at the pleasure of no less than nine Speakers. They accurately judged their man, and he has given us his evaluation of them.

Of these Speakers of the House, he has recently written:

No one ever becomes Speaker of the House of Representatives unless he has great intelligence and ability and high probity, and unless he commands the respect of his colleagues. All of these nine Speakers were eminently qualified to follow and enhance the traditions of the House of Representatives. Their wisdom, fairness, and non-partisanship in filling the high post of Speaker is shown by the fact that from the beginning of the

70th Congress, in 1927, there have been only eight appeals from decisions of the Speaker, and in seven of these eight cases the decision of the Speaker was sustained by the House of Representatives. On the one occasion when the Speaker was overruled (on February 21, 1931), the House was actually following the wishes of Speaker Longworth, for he in effect appealed to the House to overrule him in order to correct what he regarded as an erroneous precedent.

This appraisal of a long line of Speakers of the House was part of Lew Deschler's letter to Speaker ALBERT, resigning as Parliamentarian. It is characteristic of Lew Deschler, that, even in a letter of resignation, he is informative and to the point. Moreover, the qualities for which he expresses admiration, possessed by the Speakers he has served, are the very same qualities that we respect in him.

We know the high regard in which he has been held by Speakers and Members of the House for almost half a century. What is his opinion of the many Members he has known so well over so many years?

In his letter of resignation, he expressed that opinion in these words:

The challenges presented by my work as Parliamentarian have been heightened by the caliber of the men and women who have served in the House of Representatives while I have been associated with it. Truly representing all parts of the country and all their constituents, their individual and collective wisdom and their unceasing dedication to this country and its Constitution have always been a source of inspiration to me. I shall always treasure the many deep and abiding friendships which have developed through my associations with the Members over these years.

I can personally testify to Lew Deschler's helpfulness to new Members of the House as well as to those with whom he had developed the longstanding friendships to which he refers. He was always available and always thoroughly well informed when I discussed parliamentary questions with him upon first coming to the House. I observed then, and have seen since, that new Members have beaten a path to the Parliamentarian's office located just off the Speaker's lobby and the party cloak rooms, where Lew Deschler would advise them on whether amendments they wished to propose, or parliamentary inquiries they intended to make, were in order. He has explained:

I did that to save them embarrassment. If they had brought up a point of order on the floor and the Chair overruled them, it would indicate that they didn't know the rules.

This is the kind of thoughtfulness that has characterized the wise counsel, generously given, of the man appropriately described by Speaker ALBERT as "the greatest Parliamentarian in the world."

Fortunately for the House, his services, even in retirement, have been retained as a parliamentary consultant in order that he may compile the most comprehensive study ever undertaken in the history of American parliamentary law, that of the House precedents set during the decades he has been its Parliamentarian.

He has already left a permanent legacy to this House in the body of parlia-

mentary rulings he has advised upon during his years as Parliamentarian, and now he will again place the institution he loves in his debt. I thank him for his kindness and wisdom and for his half century of devoted service to this House and to his country. May his well-merited retirement, which we nevertheless all regret, be a long, productive, and happy one.

#### THE MARY McLEOD BETHUNE MEMORIAL

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I had the opportunity to witness one of the most impressive ceremonies in recent memory. On the west front of the Capitol, thousands of citizens from all over the country gathered to celebrate the unveiling of a memorial to Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune.

The Mary McLeod Bethune memorial in Lincoln Park is the first tribute to a black person—and the first to a woman—on public land in our Nation's Capital. The National Council of Negro women has worked with diligence and patience for the past 15 years to realize this monument to their founder. I commend them for this remarkable achievement—they have provided an eloquent and moving inspiration for all Americans.

I include at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in Colliers magazine shortly before Dr. Bethune's death so that my colleagues can share the reality of impact of this remarkable woman upon our society.

#### "LOVED, FEARED AND FOLLOWED"

(By Genevieve Forbes Herrick)

Some time ago in the lobby of Washington's Mayflower Hotel I came upon a friend, bound as I was for a dinner honoring a distinguished woman government official. I suggested we sit together. I always enjoy a visit with her, for she is a woman of attainment, head of a powerful organization of 800,000 women, founder-president of one college and possessor of honorary degrees from half a dozen others.

We were early. I led the way to a table up front and asked the two gentle-faced women already there if we might join them. They gave us a friendly nod and we sat down.

Presently, after some conversation with her companion, one of the women whispered softly to me that her friend had asthma; she feared that the vibrations of the loudspeaker, directly above us, might bring on an attack. I said I'd never heard that theory and urged them to remain. A few moments later she repeated her worries, this time in a louder voice. Still I didn't tumble.

The third time she was more urgent. She was sorry, but they'd simply have to find seats farther from the amplifier. They bowed, rather elaborately, and left.

Suddenly I saw through the asthma alibi. For my companion was a black woman, probably the most influential black woman, and certainly one of the blackest, in the country.

I fumbled for the right words to relieve her embarrassment. She found them to relieve mine.

"I feel sorry for them," Mary McLeod Bethune, friend of the high and the humble of



both races, spoke with compassion. Then, thoughtfully, and with some satisfaction: "Twenty years ago they wouldn't have bothered to think up that ridiculous story. They'd have jumped up the minute I sat down. We've made progress—some progress."

Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune—nearly everybody uses the full, rhythmic name—has not only witnessed progress, she has helped make it. Today, at seventy-five, this woman—born in a cabin on a South Carolina plantation to parents not long out of slavery—is loved, and feared, and followed.

She is loved and revered by hundreds of graduates of Bethune-Cookman College in Daytona Beach, Florida, which she founded 46 years ago. She is frequently feared by public officials and private employers the nation over who realize her power and recognize her persistence in her fight for her race. She is followed, almost to a woman, by the 800,000 members of the National Council of Negro Women, which she found in 1935, and from whose continuous presidency she retired last November.

Mary McLeod Bethune may not make the headlines, like a Marian Anderson, a Joe Louis, or a Ralph Bunche—who overcame their hazard of color to achieve outstanding personal success against white competition. But she will find a place in history, not so much on account of what she has accomplished for herself which is plenty, but because of what she, as a Negro, has done for America's 13,000,000 Negroes, and for what she has inspired them to do for themselves.

Mrs. Bethune can whip up a regular Old Testament wrath when the rights of Negroes are challenged. When she herself is treated shabbily, she keeps her temper, striving always to "meet personal humiliation with grace and dignity." And sometimes with a dash of shrewd humor.

For instance, that time she was in the parlor car of a train up North. The conductor came up the aisle, calling out, "Tickets, please."

At her chair, he commanded: "Gimme your ticket, Auntie."

She continued to read. "Hey, gimme your ticket, Auntie." She turned a page of her book. He shouted, "Auntie, hand over your ticket." She looked up, in feigned surprise and said calmly, but so others could hear: "And which of my sister's sons are you, John or Joe?"

She recalls with relish that "the passengers roared with laughter, the conductor got pretty red, and said, oh, so politely, 'May I have your ticket?'"

As she acts out the incident, she adds ringingly, "I have no inferiority complex." Far from it. Her organlike voice rises to a proud crescendo: "My mother was a descendant of African tribal rulers. She held her head high."

The daughter, too, holds her head high. It is a massive, majestic head, framed in white hair. As she sits in the great chair in her office, a blue silk robe flung over her broad shoulders like a ceremonial mantle, aides grouped deferentially around her, Mary McLeod Bethune might, herself, be an African queen.

Mrs. Bethune employs no "ghost" to write her talks and articles and the column which she conducts in the Chicago Defender, a Negro newspaper. Others, with more time, may furnish the facts and figures. She alone weaves them into the fabric of words. Her prose is frequently picturesque and poetic, as when she urges her people: "Be a Daniel. Take the vow of courage. Be militant. But let the weapons of determination be coupled with the armor of justice and forgiveness."

She tells the story of her life with self-revelation and self-respect. Mary Jane McLeod, fifteenth child in a family of 17, was born on a plantation near Mayesville, South Carolina, July 10, 1875. By the time she came

along, her parents, who had continued to work "for the master" after freedom, had earned five acres of land, and what her mother called their own "vine and fig tree." The fig tree was really a cotton patch; the vine covered a rude cabin built by her father and the boys.

Mary was eleven before the community had a school for colored children—a one-room affair established by the Presbyterian Board of Missions. She walked the five miles each way every day. At night she taught her older brothers and sisters to read and write.

Finishing the school's limited course, she had no place to go but back to the cotton fields. But one sunny morning as the family worked in the field, her former teacher appeared. Another rural schoolteacher had written the Board of Missions that, by doing dressmaking on the side, she had saved enough money to give an education to a colored girl, "providing you can find one you know will make good."

Mrs. Bethune's voice lingers over that prophetic phrase—"one you know will make good."

She pauses, and we are back in that cotton field, hearing the teacher say, "Aunt Patsy, we have chosen your Mary."

We see "Aunt Patsy" McLeod extend her arms to heaven. We hear her reverent, joyous cry: "Thank you, Master." (We know it is not the "master" for whom she had worked to earn the five acres.)

A few weeks later, Mary, who had never seen a train, boarded one to ride 150 bewildering miles to Concord, North Carolina, where, for eight years, she studied at Scotia Seminary. She then went to Chicago to spend two years at the Moody Bible Institute. For the first time in her life she found hers the only black face in the group. It was, and still is, a challenge, and sometimes a painful experience. "White men's eyes piercing me, piercing. Some of them are kind eyes; others would like to be but are still afraid."

At Moody Institute, her mezzo soprano voice (at seventy-five it still has the vibrancy of a cello) won her a place on the Gospel Choir Team that toured the Northwest. One day she was billeted at a farmhouse in a remote part of Minnesota, among the first of her race to come that way. As the farmer's wife bustled about the kitchen, her small daughter sat in the parlor, fascinated by the strange lady. When mother called, "Dinner's ready, Miss McLeod," the little girl burst out, "Mama, the lady's got to wash her face and hands. They're awful dirty."

"I didn't blame that little tot. She'd never seen a black face before." Mrs. Bethune doesn't wince at the word "black." She regards bitterness as a worthless weapon.

When she left Moody Institute, she turned to teaching. In 1897 she met and married a fellow teacher, Albertus Bethune. He died in 1919, leaving her one son, Albert, now on the faculty of his mother's school.

At mention of the school, she closes her eyes and, in the rhythm of a spiritual, chants:

"I'd been dreaming, all my life, down yonder in the cotton fields, in the classroom, singing in the Chicago slums, dreaming, dreaming, of big buildings and little children—my own institution." She opens her eyes and asks, "But where to put it?"

In the South—there the need was greatest. And in an inexpensive community—she had no money. These were the two firm lines in her blueprint. The rest she left to chance, which she prefers to call God.

In Florida on a mission, she found some "friendly folks" who directed her to a piece of land and a miserable house she could rent for almost nothing. She had a "hunch" it was the right place. So one October day in 1904 found her in this shack at Daytona Beach. She had a dollar and a half; a few soapboxes for furniture, five little colored

girls for pupils. She also had faith and gumption.

With a flourish she founded the Daytona Educational and Industrial Training School, and became its president. She started a one-woman campaign for funds, going from door to door. To help out, she often sold fried fish and sweet-potato pies. No cook herself, she had friends provide the food, while she furnished one of her best commodities, salesmanship.

At the end of a toilsome day vending fish and education, she would wash out her one shirtwaist, cut new cardboard soles for her shoes, count her money, say her prayers, and go to sleep, ready for a new day.

#### A BAD FIRST IMPRESSION

Money came in, but slowly. Mrs. Bethune invited the industrialist and philanthropist James N. Gamble, son of the founder of Procter & Gamble, to visit her project. Gamble had a winter home in Daytona Beach, and had been attracted to Mrs. Bethune's struggling experiment because it was "a Christian effort on behalf of Negro children." When he entered her office, furnished with a wooden crate and a wobbly chair, he demanded sternly, "And where is this school of which you wish me to be a trustee?"

She fired back: "In my mind, Mr. Gamble. And my soul."

He gave her financial assistance and advice, becoming chairman of the school board and so remaining for 20 years until his death. To him she gives great credit for the school's development. In 1923 the former grade school for girls was merged with the Cookman Institute to become the Bethune-Cookman College. At the same time, it began to receive aid from the Board of Education for Negroes of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Today the college is fully accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. It has a faculty of 100. Its 27 buildings are dominated, appropriately, by Faith Hall. Its 1,000-odd regular students include three boys from Nigeria who are sons of tribal chiefs. Sixty-five per cent of its graduates are teachers. Five per cent are in professions. Most of the others are skilled laborers, secretaries and in domestic service.

Life at Bethune-Cookman hasn't always been placid. One Election eve, Ku-Klux Klansmen marched across the campus as a warning to Negro teachers and older students not to vote. Mrs. Bethune ordered every light in all the buildings turned on and kept them burning until dawn. The next morning she led her flock to the polls, unmolested.

In reviewing the school's growth, its founder puts first its most intangible asset—her partnership with God.

She says simply:

"I believe in God, and so I believe in Mary Bethune."

When she says that, she is stating what is to her a plain fact; she's been facing facts all her life. As a child she faced her first racial fact when she realized, with a shock, that "we Negroes are regarded as different."

She didn't like that classification then; she doesn't like it now. She points out that she doesn't want to be "Jim Crowed" into a back seat just because she's black; nor does she want to be ushered into a front one simply because she's not white, and "they want to palaver over me."

She does want, for herself and her people, what most of her people want: equality of opportunity in learning and earning, and in living. In the middle thirties she felt that this opportunity, never very great, was slipping away—particularly the chance for the Negro to obtain employment. Other Negro women all over the country were also troubled, but they did nothing about it. They had their clubs and societies, but there was not unity among the groups.

By 1935, Mary Bethune had made her place as an educator. She was sixty years old and she suffered greatly from asthma. But she felt there was still a job for her to do.

On the fifth of December of that year, she summoned representatives of leading Negro women's organizations and outlined to them her plans, big plans, for a federation. Almost singlehanded she founded the National Council of Negro Women, then went to work to put flesh on its paper frame.

Every night a handful of women volunteers, their own day's work done, came to her small flat in Washington and did all the clerical jobs which they couldn't afford to hire done. Mrs. Bethune did the talking and the walking, in an effort to sell the council to Negro women's organizations.

With very little money and limited personnel, the council decided to concentrate on one problem, the problem it considered the most pressing at the time—the growing unemployment of Negroes. Mrs. Bethune recalls how she "bothered" government officials and testified at Congressional hearings, speaking now as the leader of organized Negro women. She laid a considerable piece of the groundwork on which, several years later, was to be established the Fair Employment Practice Committee—a federal group set up to work for the elimination of discrimination in employment. This success made the council popular, and clubs all over the country began to sign up.

Having done something for her people, she quickly followed through with a demand that they do something for themselves, and launched a "Hold Your Job" campaign designed to impress on Negroes the need for good relations with their employers and fellow workers; and this attracted the attention of businessmen. White "angels" came forward; notably millionaire Marshall Field III, who helped the council get its headquarters in a mansion in one of the best Negro residential districts in the capital.

During World War II, the council worked for the admission of Negro women into all branches of the service on the same basis as other women. When Oveta Culp Hobby was appointed director of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, many Negroes were disturbed by the selection of a woman from Texas. Many were ready to protest vigorously.

Mrs. Hobby, aware of the problem, turned to Mrs. Bethune. After a series of conferences between the two women, Mrs. Bethune, satisfied that Mrs. Hobby's place of birth did not condition her idea of justice, reported her conclusion so convincingly that most council members withdrew their objections to the Hobby appointment.

Subsequently, Mrs. Bethune became the only Negro member of the women's committee selected to choose candidates for the first officers' training school for the corps. Mrs. Bethune's recommendations for the selection of Negro candidates were so strict that she was criticized by some of her people. She insisted:

"I won't vote for an unqualified girl just because her face is black."

Since the war the council has worked for such legislation as the anti-poll tax and the antilynching bills; a broadened Social Security program, and a bill for the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission.

Congressmen and businessmen, labor leaders and Cabinet members know that when Mrs. Bethune walks into the office, she not only speaks for 800,000 Negro women, but that most of those 800,000 speak for Mrs. Bethune—the words she wants them to speak.

#### AMONG HER SEVEREST CRITICS

Like every leader, she has her critics. Ironically, some of her most severe are the young

Negro women whom she most wants to help. They think she belongs to what they call the "Uncle Tom" school—in other words, that she is not militant enough. Mrs. Bethune, however, believes that a series of little wins can add up to a great victory.

Here's an example of her step-by-step strategy. She goes before Southern legislators and asks, with assumed innocence:

"Don't you want to let the Negroes learn to read?" They can make but one answer—"Yes." What she means, and of course they know it, is that she's going to fight to get Southern Negroes enough education so that some of them can step out of the cotton fields and into a business office.

In spite of Northern critics and Southern foes, Mary McLeod Bethune has gone far in the South. She was perhaps the first Negro to receive an honorary degree from any white college in the South—Rollins College at Winter Park, Florida, made the award last year.

"First" and "only Negro" are familiar phrases in her biography. As director of the Division of Negro Affairs of the National Youth Administration, she was the only member of her race operating in that organization at a top level. In 1939, typical of the seven years she spent with the administration, she traveled 35,000 miles to address 41 meetings in 21 states; dedicated six Youth Centers, and made three commencement addresses—all this at the age of sixty-four. At the United Nations Conference in San Francisco, she was associate consultant to the American delegation. After working hours she addressed 52 California meetings.

Honors, awards, medals—she has them by the score. Some are mere token payments on a debt to a member of a minority group. Others are real tributes to a real leader—sex, color or race aside.

She rejoices, too, in her collection of personal mementos of the famous. She has a trunkful of autographed photographs of international celebrities. She has known five Presidents.

She has a boxful of Rockefeller dimes that she's going to have made into a bracelet someday. During his winter sojourns in Florida the financier got to be a friend. After John D. Rockefeller's death, his cousin gave her one of his favorite woolen scarves. She loves to wear it. She is also never seen without a cane, one of Franklin D. Roosevelt's, which she asked for and received from Mrs. Roosevelt after his death.

She first met the late President, through friendship with his wife, when he was governor of New York. She is fond of relating that when he was at the White House he would often ask her to consult with him on race problems and that his customary greeting was:

"I'm always glad to see you, Mrs. Bethune, for you always come asking help for others—never for yourself."

#### THE NURSE-MIDWIFERY PROGRAM

#### HON. THAD COCHRAN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the June issue of *Nursing Outlook*, describing the success of the nurse-midwifery program operating in my State and the Southeast region.

This program has been strongly endorsed by the Mississippi Nurses' Association and is an example of the contribution nursing and those dedicated to

the profession are making to our health and well-being.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

#### NURSE-MIDWIVES MAKE A DIFFERENCE

(By Marie C. Meglen and Helen V. Burst)

Mississippi's maternal and infant mortality and morbidity rates have been, for many years, among the highest in the country. In 1965, for instance, the infant death rate per 1,000 live births was 41.5 compared to 24.2 nationally, and maternal mortality was double the figure for the country as a whole. But in less than three years (1968-1971), infant mortality in one target Mississippi county was dramatically reduced to 21.3.

What made the difference in this county?

Most professional observers would agree that the educational preparation and use of nurse-midwives, working with county physicians and other health team members, helped expand care for this predominantly rural, medically indigent population.

That effort began in 1969. Before that time nurse-midwives did not practice in the state. Since the creation of the program to prepare nurse-midwives at the University of Mississippi Medical Center in Jackson, there are now five nurse-midwifery services functioning in Mississippi and a sixth in Louisiana affiliated with our program. In addition, graduates of our program are teaching in associate, baccalaureate, and graduate nursing programs in our state.

As our program moves from pilot program to proven project on the threshold of regionalization, a review of its development, assessment of its present status, and speculation on its future seem timely. At the same time, we and others in the program feel an obligation to share our experiences and conclusions with those who may wish to take this route to improved maternal-infant care in their regions.

#### BEGINNING OF PROJECT

Our nurse-midwifery program was developed as part of a "parent" project, The County Health Improvement Program (CHIP). CHIP was the result of a study begun in August, 1967, by representatives (mostly physicians) from the University of Mississippi Medical Center, the state medical and surgical associations, and the state board of health. The aim was to design and implement a model of improved health services that could be adapted for almost any common health care problem in any community in the state with large numbers of medically indigent people. After a year's study, the group decided to focus on our tragically high maternal and infant mortality and to establish a demonstration health care program to meet the health needs of mothers and their infants.

With funding from private foundations and state and federal sources, CHIP was established in 1968. Five delta counties were to have been included in the target area. But grant funds fell below expectation, so CHIP planners decided to concentrate on Holmes County alone.

Located in the Mississippi delta, this county was typical of many rural areas in the state. The county's rural poor were often malnourished, had inadequate housing and sanitation, and little means of obtaining professional health care. Some 72 percent of the families subsisted on less than \$3,000 a year. Half of all births were at home, either unattended or by a "granny" midwife, and the county's infant mortality rate was 39.1 per 1,000 live births (1968). Seven physicians tried to serve the entire population of 28,000. There were two small hospitals, totaling 73 beds in urban settings in the county.

Rather than set up a parallel delivery system, the CHIP plan was to reinforce existing health care resources with added physicians from the University Medical Center, some



60 miles away, and to introduce nurse-midwives and indigenous community health aides to the health team. Family-centered quality care was to include hospitalization of high-risk mothers, family planning, sanitation and nutritional counseling, home visits, food supplements for mothers and infants, prenatal care, delivery by professionals, and infant follow-up for one year.

Key figure in the proposed health team was the nurse-midwife, then not practicing in Mississippi. The head of obstetrics at the medical school, in consultation with the American College of Nurse-Midwives (ACNM), recognized that the preparation of nurse-midwives would be a pivotal point in the overall effectiveness of the CHIP plan. The medical center then applied for and obtained a contract with the Division of Nursing, DHEW, to prepare nurses for an expanded role in comprehensive health care for mothers and infants through the development of an educational program to prepare nurse-midwives. Because of state needs, preparation of nurse-midwives in our program includes the ability to supervise normal infants through the first year of life, as well as management of patients throughout the normal maternity cycle.

#### SETTING UP THE PROGRAM

By mid-1969, a certified nurse-midwife was employed to direct the nurse-midwifery program. The legal status of nurse-midwifery practice (total care of the low-risk patient during the entire maternity cycle including hospital delivery, under physician supervision/standing orders) in our state was clarified soon after, and standing orders agreed upon. Standing orders, of course, vary somewhat from service to service, but generally Mississippi nurse-midwives may prescribe vitamins, iron, and some other medications in the prenatal period. They may also give some analgesics and local, pudendal, and paracervical blocks for labor and delivery, and they may cut and repair episiotomies.

Because our first class had to be enrolled by September 1969, to meet the requirements of the Division of Nursing contract, our planning time was at a minimum. But a curriculum was designed, and seven other nurse-midwives educated in five different nurse-midwifery programs were recruited as faculty, along with one obstetrician. The faculty had combined experience in both rural and urban nurse-midwifery practice and were all committed to this approach as a means of reducing maternal-infant mortality and morbidity. Six students were eventually admitted to our first class.

Almost simultaneously with student enrollment, a university nurse-midwifery service was started as a site for clinical experience along with outpatient services, including family planning, offered in cooperation with the Holmes County Health Department. However, the university service had to be staffed by nurse-midwifery faculty who were teaching in the program. This double load on faculty became a pressing problem as the program grew. It was eventually resolved when a service not dependent on faculty was established with a grant from the Field Foundation.

We also knew the curriculum would probably need modification and revision. Originally planned along traditional lines, it consisted of nine courses offered in three academic quarters, plus a 12-week preceptorship. The courses included a broad base of maternal and child health, with emphasis on the special needs of poor, rural populations and on the cultural, political, and historical background peculiar to Mississippi. In addition, methods for evaluating students' clinical performance were developed.

During the initial year, faculty came to realize the difficulty a student has in making the role change from nurse to nurse-mid-

wife and designed methods to ease this transition. This adjustment proved most difficult for the mature woman with years of experience in nursing who was resuming a student role at the same time she was assuming responsibility for patient management. We found it took, on the average, eight to ten months for students to gain confidence in their ability to make the critical decisions of a nurse-midwife.

#### EXPANDING THE PROGRAM

For the second year, faculty modified the curriculum by consolidating the nine courses into four and placing earlier emphasis on basic nurse-midwifery skills such as pelvic exams and delivery maneuvers. During the academic year, the theory-clinical ratio reversed so that students spent more time in clinical practice. Eight students successfully completed the program using this revised curriculum. Four were graduated the first year.

In December, 1970, a full nurse-midwifery service was initiated in Holmes County. This was in addition to the nurse-midwifery service at the University Medical Center that was not dependent on the faculty. Also during this year, support from several sources helped to extend and expand our program. A Commonwealth Fund grant permitted us to institute a refresher program for inactive nurse-midwives; a National Foundation grant supported efforts to create regional awareness of nurse-midwifery; and the National Center for Health Services Research and Development funded a study of the cost-effectiveness of this new maternal-infant health care team. The study results, we believe, will further substantiate the value of this maternal-infant care team concept. Inclusion of these programs rounded out the total nurse-midwifery effort to embrace basic education, graduate education, research, and service.

The University Medical Center is the responsible educational unit for the nurse-midwifery program. All nurse-midwifery faculty hold appointments in both the department of obstetrics-gynecology in the school of medicine and in the school of nursing. Joint appointments foster coordination between the nurse-midwifery education program and the graduate program in the nursing school. All nurse-midwives in the program, either on faculty or in service, participate in supervising and instructing students during their didactic, hospital, or field experiences. Additionally, all nurse-midwives and nurse-midwifery students participate in conferences, seminars, and rounds offered by the department of obstetrics and gynecology.

Initially, only baccalaureate-level nurses were eligible for enrollment. But after our first two classes, we instituted a certificate program to enable RN's without a bachelor's degree to obtain nurse-midwifery education through this program. We saw this as one solution to the scarcity of applicants from Mississippi, where the pool of baccalaureate-prepared nurses is small.

Retention of nurse-midwives in the state and region is critical if we are to make a lasting contribution to the health of the area's citizens. Recruitment of indigenous students is thus essential. To this end, the program also waives tuition and pays stipends to students who agree to practice in a regional site approved by the program for one year after graduation.

Students may now enter the program through two routes: a graduate credit program in the medical sciences for students who have a bachelor's degree in nursing; or a certificate program, without academic credit, for registered nurses offered through the medical school's obstetrics and gynecology department. In addition, the graduate program in the school of nursing offers its master's students a curriculum pattern that includes nurse-midwifery.

#### ANOTHER REVISION

Three classes of nurse-midwifery students focused attention on a prime curriculum complaint: it was too rigid and did not take into account a student's previous experience or education. Therefore, after many faculty meetings, we produced a mastery learning curriculum that utilizes a modular approach. It individualizes the educational process and provides students with immediate correlation of didactic instruction and clinical experience. Each module has identified terminal behaviors. Mastery of the terminal objectives is the critical factor. Students may complete a module within a time span that can be lengthened or shortened, according to students' needs. Flexibility is therefore built in.

The new curriculum includes seven modules with a concurrent pediatric component (neonatology, infant care, and pediatric physical diagnostic screening examination), which is followed by advanced clinical experience and a preceptorship. The first three modules focus on base-line skills—physical diagnosis, pelvic examination and gynecology, and such techniques as microscopic urinalysis or analysis of vaginal discharge. Students rotate through those areas that provide these learning experiences until the behavioral objectives for each are met.

They then move on to the next four modules: antepartum, intrapartum, postpartum, and family planning. Students decide which of the four areas they will complete first. Those with advanced education or experience in one or more of these areas may be able to meet the learning objectives for the module in a shorter time. Evaluation of students' clinical performance has also been revised to reflect program objectives and is ranked on a simple scale: achieved, progression, or no experience yet. Students' reaction thus far is favorable.

By the end of our third year, 25 graduates had received university certificates and had successfully taken the American College of Nurse-Midwives certification examination. Twenty-three of those graduates are still practicing in Mississippi.

#### IN RETROSPECT

Perhaps the most important advice we can offer any group who contemplates initiating a nurse-midwifery education program is: (1) establish an independent nurse-midwifery service first, so that faculty do not have to bear the burden of maintaining both service and educational programs; (2) allow time at the outset for faculty to work together and develop the program, including the curriculum, and to become familiar with the established health care system, patient needs, and local environment; and (3) establish the program, as we were fortunate to do, where there is strong medical support and freedom for creativity within a setting in which a primary goal is improved health care for patients as well as professional education.

The success of our program, we believe, is due in part to its having been stated at precisely the time when the value of the nurse-midwife and nurse practitioner in general was being recognized. It profited from being in the right place at the right time and from being part of a larger program anchored in the health care structure.

Because of its comprehensive nature and adaptability, we believe a nurse-midwifery program is applicable to most other geographic locations and to all socioeconomic groups. Our ultimate goal, which we share with other nurse-midwifery programs, is to educate a sufficient number of nurse-midwives to help bridge the health manpower gap and assure that all the nation's mothers and babies have quality care.

**THE U.S. TUNA FISHERMAN—A  
POSSIBLE ENDANGERED SPECIES**

**HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, action is currently being considered which could lead to the destruction of nearly 80 percent of California's vital commercial fishing industry. I am referring to proposals to extend the fishing zone to 200 miles. Unfortunately, this action is being proposed in the guise of protecting the U.S. fishing industry. However, nothing could be more misleading. Any unilateral action to extend the fishing zone to 200 miles would not only cause tremendous economic and political repercussions throughout the world, but it would also virtually destroy the U.S. tuna industry.

Tuna are a species of fish which cannot be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of a few nations. This is because of the unique biological characteristics of the highly mobile tuna who undertake long migration.

Ninety percent of the tuna caught by the United States has been in areas which have been considered international waters. However, a few countries are beginning to carve up these international waters by unilaterally claiming a 200-mile fishing zone; and, therefore, prohibiting U.S. tuna fishermen from fishing in areas which have been recognized for centuries as international waters.

The present, well-established fishing zone of 12 miles is currently being challenged, not only by those who support legislation to extend the U.S. fishing zone to 200 miles currently proposed in Congress, but also by some of the representatives currently meeting in Caracas, Venezuela, for the third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

Before tampering with the current international law, we need to take into account the damage that might be created by allowing reciprocal actions by other nations to extend their territorial seas to 200 miles. And we need to realize the unique characteristics of the various species of fish, combined with the special needs of various U.S. fishermen as they attempt to harvest them.

For if we fail to preserve our well-established fishing zone and allow a worldwide extension of nearly 17 times the present size to 200 miles, then not only would nearly 40 percent of the oceans waters be enclosed in the exclusive domains of a few nations; and not only would this action interfere with the international straits; but it would cause havoc to the U.S. fishing industry.

Naturally, I believe that we should support conservation efforts to preserve our fishing resources; and I recognize the problem of fishermen competing on the high seas. But, I believe that we should seek a solution which is equitable to all fishermen.

If the United States and other coastal states are permitted to extend their fishing jurisdiction pellmell to 200 miles, this would, according to August Felando of the American Tunaboat Association, destroy the tuna industry of California, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa.

I am very disturbed with the prospects of any action which would lead to the destruction of this important industry in California which represents 79.8 percent of all total landing of fish and shellfish; and, I am concerned with the impact of the loss of this essential industry on the port of San Pedro. San Pedro, which I am proud to represent, has been for the past quarter of a century the Nation's leading commercial port in terms of landing value of fish and shellfish.

We as a nation cannot afford the loss of this important industry which:

Provided 80 percent of U.S. households with over \$1 billion of canned tuna in 1973—50 percent of the entire world supply.

Employs over 16,000 U.S. processing plantworkers who earn more than \$90 million annually.

Purchases \$70 million annually in cans, labels, cartons, and vegetable oil—and thereby provides thousands more U.S. jobs in these and transportation-allied industries.

Possesses U.S. tuna fishing vessels worth almost \$500 million which required \$12 million for fleet maintenance last year in addition to the \$72.5 million spent for new vessel construction.

Provides a livelihood for U.S. tuna fishermen who earn about \$65 million annually, and requires \$5.4 million spent for provisions for fleet supplies.

Utilized \$11 million in fuel to operate these vessels; paid \$8 million to insurance companies in premiums for fleet protection; and paid \$17.5 million to banking, lending, and leasing institutions in interest, rentals, and service charges during 1973.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe we must protect this important tuna industry which contributes many millions of dollars to our economy, provides thousands of jobs, and provides an inexpensive source of rich protein food. Therefore, I am hopeful that a species-by-species approach is used to resolve this complex problem in order to prevent any action which would destroy this worthwhile U.S. industry and possibly make the U.S. tuna fisherman an endangered species.

**FREEDOM OF THE PRESS**

**HON. JOHN J. RHODES**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, one of the livelier—and important—debates in recent years has concerned the constitutional rights and professional responsibilities of the American press. This subject has occupied the thinking of

Members of Congress, as well as many thoughtful members of the media. It has been observed that conflicting interests frequently give rise to instances of unfairness and even injustice—such as occurs when the press sets out to explore various aspects of Government. However, I think we do well to note that we have in our country an atmosphere of media freedom that is unmatched. We must continue to pursue this important debate. But we should also be proud that ours is a nation where freedom prevails.

Mr. Speaker, the Arizona Republic editorialized on July 8, 1974, about freedom of the press, or lack of it, in the Soviet Union. For the purposes of comparison, I feel that it is instructive:

**FREEDOM A LA RUSSIE**

All was not sweetness and light during President Nixon's visit to Moscow. The 300 American and European newsmen who accompanied the President received a refresher course in freedom of the press, Soviet-style.

It started only minutes after they arrived, when they learned that Julian Nundy, a correspondent for Reuters, the British news agency, had just been expelled for writing stories critical of the Kremlin. And it continued almost until the moment they left.

To add insult to injury, the Intourist Hotel, where the correspondents stayed, charged them \$105 a night.

Two correspondents, Robert F. Kaiser of The Washington Post and John Shaw of Time Magazine, were manhandled by the KGB, the Soviet secret police, when they attempted to visit the wife of Vitali Rubin, a leading Jewish intellectual, who had been arrested a few hours earlier.

The same treatment was meted out by uniformed police to a television crew from ABC, who attempted to interview another leading Jewish intellectual, Viktor Polisky.

When Kaiser, at a press conference, asked the Soviet spokesman to explain a mysterious deletion in the Russian translation of a statement by the President, the spokesman first refused to answer, then ridiculed him and denounced him as a "disrupter."

A White House aide, Tim Elborn, sought to help reporters and photographers get a better view of Mrs. Nixon and Mrs. Brezhnev at a school circus. Three KGB men grabbed him and threw him out.

Ron Ziegler, Nixon's top communications aide, was grabbed by a guard when he attempted to enter the press room set aside for the visiting correspondents.

On the Tuesday night following the President's arrival, all three U.S. networks were blacked out. When they attempted to explain to American viewers why the picture had disappeared from the screen, they were cut off the air in midsentence.

The Russians apologized and promised it wouldn't happen again. On Wednesday night, CBS attempted to broadcast an interview with Andrei Sakharov, the renowned Soviet physicist, known as "the father of the Soviet H-bomb," who had been fasting in protest against political oppression in his country.

The technicians walked out and that was the end of the broadcast.

Many Americans feel the U.S. press sometimes abuses its privileges under the First Amendment. Many newsmen feel they are sometimes harassed by government officials and government agencies anxious to suppress the news.

They should both count their blessings.



LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY, JANUARY 1, 1974, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1974

## HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my policy of providing periodic reports to my constituents describing my legislative activities, I am inserting the following summary covering the past 6 months of the 93d Congress in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

### JANUARY THROUGH JUNE: A LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY

Although the Watergate affair has dominated the headlines for the past six months, Congress has not neglected the other important business of the nation during this period.

Some of the most important legislative efforts of the past six months are now in conference committee where differences between House and Senate-passed measures are being ironed out. It is expected that agreement will be reached on many of these key measures before the end of this session of Congress.

This six-months summary is divided into subject categories. The categories will help readers find the subjects of their special interest.

#### 1. DISASTER STRIKES

On April 3, nature's caprice expressed itself in a tornado which struck Louisville as well as other communities in our area. Although the response of the federal government to the devastation could have been better in some areas, the response of local citizens was nothing short of inspiring.

And the services rendered to disaster victims by the City and County governments and the Governor's Office were indispensable.

In the wake of the tornado, I met in Louisville with Federal Disaster Administration officials, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development James Lynn, and Senators Domenici and Burdick, members of the Senate Committee on Public Works, to discuss the federal government's response to our tragedy.

In part because of our community's experience in the tornado's aftermath, the Congress approved amendments to the Federal Disaster Relief Act providing additional assistance for the communities victimized by natural disasters.

Although the Disaster Relief Act Amendments became public law in May, a Presidential Executive Order is still required to set the wheels in motion and make the full range of aid available to communities like ours. On June 25, I wrote to the President to urge that he issue an Executive Order so that assistance for the reconstruction of our beautiful Cherokee and George Rogers Clark Parks would be made available immediately.

#### 2. BETTER GOVERNMENT

Unquestionably, more attention is directed to the Presidential impeachment inquiry today than any other matter before the Congress. In this, the Congress faces an awesome challenge.

The challenge is to be fair in the investigation of the impeachment charges despite the emotional nature of the question, despite the inevitable partisanship, and despite the different interpretations which persons can place on the evidence.

In whatever way the impeachment question is finally decided, the process itself is a demonstration that our Constitution is a

living, breathing document—protecting the innocent, punishing the guilty and guarding the rights of all.

Perhaps this process, as painful as it is to everyone, will help some of our citizens regain their confidence in our system of government—a confidence that has been shaken badly by the Watergate scandals.

But "better government"—as far as the Congress is concerned—doesn't stop with settling the impeachment question.

For example, the Congress approved an important bill creating a new system for handling the federal budget. The bill also specifies the conditions under which the President may impound (refuse to spend) funds appropriated by the Congress.

This legislation will not only enable the Congress to hit its spending targets, but will also curb program uncertainties due to budget delays, and help ensure that each federal dollar is spent wisely. This legislation should help to curb excessive federal spending while not shortchanging worthy programs.

The Senate has approved a bill providing public financing of elections for federal offices and imposing stringent controls on campaign contributions and expenditures. This bill is similar to a bill I cosponsored in the first session of this Congress. A House Committee has just reported a somewhat different campaign reform bill. Final action on a reform package is expected before adjournment later this year.

This legislation is badly needed to protect the electoral process from being held hostage by monetary influences.

The House is likely to also consider a plan to reform its own committee structure in the near future. The plan—called the Bolling Committee Report—was originally intended for floor action in May, but the measure was sidetracked by action of the Democratic Caucus.

I strongly opposed allaying consideration of the plan. The proposal—which, among other changes, will revamp committee jurisdiction to eliminate overlap and duplication—in my judgment would increase the effectiveness and upgrade the work product of the House. I am hopeful the Bolling Report will be acted on before the end of summer.

And, by a bare seven-vote margin, the House in May rejected a law permitting the registration of voters by mail. I supported the mail registration plan. Such a law would help remove the barriers which now inconvenience persons in registering to vote. It would have brought many more eligible voters into the electoral process.

#### 3. ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

The House may soon consider H.R. 11500, a federal strip mining control bill. If enacted, the bill would require that all strip mined land be reclaimed.

Although Kentucky and several other States already have strip mine control laws, federal legislation is needed nonetheless. Not all States measures provide for adequate reclamation of stripped lands.

I am inclined to support H.R. 11500, a compromise measure, though many feel it could harm the coal industry in Kentucky.

The energy crisis is not over, although some of us may be lulled by the shorter gasoline station lines and the end of the oil embargo.

Now in conference between House and Senate is the new solar energy demonstration program bill. Energy from the sun is a clean and limitless energy source. This bill will help develop the technology to harness the sun's energy for heating and cooling our homes, schools and office buildings.

The establishment of the Federal Energy Administration by Congressional action earlier this spring will also help the energy

situation by coordinating the government's financial and scientific resources. I voted for the bill establishing this office.

Another bill, the National Energy Emergency Act, was passed by the Congress but was vetoed by the President. Among other things, this bill would have rolled back the prices of petroleum and oil products. I voted for the bill, but the President's veto was later sustained by the Senate.

Air pollution control standards have come under sharp attack during the energy shortage. These standards, it is argued, cannot be met except by the installation of sophisticated and extremely expensive control devices—raising the costs to the consumer—by using clean forms of energy such as natural gas and low-sulphur coal—which are in the shortest supply—or, by curtailing the amount of energy available to individuals and to industry.

However, I am not convinced that our energy and environmental goals are incompatible. Stretching out the timetable for meeting certain pollution target levels and standards is prudent in my judgment. But, I believe that it would be most unwise to ease standards to a degree which might endanger public health.

Deciding which standard to ease and which to retain is where the rub comes in. I voted against a bill to suspend nationwide motor vehicle pollution standards, but voted for a postponement of a tightening of these standards originally scheduled for next year. In the end product, it's all a matter of judgment.

#### 4. FOREIGN POLICY AND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Peace in the Middle East and continued detente with the Soviet Union have captured our interest in the area of foreign policy. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger has been particularly active in both areas. And, the President made visits to both the Middle East and Russia this spring to emphasize America's interest in a peaceful world.

The Congress, however, also has a crucial role to play under the constitution in shaping American foreign policy. The Senate must ratify all treaties. And the House must approve all bills providing money for foreign economic and military assistance and for the national defense.

In fact, a cornerstone of American foreign policy is a strong national defense capability. The House has approved \$22.6 billion for military procurement for the fiscal year 1975. These funds and other expenditures will provide very adequately—in some ways, too adequately—for our national security.

I voted for three amendments to the military procurement bill which—in my judgment—would have kept military spending at adequate levels, but chopped fat from the current budget.

I supported efforts to reduce U.S. troops overseas by 100,000 by the end of 1975; to reduce military aid to South Vietnam by \$400 million; and to establish a military spending ceiling. The efforts, however, failed to attract majority support in the House.

The United States has always come to the aid of friends abroad who are in need. This year the Congress approved, with my enthusiastic support, emergency aid to the disaster-stricken nations of Pakistan and Nicaragua, and assistance to the Sahelian nations of Africa, which face a drought which may starve millions of people to death. This bill is now in conference, but should pass with ease when the work on it is completed.

#### 5. THE ECONOMY

Congress permitted wage and price controls to expire on April 30 by declining to extend the life of the Economic Stabilization Act. Although the transition from a con-

trolled economy to a free market economy may be difficult, I believe that it is the wisest course of action to take under the present set of somewhat unusual circumstances.

First, we must remember that the use of the controls was only of limited help. At the very time controls seemed to be curbing inflation, the Administration removed them. Inflation again surged, and controls were reimposed. Such inconsistency, obviously, did not create economic stability and, as a partial result, we now face the most serious inflation since World War II.

What can we do about it? First, we ought to let the free market exert its considerable forces to stabilize the economy. Second, we must keep federal spending at prudent levels. And finally, we must address the rising prices in those sectors contributing most to inflation: food and energy.

If the price control apparatus still largely covering sources of energy does not do the job, perhaps a rollback of prices will be needed.

And, this fall, the new federal farm program—passed by Congress last year—should begin to take effect. The new program encourages farm production (rather than discouraging it as the earlier farm program did) and should help to increase supplies of food and fiber, thus reducing prices to the consumer.

#### 8. FOR THE GOOD OF ALL

The nation's health is everyone's concern. Some form of national health plan, I believe, should be enacted by the Congress.

Several such plans have been offered. Among them are those offered by Senator Edward Kennedy and Representative Wilbur Mills, by Rep. Martha Griffiths (the most comprehensive plan of all), by the Administration, by the American Medical Association, and by Senator Abraham Ribicoff (which deals solely with catastrophic disease and injury).

The status of these many plans is uncertain. Clearly, compromise among the authors of the various systems is needed to obtain an acceptable bill. The Congress, however, is more acutely aware than ever before of the burdens of high health care costs. So the Congress is likely to take action on health care either this year or next at the latest.

Much more than a system of health care financing is needed to improve the nation's health, however. A bill authorizing a new plan for an attack on diabetes mellitus is now in a House-Senate conference. The Congress passed a bill, now public law, creating a National Institute on Aging. And included in a supplemental appropriations bill was \$4.5 million for child abuse prevention and treatment programs.

I voted for all of these measures.

A bill to reform the system of private pensions is reportedly near agreement in a conference committee. The reform is needed to protect pension plan participants from such hazards as unfair length-of-service requirements and inadequately funded plans.

The Congress also acted to increase and expand the coverage of the minimum wage law. I supported this measure, which is now public law.

The busing of schoolchildren is a concern of many parents in the Louisville area. Although I am convinced that the best approach to this problem is a Constitutional Amendment, I supported an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to make busing the last-resort desegregation effort, and to prohibit busing beyond the next-nearest school to a child's home.

The measure is now in conference, and the House has voted twice to insist that its conferees not settle for the less stringent busing provisions contained in the Senate version of the bill.

Also in conference is a bill to create a

Legal Services Corporation, which would provide professional legal aid to those who could not otherwise afford it. I supported this bill on the House floor.

#### 7. VETERANS

Both the Senate and the House have approved significant increases in educational benefits for veterans. Although the Senate bill provided benefit increases totaling \$1.9 billion and the House bill provided an estimated \$1.3 billion in increased benefits, both versions of the legislation raise benefit levels and lengthen the time of eligibility for the aid from 8 to 10 years after discharge.

Should agreement by the House and Senate on their differences be achieved in conference, as expected, America's veterans will have two extra years of eligibility for education and training assistance at levels significantly increased from their previous inadequacy.

Increased compensation rates for disabled veterans and their dependents have become law. Widows and survivors' benefits were increased 17 percent, disability allowances by 15 percent, and dependency allowances by 15 to 18 percent. I supported both measures.

#### 8. TRANSPORTATION

In June the Department of Transportation announced that the Louisville and Jefferson County Transit Authority would receive a federal grant of over \$8 million to finance the acquisition of the Blue Motor Coach and Louisville Transit Companies and to purchase new buses and equipment. The federal funds will finance about 80 percent of the switch to a publicly-owned transportation system.

Although the Congress agreed on legislation to create a new program of federal subsidies to defray the operating costs of urban mass transit systems, the threat of a Presidential veto prevented the return of the conference report to the House floor. Operating subsidies would help keep fares low and service from being cut back.

An Administration bill to provide operating subsidies out of the Highway Trust Fund revenues—rather than out of general revenues, as in the earlier bill—is now under consideration. I am hopeful that some operating subsidies can be approved before the end of this Congress.

#### BIASED OPINIONS ON WATERGATE

### HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the newscasters of all networks have been denounced lately for their biased opinions on the Watergate issue. The following article from the Washington Star-News tells of the different reactions viewers have to network reporters. I insert this article for the benefit of my colleagues:

MAIL IS UP AND RATINGS DOWN AS NETWORKS FRET

(By Bernie Harrison and Patricia Simmons)

The TV networks' news divisions are getting an unprecedented amount of mail these days and they're reading it closely. Some of it is pretty angry stuff.

While critical mail is considered normal, the recent heavy volume—double last year's at CBS and NBC—is fueling debate in executive offices over news policies in general and Watergate coverage in particular.

No red-blooded network news official will

admit that critical mail would influence what they insist is objective reporting, but the mail coupled with the impact of recently declining Nielsen ratings, showing that fallen off by one million, make it understandable that ABC, CBS and NBC are concerned.

Here are random excerpts from over 42,000 pieces of mail CBS and its correspondents received so far this year:

"Why doesn't 'turnip head' (Dan) Rather get away from the White House?" ... "What is it, this overpowering, bright red, obviously apparent 'thing' you (Cronkite) have about Richard Nixon? I wonder if you realize how strong your prejudice comes over the airwaves?" ... "It would seem to me that you are no better at picking your news staff than Mr. Nixon is at picking his White House staff" ... "Impeach Rather."

The theme is virtually the same at ABC, which only began keeping a mail count in January. For instance, letter-writers "are sick and tired" of (television's) obsession with Watergate or "reject the interpretation of the liberal press in analyzing presidential addresses" or "feel ABC is the best of an unfair and scurrilous group."

Letters addressed to NBC's John Chancellor ask pretty much the same questions as those sent to ABC's Howard K. Smith—to wit: "Why don't you spend more time on the important issues" of world hunger and inflation? And: "Why not give us some good news?"

Mail to NBC and CBS, both of which did keep comparative figures from last year, accuses those networks of pro-liberal bias on nearly a 2 to 1 ratio. A count of mail since January at ABC shows 504 letters accusing the network of "bias against President Nixon" and 288 saying the network has been "fair to the White House."

At all three networks there have been many letters in praise of both the news shows and their commentators.

For instance, this compliment was sent by mistake to NBC but forwarded to CBS: "Let's cheer for our champ Dan Rather/who works slippery Dick to a lather. It's with delicious delight that we look for the fight with Dick on the ropes with his blather." Other expressions of approval sent to CBS include: "I'd rather be Dan than President" and "I just want you to know that I am tired of having Richard Nixon get prime time because of his office. If one of your TV programs had a rating as low as his, you'd take it off the air."

CBS's morning-news host Hughes Rudd is one newsmen who has received mostly favorable comments, among them this one: "Hang onto Hughes Rudd and treat him well, for you have someone very special there."

This year, through May 24, in mail sent directly to the networks, Walter Cronkite's CBS News program has received 488 favorable comments, 901 unfavorable. During approximately the same period, ABC News, with Howard K. Smith, has received 519 favorable letters and 764 unfavorable.

CBS and NBC do not keep count on pro or con letters sent directly to the commentator. However, ABC, which does, says that in mail sent directly to Howard K. Smith he tallied 3,029 pro and 605 con. Smith's personal secretary, who reads the mail and reports the figures to the network, says she has learned to get through an average of 300 letters a day.

The mail, per se doesn't upset network officials. For instance, John Lynch, chief of Washington's ABC News Bureau, recently observed that it would be a dark day indeed if the networks shaped their news-gathering efforts to appease its critics. But, still, there is a repetitive motif to it that easily leads one to visualize a public tired of Watergate and fed up with the snowballing problems of the Nixon administration.

For CBS, this has been an especially unsettling few months. Aggregate ratings for



the three network evening newscasts declined the equivalent of one full rating point during the January-May period, compared with last year, and the brunt of the loss appears to have been suffered by CBS News, which many journalists feel has been the most aggressive of the three networks in covering Watergate. Veteran TV reporter Les Brown referred to the critical mail from viewers as support for the theory that Watergate's dominance was responsible.

NBC News, which virtually caught up with CBS in the ratings during the latter's current slump, testily pointed out that Brown forgot to weigh this year's (early, crisis-induced) Daylight Saving Time switch, which always causes a rating slump. On the other hand, it might be argued that the energy crisis should have added viewers by keeping them at home.

The bad news from Nielsen follows another distracting experience for CBS. The network had quietly kept to itself the protests from owners of affiliate stations over its "pro-liberal bias," but at the recent CBS affiliates convention in New York, the only way Richard Salant, president of CBS News, could get on the program was by agreeing to answer the bias charges. He defended his department and correspondents, and mollified his critics by agreeing that Dan Rather had erred in parrying a presidential aside with a sharp rejoinder at a Houston press conference. ("Are you running for something?" Nixon asked. "No, are you?" Rather replied.) Salant said "most of us" wish Rather hadn't said that, and he suspected that Rather also wishes he hadn't.

Rather's mail took a huge jump immediately after his encounter with Nixon in Houston. Through the week ended May 24, CBS received 3,071 comments favorable to Rather, 4,686 accusing him of bias. Through the week ended March 15—the last full week before the Houston incident—Rather had received only 20 favorable letters, and 99 unfavorable. Figures jumped to 94 pro and 280 con for the week ended March 22; 193 pro, 703 con for March 29; and 1,547 pro, 1,904 con for two combined weeks ending April 12.

Several affiliate stations had complained that the Nixon-Rather incident was clear proof of an anti-Nixon bias on Rather's part. Others felt it an impertinence, worthy of reprimand, but more a proof of an inflated ego than an indication of bias.

Indeed, the problem may not be bias, which is difficult to prove, but rather the medium's own terrifying power to magnify and this is a classic example of what happens when networks daily feature developments of the same traumatic story.

Former FCC Chairman Newton Minow is among public figures who feel that Congress needs special treatment from television in order to counter the White House's ability to reach the electorate via TV. But that presidential power is still less than the cumulative power of the daily reporting by the networks on Watergate.

Former Assistant U.S. Atty. General William Ruckelshaus believes the press and TV now rival the government in their ability to set "the national agenda."

It is in the nature of the television medium that perspective—the importance of a development in a story—is easily lost. Network newsmen, whose income varies sharply with the number of network appearances they make, develop a style they seldom vary. Rather, for example, is crisp, forceful, uses few equivocating words, and like any reporter seldom downplays his story by calling it a minor development.

Searching for bias is not easy. What a news reporter says, and how he says it, is open to as many interpretations as the mumbled lines in the Watergate transcripts.

And if TV coverage weren't already difficult enough to compare and evaluate, the recent

"show-biz" trend in style adds additional complications. Eric Sevareid was grumbling about this recently, saying that he wished TV news would follow the lead of the entertainment division, which announced that it would have more programs next fall dealing with "human values." Said Sevareid: "I expect an anchorman to sing the news some night while doing a buck and wing." He added that the controversy over where burlesque had gone could now be settled. "It's back," said Sevareid, "and in the damndest disguise."

## BROOKS HAYS TALKS ABOUT SENATOR FULBRIGHT

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Brooks Hays of Arkansas and North Carolina, wrote an article entitled "A Tear for Fulbright," that recently appeared in the Arkansas Gazette and the Raleigh News and Observer.

As my colleagues know, Brooks Hays served in this body with distinction for 16 years and was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. He has also served as president of the Southern Baptist Convention, an assistant to the late President Kennedy, a member of the Board of the TVA, and a visiting professor at Rutgers and other universities.

Mr. Hays has just completed serving a term as president of Former Members of Congress, of which he was a cofounder.

Mr. Speaker, I was moved by this tribute to Senator FULBRIGHT by a person who was elected to Congress at the same time from the same State as Mr. FULBRIGHT was and who has also suffered the sting of defeat. Mr. Hays and Senator FULBRIGHT can both sympathize with the old saying that—

The people can defeat a candidate for a good reason, a bad reason, or no reason at all.

I commend this article, which follows, to my colleagues:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, June 25, 1974]

BROOKS HAYS SHEDS A TEAR FOR FULBRIGHT

(By Brooks Hays)

(This article by Brooks Hays, the former Arkansas Congressman, appeared in the Raleigh News and Observer.—Editor.)

In defeat Senator Fulbright was, as expected, magnanimous, so I will try to be, even as I am acting out a line in the old hymn, "To Shed a Sympathizing Tear."

The Senator and I were elected to Congress on the same day in 1942, and two years later I rejoiced over my brilliant young colleague's election to the Senate. In the House during his single term I think he regarded me as an elder confidant and counselor. He had had no buffeting of consequence and he knew of my three previous defeats. Perhaps in this 1974 previous reverse he will know that my message of sympathy is not perfunctory.

My feelings can best be expressed by sharing comments from two friends when I was defeated in 1958 after sixteen years in the House. A dinner was given for my wife and me. Later Congressman Henry Reuss of Wisconsin said, "I noticed you and Mrs. Hays

didn't shed a tear." "Of course not," I said, "it was a happy occasion."

But the Congressman added, "I sat with John Sherman Cooper and Ken Keating and they blubbered all evening."

Not taking that too seriously, I later repeated it to Senator Cooper hoping to induce a smile. The smile did not appear. In all seriousness, he said, "I was not weeping for you; I was weeping for my country." Without suggesting that my defeat bore dimensions comparable to the Senator's, I do weep, at least figuratively, for my country over the removal from public service of one of our greatest men.

Here is another test of faith in popular government, and I can meet it. My classroom expositions have always included the conviction that "government by consent of the governed" was never predicated on the assumption that the majority would, in the choice of officials or policies, always exhibit wisdom. I have been defeated often enough to know that the majority can be terribly wrong. But Arkansans are fiercely jealous of their democratic traditions. (The State motto is "Let the People Rule"). I share that devotion.

So to my old and revered friend, Bill, I say as I said to our fellow warrior, Adlai Stevenson, "Tis not always ours to command success. We can do more. We can deserve it." (Addison).

I used to enjoy a little joke on Bill, involving a situation for which we both blamed my wife. When she was a college student doing practice teaching at the University of Arkansas, Bill was in her seventh grade English class. That she left a glaring gap in his instruction was revealed years later, when he was debating Congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce during a House session. At one point he objected to a statement she had made.

"Where did I say any such thing," she demanded.

"Why, the gentlewoman inferred it throughout her speech."

"I beg your pardon!" she said haughtily. "The gentleman may have inferred it—I certainly did not imply it."

Bill said to me later, "So help me, I didn't know what she was talking about." Glee-fully, I suggested our alibi: "We can just blame Marion for that."

He was popular and glamorous, as well as scholarly. Not many public men wind up in the Senate in their thirties, and only two years after entering politics. His resolution on postwar foreign policy, pledging us to cooperation with other nations for peace, quickly made his name known around the world. However, he derives greatest satisfaction from the Fulbright scholarship program which has benefited 150,000 young scholars and greatly strengthened our hopes for peace.

Apparently, he recognizes that a bit of luck abetted his natural endowments. Few men have reached the top of the political pile with such meager personal acquaintanceship with a constituency and such limited experience in campaigning. Shortly after he became a senator he phoned me, "Brooks, who is (name withheld)?" naming someone I knew in south Arkansas. I told him, "Just about the most effective political leader you had in your corner in that country."

But he rapidly closed the gap, and with an easy smile and an attractive wife who knows how to supplement his efforts, he developed a firm following which many had deemed impregnable.

I never quite understood the impression among some that he is aloof and even arrogant. Sure, he is no back slapper, and his style is low-key, but he has gentle ways, and the biting characterizations that occasionally cropped out in the Foreign Relations hearings during the Vietnam inquiries did not reflect ill-temper, but rather firm judgments over what he believed to be a dangerous policy. \* \* \*

I could feel for him in the short "Issues and Answers" joint appearance with his opponent on Sunday before the primary—the only opportunity he had to confront Governor Bumpers during the agonizing campaign.

Bill Fulbright sincerely believes that it is the duty of candidates to discuss issues—that the voters are entitled to know the difference between the respective positions. Whatever else might be said about that program it certainly proved that Dale Bumpers was not running because of any clash in philosophies. Conceivably his victory was another case of a good young man upsetting a good older man.

Still, we, who from close and extended observation, are aware of the tremendous debt the United States owes the Senator, are perplexed that a competent and friendly man like Governor Bumpers, apparently having admiration for Fulbright, would choose to oppose the Senator, whose difficulties were produced largely by his opposition to the Viet Nam engagement, a position that the Governor did not condemn.

Another source of discontent was the charge that the Congress is involved in international problems at the expense of domestic affairs. In Senator Fulbright's case this cannot be sustained. He has recognized the interlocking relationship of the two interests, and the State has profited by his statesmanship in both areas. His concern over markets for exportable farm products, notably poultry and rice, projected him into the field of trade legislation and, indirectly, international negotiation with resultant benefits for the Arkansas economy.

The Senator's courage has been shown in numerous votes and actions. He recognized, before scarcely a single other Senator did, the dangers from McCarthyism. He voted, after listening to Senator Ervin on the Prayer Amendment, against an attempt to undo the Supreme Court's decision in which a prescribed prayer was required by the State of New York. This vote by Bill was not very popular in Arkansas.

The one controversy in his period of service in which he did not exemplify the basic ideas which make up his political philosophy was, of course, that of civil rights. There were times in that legislative drama when I felt a bit wistful about him, particularly when I would have welcomed some support in my efforts to achieve a non-violent acceptance of Court orders for desegregation in Little Rock. But I never at any time condemned him or my other colleagues for their silence. At least, Senator Fulbright was among those Southern politicians who did not exploit the issue. And he gracefully, though slowly, assumed a viable relationship with the black community.

With these lines depicting my grief that Fulbright's voice in the Foreign Relations Committee and in the Senate is stilled, I want to register also my belief that the loss to politics will be a gain to education. He will doubtless have more offers of professorships than any modern figure has received, and more invitations to speak than he can conveniently accept or expeditiously decline \* \* \*

Governor Bumpers has already made a terrific impact on Southern politics. I will try to suppress my hurt feelings over the course he took this year. I may continue to insist that his own future as a leader in State and national life would have been better served, had he not paid this price of Fulbright's removal from the scene, but he will find me applauding his independence and his ethical standards \* \* \*

I will hope, therefore, for the healing of wounds and for the emergence of a leader who can demonstrate that personal ambitions even of the giant proportions he possesses may be accompanied by a statesmanship that overshadows opportunism.

## THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Law Journal of July 8, 1974, there appears an excellent editorial on the right to privacy authored by James A. Finkelstein.

Aside from the fact that the editorial is well written on an important subject and should be read by as many people as possible, I am delighted it also happens to be written by a good friend:

[From the New York Law Journal, July 8, 1974]

### OUR PRIVACY IS BEING ERODED

(By James A. Finkelstein)

More than 900 government data banks maintain files on millions of Americans in computerized eternity. The dossiers, according to Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., contain at least 1 billion, 52 million different records. They detail individual memberships and associations, remarks and public statements, attendance at meetings and participation at demonstrations, sexual activities, drinking habits and personality quirks. Much of the data is raw and unverified and frequently accumulated through interviews with gossip neighbors.

In the private sector, data banks are maintained by credit bureaus, associations of insurance companies, distributors of mailing lists and an almost endless variety of other organizations. Just the five largest credit bureaus maintain files, in varying degrees of accuracy, on over 54 million Americans and in just one year distributed to their clients almost 40 million investigative reports.

Under the Bank Security Act, banks are required to maintain microfilm records of every customer transaction in excess of \$100 and to turn those records over when requested by federal investigative agencies.

In response to public concern, President Nixon established in February a cabinet-level committee, headed by Vice President Ford "to draw up safeguards for the protection of the privacy of individual citizens against misuse of information about them stored in computers."

Congress has been grappling with this problem for the past five years on a non-partisan basis. The acknowledged leaders in the effort to preserve the right to privacy have been liberal Manhattan Democratic Congressman Edward I. Koch, and conservative California Republican Congressman Barry Goldwater, Jr. On the Senate side, that effort is led by senators of such diverse views as Sam J. Ervin, Jr., Barry Goldwater, Edward M. Kennedy and Charles H. Percy.

Proposed legislation would include the right of an individual to examine his files and make corrections, the rights of an individual to challenge the accuracy of his files, and to enforce privacy through administrative and judicial processes. In addition, such legislation would require public disclosure of data banks when established and that access to the files be explicitly defined and controlled and that dissemination be strictly limited.

The Constitution guarantees that protect the privacy of individuals have been eroded by access of both government and private access to the records of individuals. As Senator Ervin put it: "When people fear surveillance, whether it exists or not, when they grow afraid to speak their minds and hearts freely to their government or anyone else, then we shall cease to be a free society."

Facts that have emerged from various Watergate investigations demonstrate the

extent to which government power can be exerted on the individual's right to privacy, through the preparation of an "enemies list," the breach of the confidentiality of income tax returns, warrantless wiretaps under the imperatives or pretext (depending upon one's point of view) of "national security," burglary of a psychiatrist's office to invade the privacy of an individual's medical record. The many forms that an individual fills out become, in the Solzhenitsyn metaphor, "hundreds of little threads radiating" from each person who necessarily then fears those who manipulate the threads.

Before the 93d Session of Congress adjourns, it should act on pending legislation to preserve the individual's right to privacy; the right, as defined by Justice Brandeis, "to be let alone."

After an exhaustive study of military surveillance of civilian politics, the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights warned: "The Orwellian nightmare of a government always watching, and, armed with knowledge of a citizen's thoughts and ambitions, silencing their adverse views with real or presumed threats of reprisals, is a vision which has haunted twentieth century Americans since it was conceived. Yet those charged with the operation of government continue to ignore the warning."

Congress can no longer evade the warning. It can and must act now to put an end to the nightmare.

## 2,4,5-T HERBICIDES: EPA BACKDOWN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the many profound lessons this country should have learned from our Indochina experience is that poisonous chemicals have no morally useful role in war or in peace. For 8 long years, the United States dropped ton after ton of 2,4,5-T herbicide on the land and people of Vietnam. Besides inflicting immediate damage upon Indochina, these poisons may very well have caused genetic damage to the Vietnamese people for generations to come. Recent newspaper accounts and scientific studies clearly illuminate this depressing possibility:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 6, 1973]  
CONTAMINATION OF VIETNAM RIVER FISH LAID TO DEFOLIANT

Two Harvard biochemists have found that a component of a defoliant chemical used by United States forces in South Vietnam has contaminated fish and shellfish in Vietnamese waters and they say it may pose long-term hazards for the human population.

[From the Daily News, May 2, 1973]  
SOUTH VIET SHRIMP CALLED TAINTED BY DEFOLIANT

Japanese newspapers have quoted a South Vietnamese botanist as saying that marine life in the South China Sea has been contaminated by defoliant chemicals dropped on forests by American planes during the Vietnam war.

Clearly, there is no place for 2,4,5-T herbicide in an environmentally responsible society. One would think we would have learned that lesson by now. Yet, just days ago, the Environmental Protection Agency announced that it was



withdrawing its notice of cancellation of registrations for the use of 2,4,5-T on rice, and withdrawing notices of intent to hold hearings on all uses of the substance. I am in firm opposition to the EPA backdown on this matter and urge the appropriate officials to swiftly reconsider their decision. On June 28, the Environmental Defense Fund wrote to the Deputy Administrator of the EPA, John Quarks, to express their dissenting views on the herbicide decision. The letter, written by William A. Butler, the Washington counsel of the Defense Fund, is now submitted in full for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues:

ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND,  
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1974.

Re 2,4,5-T; Silvex and Erbon: I.F. & R. No.'s 295 et al. and 302.

JOHN QUARKS, Esq.,  
Deputy Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: The Environmental Defense Fund wishes the record to show that it is in fundamental disagreement with two positions in which EPA has apparently acquiesced by its actions of June 24, i.e., actions withdrawing notice of cancellation of registrations for use of 2,4,5-T on rice and withdrawing notices of intent to hold hearings on all registered uses of 2,4,5-Trichlorophenoxyacetic acid and all registered uses of herbicides potentially containing tetrachlorodioxin, including Silvex and Erbon. These positions apparently now taken by EPA are:

1. that if information obtained after a pesticide is registered indicates that continued registration may pose a hazard to public health, the registration need not be suspended or cancelled while the newly discovered hazard is being evaluated; and

2. that the burden of proving or disproving newly appreciated hazards properly falls upon EPA, rather than upon the registrant, and that if EPA cannot provide such proof, registrations must be continued.

In contradistinction to the above, EDF believes that the mere existence of a substantial doubt as to whether a pesticide is

injurious to public health is in itself sufficient grounds for suspension and/or cancellation of registrations of the pesticide;<sup>1</sup> that the suspension or cancellation notices should be continued until such time as the registrant is able to submit data showing that the pesticide can be used with an adequate margin of public safety; and that although EPA may assist in developing such data, legal responsibility for the provision of such data may not be assumed by the agency. The responsibilities of EPA in this area are to determine whether there is a credible doubt concerning possible adverse effects of the pesticide and, if so, to suspend and/or cancel registrations unless and until the doubt is resolved. If EPA takes upon itself the ultimate burden of proof regarding a toxic product's safety, not only will it remove much incentive on the part of registrants to do so, but will also impose upon itself an impossible task in direct conflict with its own earlier policy and the legislative intent of the Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1972.

Therefore, we request that EPA suspend (and/or reinstate cancellation notices) for all registrations of 2,4,5-T and other herbicides derived from trichlorophenol during the period in which hazards of these herbicides are being evaluated. In light of Dr. Upholt's statement at the conference of all parties that EPA does not question (1) that tetrachlorodioxin (TCDD) itself is highly teratogenic, (2) that the purest commercially available 2,4,5-T is itself teratogenic, and (3) your statement that existing suspensions and cancellations of 2,4,5-T other than on rice will remain in effect (i.e., use around the home and garden, and recreational areas, or where water contamination would occur), we

<sup>1</sup>In view of the fact that both the registrants and the EPA have embarked on major research programs in order to resolve some of the still unanswered questions concerning possible adverse effects of 2,4,5-T and related herbicides, we presume that neither question the existence of a continuing substantial doubt in the present case. In fact, your notice and statement clearly imply as much.

are at a loss to understand why for the larger volume and food uses of 2,4,5-T EPA is willing to permit continued use of the environment as registrants' laboratory, and the population at large as their unwilling guinea pigs. We are further perplexed why EPA permits Silvex, almost identical to 2,4,5-T in all pertinent chemical particulars, to be continued to be used for the very purposes (home and garden, recreational areas, and areas where contamination of drinking water could occur) for which 2,4,5-T has long since been cancelled, a cancellation you have now just affirmed. Surely this anomaly demands redress.

At the conference of all parties you agreed that we and our clients, as well as industry, might have an opportunity to participate in the planning of EPA's ongoing research in these matters. We would like an opportunity to meet with your research administrators as soon as possible to exchange ideas with them. We also request that EDF be kept informed of the progress of the research programs as they are conducted to assess the hazard of these herbicides; that the concentration of TCDD in current production runs of Silvex and Erbon be determined, with EDF being notified of the results; that the research programs include studies to assess the teratogenicity of both commercial and purified grades of all of the herbicides in question, especially Silvex; that a reaffirmation of the responsibility of a registrant for establishing the safety of his product, that the registrants be required to reimburse EPA for the cost of the research program; and that EPA publish a public warning that until the degree of hazard can be assessed, all direct or indirect exposure of pregnant women or animals to these herbicides should be avoided.

We trust that the above requests will not appear strident, but candidly, we are deeply concerned both by the specific of the June 24 decisions, and by the ominous policy shift they seem to portend. We trust that within the next year or two these issues will receive the public review they deserve.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. BUTLER,  
Washington Counsel.

## SENATE—Thursday, July 11, 1974

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Rev. Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Where there is no vision, the people perish: but he that keepeth the law, happy is he.*—Proverbs 29:18.

Eternal Father, who made man to dream dreams and see visions, keep us ever erect in spirit that we may always see the horizon and the promise of a better world.

Deliver us from the small vista, the cramped intellect, the narrow view, the tiny thought, which first diminishes and then destroys a nation. Keep our eyes open to the everlasting hills, the illuminated skies, the bright sunrises of hope and beauty and truth. Keep ever before us the holy vision of Thy perfect kingdom when all men are brothers and the law is fulfilled in love.

We pray in the name of Christ, who never forsook the vision, even on a cross. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 10, 1974, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agreed, without amendment, to Senate Concurrent Resolution 101, to authorize the transfer of catafalque to the Supreme Court for funeral services for the late Chief Justice Warren.

The message also announced that the House passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 14920. An act to further the conduct of research, development, and demonstrations in geothermal energy technologies, to establish a Geothermal Energy Coordination and Management Project, to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to

provide for the funding of activities relating to geothermal energy, to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide for the carrying out of research and development in geothermal energy technology, to carry out a program of demonstrations in technologies for the utilization of geothermal resources, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14323. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to revise the method of providing for public remuneration in the event of a nuclear incident, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 559 to provide additional copies of hearings and the final report of the Judiciary Committee on the impeachment inquiry.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 15323) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to revise the method of providing for public remuneration in the event of a nuclear incident, and for other purposes, was read twice by title and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.