

It seems to me that it is certainly justifiable, even at this late hour today, to file a cloture motion to assure that the Senate will vote on this matter on Thursday, rather than possibly having it go over until Friday or later in the week, when not as many Senators might be present as might otherwise be the case.

Therefore, on behalf of myself and 16 other Senators, I send this motion to the desk and ask that it lie at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair, without objection, directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the motion to concur in the House Amendment to the Senate Amendment to the Bill (H.R. 7824), a bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to provide for the transfer of the legal services program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to a Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes.

1. Robert Taft, Jr.
2. Jacob K. Javits.
3. Alan Cranston.
4. Edward W. Brooke.
5. Robert P. Griffin.
6. James B. Pearson.
7. Harrison A. Williams.
8. Floyd K. Haskell.
9. Joseph R. Biden.
10. Walter D. Huddleston.
11. Lee Metcalf.
12. Clifford P. Case.
13. Charles McC. Mathias.
14. Gaylord Nelson.
15. Walter F. Mondale.
16. Edward M. Kennedy.
17. Richard S. Schweiker.
18. Mike Mansfield.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will meet at the hour of 9:30 a.m. tomorrow. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized each for not to exceed 15 minutes and in the order stated: Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD.

There will then be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements limited therein to 5 minutes each.

At the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order 910, S. 1566, a bill to provide for the normal flow of ocean commerce between Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, with the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the west coast and to prevent certain interruptions thereof. There is a time agreement on that bill. Yea-and-nay votes are anticipated.

At the hour of 3 p.m., the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business. In the interim, in the event the Senate has completed action on S. 1566 prior to the hour of 3 p.m., the Senate will likely resume consideration of S. 3164, cost of real estate settlement services, until the hour of 3 p.m. But in any event, at the hour of 3 p.m., the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business, S. 707, consumer protection, at which time the question before the Senate will be on the adoption of the first committee amendment, on which there is a 1-hour limitation, with a rollcall vote scheduled to occur on the

adoption of the first committee amendment at the hour of 4 p.m.

I repeat, there will be rollcall votes tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be called before the Senate, I move that the Senate, in accordance with the order previously entered, stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 6:05 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 17, 1974, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 16, 1974:

ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

Robert L. DuPont, Jr., of Maryland, to be Administrator of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration. (New position)

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Philip A. Loomis, Jr., of California, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1979. (Reappointment)

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. John J. Burns, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, MAY 1974

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the May 1974 civil-

ian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, MAY 1974

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in May 1974 was 2,863,459 as compared with 2,849,009 in the preceding month of April—a net increase of 14,450. Total pay for April 1974, the latest month for which actual expenditures are available, was \$3,006,489,000.

Employment in the Legislative Branch in May totaled 35,026—an increase of 269, and the Judicial Branch increased 13 during the month to a total of 9,407.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in May 1974, as compared with the preceding month of April and with May a year ago, follows:

	Full-time in permanent positions	Change	Temporary part-time, etc.	Change	Total employment	Change
Monthly change:						
April 1974	2,455,621		349,237		2,804,858	
May 1974	2,465,613	+9,992	353,413	+4,176	2,819,026	+14,168
12-mo change:						
May 1973	2,433,618		339,138		2,772,756	
May 1974	2,465,613	+31,995	353,413	+14,275	2,819,026	+46,270

Some highlights with respect to executive branch employment for the month of May 1974 are:

Total employment of executive agencies shows an increase of 14,168 during the month to a total of 2,819,026. Major increases were in Defense agencies with 6,387, Agriculture with 3,417, Interior with 3,408 and Postal Service with 1,896. The largest decrease was in Treasury with 4,707.

The full-time permanent employment level of 2,465,613 reflects a net increase during

the month of 9,992, primarily in Defense with 4,327 and Postal Service with 3,197.

During the first eleven months of fiscal year 1974 there was a net increase of 43,906 employees in full-time permanent positions. This represents an increase of 36,286 among the civilian agencies and an increase of 7,620 in Defense agencies.

With one month left in fiscal year 1974, the May figure for full-time permanent employment is 14,987 under the budget pro-

jection of 2,480,600 for the fiscal year-end employment level.

Temporary and part-time employment in May shows an increase over April of 4,176 to a total of 353,413. Major increases were in Interior with 3,347, Agriculture with 3,322 and Defense agencies with 2,060. The largest decreases were in Treasury with 4,616 and Postal Service with 1,301. The changes in Interior, Agriculture and Treasury are largely seasonal.

Total employment inside the United States increased 15,805 in May to a total of 2,677,358. Total employment outside the United States decreased 1,637 to a total of 141,668.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a tabulation, excerpted from the joint committee report, on personnel employed full time in permanent posi-

tions by executive branch agencies during May 1974, showing comparisons with June 1972, June 1973, and the budget estimates for June 1974:

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

Major agencies	June 1972	June 1973	May 1974	Estimated June 30, 1974 ¹	Major agencies	June 1972	June 1973	May 1974	Estimated June 30, 1974 ¹
Agriculture.....	82,511	81,715	78,598	80,200	Environmental Protection Agency.....	7,835	8,270	8,795	9,200
Commerce.....	28,412	28,300	28,571	28,600	General Services Administration.....	36,002	35,721	36,516	37,200
Defense:					National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	27,428	25,955	25,430	25,000
Civil functions.....	30,585	29,971	28,873	28,700	Panama Canal.....	13,777	13,680	13,659	14,000
Military functions.....	1,009,548	957,310	966,028	996,600	Selective Service System.....	5,791	4,607	3,110	3,100
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	105,764	114,307	125,311	123,900	Small Business Administration.....	3,916	4,050	3,939	4,100
Housing and Urban Development.....	15,200	15,820	14,870	14,800	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	14,001	13,995	13,531	14,000
Interior.....	56,892	56,771	57,535	58,900	U.S. Information Agency.....	9,255	9,048	8,867	9,100
Justice.....	45,446	45,496	47,461	48,900	Veterans' Administration.....	163,179	170,616	173,714	173,400
Labor.....	12,339	12,468	12,396	12,700	All other agencies.....	33,499	34,610	36,939	37,300
State.....	22,699	22,578	22,670	23,400	Contingencies.....				2,000
Agency for International Development.....	11,719	10,108	9,140	9,900	Subtotal.....	1,910,854	1,874,424	1,901,877	1,942,700
Transportation.....	67,232	67,885	68,234	69,500	U.S. Postal Service.....	594,834	547,283	563,736	537,900
Treasury.....	95,728	98,087	104,078	104,700	Total ²	2,505,688	2,421,707	2,465,613	2,480,600
Atomic Energy Commission.....	6,836	7,145	7,372	7,400					
Civil Service Commission.....	5,260	5,911	6,240	6,100					

¹ Source: As projected in 1974 budget document submitted by the President on Feb. 4, 1974.

² Excludes 4,000 positions involved in proposed transfer of St. Elizabeths Hospital to the District of Columbia.

³ May figure includes 1,320 disadvantaged persons in public service careers programs as compared with 1,113 in April.

FRUSTRATION OVER INFLATION

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, certainly the most frustrating and most serious problem we face in America today is runaway inflation. A recent Gallup poll confirmed once again what we already knew: by an overwhelming margin, the No. 1 concern of the citizens of our country is the inflationary spiral which eats away at their paychecks and makes it well nigh impossible for those on fixed incomes to get along.

It is not surprising that the people should look to their Government for a solution to the problem, since there is more than ample evidence to indicate that it is Government which originated the problem in the first place. And as more and more public ire is directed at the Government generally, elements within the Government begin to point fingers—at virtually anyone else—in a wild attempt to avoid the blame.

In fact, there is more than enough blame to go around, and neither the Congress nor the executive department are alone in contributing to the problem, as Art Pine pointed out in an excellent article in the Baltimore Sun this past weekend. Mr. Pine reports on economic affairs from the Sun's Washington bureau.

He notes first of all that the public is confused when it comes to inflation—most people do not understand how inflation is caused, and have often conflicting notions about how to solve the problem. Mr. Pine says:

The confusion isn't difficult to explain. Economics itself is often so complex a subject that even economists are frequently baffled by it. Until recently economics wasn't even taught in the high schools, and in college the material often bore little real relation to what actually was happening in the outside world.

Compounding public misunderstanding on the issue is the fact that the administration has consistently been publicly overoptimistic in its economic forecasts, leading to high public expectations which are rarely, if ever, fulfilled.

And the two Houses of Congress "are so hopelessly disorganized in their approach to economic policy that they often wind up doing precisely what economists fear most," he says. Mr. Pine argues persuasively that the vital first step in dealing effectively with inflation must be an end to misleading public statements by Government officials, and the avoidance of purported "solutions" to inflation such as economic controls, which are more cosmetic than anything, and which fail to address the real causes of the problem. There can be no place for demagoguery or crude attempts at capitalizing on public discontent by offering "solutions" which are much longer on sex appeal than on economic good sense. If we are to deal effectively with inflation, our approach must be calm and well reasoned.

In the interests of helping to stimulate this sort of discussion, I now enter in the Record the text of Mr. Pine's article:

[From the Baltimore Sun]

WHO'S BEEN HONEST IN MONEY TALK?

(By Art Pine)

WASHINGTON.—Amid mounting frustration over the nation's inflation problem, the government has run into an ironic dilemma. The issue is not merely whether strategists can find the right policy to slow prices effectively, but also whether the public would accept it if anyone ever devised a solution. Indeed, given the widening disparity between the nation's increasingly complex economic problems and the public's increasingly simplistic demands for action, many observers have begun to wonder whether it is possible any longer for the government to conduct a rational economic policy. Some analysts would argue that the answer already is in doubt.

The problem was touched on last week by Herbert Stein, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, who blamed the public, in part, for the rise in inflation—arguing that voters' opposition to higher

taxes effectively had inhibited recent administrations from using a tax increase to ward off inflation, thus allowing prices to go up unchecked. Mr. Stein told a television audience that "government policy operates within the limits of what the American people want and will tolerate." By eschewing higher taxes, he asserted, voters "created the conditions" for prices to soar.

The resulting public reaction was predictable—especially in view of the Nixon administration's own record on economic policy, which is blemished enough to give any White House fingerpointer pause. Within hours after Mr. Stein had made his statement, there were barb-filled editorials denouncing him for "sheer gall" and arrogance and recalling the administration's own sorry performance. Indeed, newspaper editorial-page cartoonists are still having a field day with Mr. Stein. And the gaffe is apt to remain unforgotten for some time to come.

However, Mr. Stein's unfortunate timing aside, the presidential adviser did have a point there. Especially in the past decade or so, increasing public demand for accelerating—and uninterrupted—economic growth has all but overwhelmed most western governments. Opting expediently for what seemed to be the most popular path, the free-world democracies pumped up their economies well past the overheating point, with essentially no thought to what might be the consequence. The result was a decade-long boom that many analysts now blame for the inflation spiral currently under way.

Moreover, the dilemma seems especially acute here in the United States, where a spate of other factors serve to exacerbate the underlying situation. On one hand, for a variety of reasons Americans generally seem to have less real understanding of economics than any other major national issue. Yet, because it affects their own personal well-being, voters probably respond more vocally to the economic issue than any save a Watergate-style scandal. The result is, politicians frequently feel under intense pressure to go for the most expedient—rather than the most sensible—policy solutions.

For example, during the mid-1960's President Johnson flatly rejected a recommendation from his advisers that he seek a tax increase to finance the Vietnam hostilities—largely because of his fear of an adverse public reaction. This result was a predicted round of inflation that lasted through late 1972. President Nixon bowed to voters' clamor about recession in late 1971 and proposed a series of sharp tax cuts that later overheated

the economy—bringing on a new round of inflation. And in mid-1973, feeling consumer pressure over the impact of meat prices, he ordered a second freeze over the warnings of his advisers—a blunder that distorted the supply chain for several months to come.

The existence of widespread public misconceptions about the economy is not hard to document. Opinion polls constantly turn up sizable segments of the electorate that are convinced the U.S. is in a full-scale depression, or that the best way to fight inflation is to lower federal taxes. Frequently, sentiment seems almost to contradict itself. Samplings taken during Phase 2 showed the voters were generally satisfied that the government was "doing something about inflation," even though they didn't think the controls were doing any good. There were few, if any, cries for further real belt-tightening.

The confusion isn't difficult to explain. First, economics itself is often so complex a subject that even economists are frequently baffled by it. Indeed, most forecasters have been a good deal off target in recent years, in part because economic forces appear to be changing. Second, except for the 1929 Depression, Americans generally have been shielded from serious economic hardship, and thus have not had to think about it much. Until recently, few high schools even bothered to teach the subject. And college courses often bore little real relation to what actually was happening in the outside world.

Nor has the press made much contribution in this area. Of the 1,700-some daily newspapers now operating in the U.S., only about 10 have one or more journalists even assigned to cover economic matters. (What appears on most papers' financial pages is simply business news, which relates only peripherally to general economic trends.) And the major television networks allow so little time for economic issues that to many analysts they more often wind up distorting economic developments than presenting them intelligently.

The paradox is a dilemma for economic policymakers. As recent elections have shown clearly, public clamor over economic problems often is more vocal than voter reaction on almost any other major issue—and the pressure for a quick-and-easy solution is more intense as well. With economic problems becoming more complex daily, many analysts are wondering whether the government will be able to keep fiscal policy tight—and resist the pressures to take the easy or expedient route, no matter what public opinion says. Indeed, is a rational economic policy possible anymore?

Mr. Stein had an answer during the same television interview that somehow was lost in the furor over his finger-pointing—that the government try exercising some leadership to persuade the voters on what must be done. Conceding that in a democracy policymakers must by nature "respond" to the wishes of the people, Mr. Stein then suggested that they have a leadership role as well. "Governments . . . should also educate the people," he asserted, "and that's what we have to go through now." The implication was that the administration would begin a hard campaign to instill honesty and reality into the public-policy debate.

The suggestion was a good one, and—many would argue—the only sensible approach to reconciling today's needs with the policy demands of democracy. Indeed, it seems hard to fault on any ground, assuming the administration is really ready to carry it out. But it also evoked a good deal of irony—especially in view of the administration's own somewhat spotty record in "leveling" with the public on the seriousness of the economic dilemma. Indeed, to many observers, the government has been so big a culprit that Mr. Stein's finger of blame should have been pointing the other way.

For in fact, for much of the past 15 years, government policymakers have been doing just the opposite of what Mr. Stein suggested—continually misleading the public into thinking that prosperity required no discipline, while simultaneously pushing all-out for full employment without any regard for inflation. The concept, ingrained in the national psyche during the successes of the Kennedy administration, was carried beyond its limits by President Johnson's later assurances that the nation could afford both "guns and butter."

The disease has infected Congress, which—as Senator Mike Mansfield, the Senate majority leader, confessed last week—has done nothing to combat inflation, and, indeed may often have been a good part of the problem. For years, the legislators have plunged the budget deeply into deficit without any thought of their impact on the inflation problem. And the two houses are so hopelessly disorganized in their approach to economic policy that they often wind up doing precisely what economists fear most.

For example, despite warnings from almost everywhere, the Senate last month came dangerously close to enacting a major tax cut—a step most analysts viewed as certain to exacerbate inflation. And the House Banking and Currency Committee, deliberating over wage-price controls, voted to roll back farm prices to levels of the previous May, despite warnings from virtually every sector that it would result in massive shortages of food. The list of similar blunders would go on for pages.

But to many observers—and that is where Mr. Stein's fingerpointing backfires—by far the biggest offender has been the Nixon administration, which came into office in 1969 blithely insisting it could control inflation without much national sacrifice, and has continued for 5½ years with both policy actions and rhetoric that later proved to be misleading. Indeed, the Nixon record on leveling over economic issues has been so strikingly dismal that Mr. Stein's call for new realism can hardly help but ring hollow.

On the issue of tax increases, for example, it was Mr. Nixon who first stirred up public resistance to a tax increase by charging as early as the 1968 campaign that taxes already were too high and ought to be lowered. Despite serious inflation, as soon as he got in, Mr. Nixon scrapped the Johnson surtax, and cut taxes—by signing the tax-reform bill—as early as 1969. In mid-1971, the President once again slashed taxes—despite continuing inflation—claiming his wage-price controls would offset the impact, even though he didn't believe they were working. The result was further pump-priming that led to overheating.

The administration's policy actions have been just as inconsistent, with the President first inveighing vigorously against wage-and-price controls, and then finally adopting them; preaching the need for freedom in markets, and then moving to subsidize both Lockheed and cattle-feeders; and calling for fiscal discipline, while allowing year after year of near-record budget deficits. Only last week, after harping for weeks on the need for tighter spending limits, Mr. Nixon signed a veterans' bill that would swell his own budget by a whopping \$700 million. Indeed, the White House's own resolve to take the "tough measures" against inflation would seem to be no better than the public's.

Finally, the administration's rhetoric has been so continually overoptimistic that it almost certainly helped strain public patience and give rise to the push for more instant solutions. Virtually from the day the administration took office, the White House has hyped-up its assessments of the trends in the economy, bloated its forecasts, and consistently underestimated the problems that confronted it. Only last May, Mr. Stein again

called a temporary slowdown in the rise of consumer prices "representative of a more durable change for the better"—only to be embarrassed when inflation accelerated again the following month.

Small wonder, then, that the editorial writers could not stop snickering when Mr. Stein pointed the finger at the public's reluctance to face the economic situation squarely. The administration itself seems to have been doing just that since it's first day in office.

Just the same, Mr. Stein does appear to have put his finger on a problem that is bothering a growing number of economists and policymakers—the increasing disparity between what is needed and what the public wants. And he has suggested a solution that might well be put into effect sometime soon.

Indeed, one of Mr. Stein's colleagues—William J. Fellner, another member of the council—has recently suggested just how important it might be for the government to remain firm and straightforward, both in its deeds and rhetoric, warning that unless the administration retains "credibility" in its economic policies, inflation may persist for many more years to come. The views of Mr. Fellner, who was not involved in the administration's earlier shenanigans, may not be substantially different from what Mr. Stein was attempting to get across on last week's TV program. But they do approach the problem from the proper side of the fence.

INFLATION HITS WHEAT FARMERS TOO

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, working for legislation that I have sponsored involving an increase in the target price for wheat and feed grains (H.R. 14655), I am often asked by my urban friends and colleagues why this legislation is needed when our Nation's farmers are getting such good prices.

For some time now, I have been trying to convince many of my colleagues that inflation is not only a problem for the consumer in our metropolitan areas but a severe problem for the farmer, too. In fact, the farmer has seen his old nemesis, the cost-price squeeze, turn into a virtual bear hug!

Several weeks ago, Mr. Pat Gaston, of the Salina Journal summed up this situation very well. I commend Pat's article to the attention of my colleagues. I would hope every Member could keep Mr. Gaston's article in mind when considering farm legislation. Such issues as our Nation's food supply, world hunger, and even world peace are directly related to the need for the farmer to get a fair return in the marketplace.

The article follows:

[From the Salina Journal, July 7, 1974]

INFLATION HITS WHEAT FARMERS TOO

(By Pat Gaston)

I am not what you would call ancient, and it's easy for me to remember the days when farmers hoped against hope for \$2 wheat.

This summer, those same Kansas farmers are angling after a much more ambitious sum. Five bucks a bushel is the figure most commonly quoted.

Consumers wince, certain government

economists express Grave Concern, and the baking industry fairly trips over itself pouring new leaven into its dollar-a-loaf campaign.

But what's behind this mass withholding from market of much of the 1974 wheat crop? Why are farmers who, 2 years ago, talked of \$2.50 as an unattainable price now turning up their weathered noses at \$3.90 and \$4.05? Is simple greed the answer? Has avarice finally seeped from Manhattan's concrete canyons to pollute the good folk of the Kansas plains?

Not hardly. City dwellers who are trying to cope with an inflation rate of 15 or 20 percent just forget, sometimes, that the farmer currently is caught in an even more vicious cost spiral.

Consider that a new 18-foot combine—of average size, by modern farming standards—goes for about \$25,000 these days. The bigger 20- and 24-foot models used extensively in Western Kansas cost \$30,000 and over. Those are going prices for machines that will be used a maximum of 3 months each year—during the wheat and sorghum harvests—and they represent an increase of 20 percent over the past couple of years.

Consider that an average combine gulps about 1½ gallons of gasoline for each acre of cropland harvested. On 600 acres of wheat, that's \$450 for fuel alone—double the price of 2 years back.

Consider that fertilizer, when it was available last fall, often sold at stiff black market rates of \$325 or more per ton. What anhydrous there was for sale at the normal \$180-\$200 per ton price generally was insufficient to insure a healthy crop.

As an upshot of the fertilizer shortage, and of drought and disease which plagued much of the Western Kansas wheat crop this year, many farmers harvested significantly less wheat than they did in 1973—while prices for everything else kept rising. During last year's record harvest, yields of 45 and 50 bushels an acre were the norm throughout much of the area. This year, officials agree farmers will have done well to average 30 bushels statewide.

Consider, finally, that few farmers—less than 2 in 10 are the best estimates—actually reaped the benefits of those \$5 price levels that aroused consumer alarm last year. Both in 1972 and '73, farmers were encouraged to sell early—or did so out of pressing financial need. Most took a shellacking. They are determined it won't happen again.

Based on the percentage of consumer income actually needed to purchase food, American agricultural prices have for decades been among the lowest in the world.

Perhaps the farmer, derided in the past for taking advantage of government price supports and subsidies, is tired of subsidizing the price of new cars and color television sets.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the question of national health insurance has for some time been an issue of concern to our country and the Congress. As the subject of health care is complicated, the alternatives it presents are complex. In view of the fact this issue is now being considered by the House Ways and Means Committee, I would like to share with the Congress additional insight presented by the following opinions. They

CXX—1490—Part 18

originate from recent editorials printed by the Topeka Capital-Journal and the Wall Street Journal.

DO WE REALLY NEED NHI?

Congress has received at least 16 national health insurance proposals this year and is in a dilemma about how to resolve the question whether to pass one of them or postpone a decision another year.

Our Congressmen hold the key to the nation's third largest industry. It employs about 4.4 million persons, including 320,000 physicians and 743,000 nurses. Our health bill last year came to \$94.1 billion, 40 percent of which was in tax dollars and 40 percent of which went to hospitals. That was \$441 for every person in the nation.

Powerful forces, making different demands and with different expectations, are at work to get some form of national health insurance on the books this year. But there also are many critics, notably the physicians and health providers, who fear that any federal plan will restrict their professional duties and enormously increase the total health bill by lifting the financial barrier that now keeps some from seeking care.

Congress should find out if the American public really needs and wants federal health insurance. The public has not made any great clamor for it so far, and if it does not Congress should not force it upon the people.

Indications in Kansas are that a federal plan is not needed because a great number of residents or their employers are providing their own insurance. In Topeka, a recent survey at Stormont-Vall and St. Francis Hospitals revealed that 85 to 90 percent of their patients have some form of health insurance. From 25 to 30 percent had Blue Cross coverage. Thirty-three percent were covered by Medicare, and from 16 to 27 percent had other commercial insurance coverage.

Kansas Blue Cross-Blue Shield carries coverage for about 44.6 percent of the population. Its coverage includes all counties except Johnson and Wyandotte, which are served by Kansas City Blue Cross-Blue Shield. Its coverage includes Plan 65 which supplements Medicare.

Eliminating the 10 percent without insurance, that means about 45 percent of the population is covered by plans offered by the 427 other insurance organizations authorized to do business in the state.

Nationwide, the number of persons with coverage is even more impressive. The Health Insurance Institute of New York City says that in 1972 a total of 182 million, or nearly 9 out of 10 of the civilian resident population were protected by one or more forms of private health insurance.

Some 170 million of them were under age 65 and had hospital expense protection with their coverage. Ninety-two percent of those with hospital protection also had surgical expense protection. Of the total with coverage, 73 million persons even had some form of disability income coverage.

In 1972, Americans paid nearly \$26 billion in premiums for health plans through private insurers, and group health insurance premiums, many of which are paid at least in part by employers, reached \$10 billion. Group premiums had tripled what they were a decade earlier.

It is clear that the majority of Americans or their employers are able to provide health insurance coverage themselves.

The federal government should tread lightly, and logically only where it can help those on the lower part of the economic scale and those stricken with catastrophic illness. To go further could saddle us with an unwieldy national plan vulnerable to waste and abuses and potentially the trigger for enormous inflationary health care costs.

HEALTH INSURANCE ON HOLD
Congressional ardor has cooled for push-

ing through a comprehensive federal health insurance bill this year, which is all to the good. There are few issues more deserving of calm and measured deliberation.

The cooling off is itself significant, suggesting as it does that there is no insistent clamor from the voters that the federal government plunge deeper into health care. It already is in pretty deeply, to the tune of some \$25 billion a year for Medicare, Medicaid and other programs. There are compelling reasons, both fiscal and political for the nation to consider carefully when, and even whether, to take the next step.

The most immediate problem is money. There are no fewer than eight theoretically serious health insurance bills before Congress and maybe a couple of dozen altogether. Even the cheapest would cost the Treasury another \$3.6 billion a year, conservatively estimated. This is the Fannin bill, which has the support of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It sets minimum standards, including coverage of catastrophic illnesses, for private insurance and provides for federal purchase of insurance for the poor.

From there the price goes up, to a modestly estimated \$6.5 billion for the President's Comprehensive Health Insurance bill on up to \$18 billion for the Ullman-American Hospital Association bill and finally to the ultimate in fiscal and political profligacy, the Kennedy-Griffiths Health Security bill, which is priced at an estimated \$60 billion a year to start with and might end up eventually costing \$60 trillion for all we know.

Few of these price tags, with the possible exception of the sky's-the-limit Kennedy-Griffiths figure, cover full economic costs. Most of the bills also involve higher costs to industry, which would certainly be passed along in higher prices, an increasingly popular way in Congress for financing programs the government can't afford to support directly. The Fannin bill, which not only is the most modest of the bunch but also the most sensible looking would raise industry's health insurance costs \$2.7 billion. The Nixon bill would add some \$9 billion.

In other words, the combined overt and covert cost of even the most limited proposals are almost certain to aggravate the nation's number one problem, inflation, which demands solution ahead of almost any other consideration short of clearcut questions of national security. Even without any significant new spending plans, the administration has projected a \$9.4 billion deficit for fiscal 1975 and it would like to find some way, as part of its inflation fighting efforts, to cut that by \$5 billion or so. As to the industry costs, they would be added to all the other costs—pollution control, safety, etc.—government has loaded on recently.

Under these circumstances, it is prudent to put expensive new federal health insurance plans on hold for the time being and try to restore health instead to the national economy. For the longer term, it would be useful to reexamine the problem.

As with so many national issues these days, it is difficult to sort out the substance from the rhetoric, but the public question here would seem to revolve around some 20 million people who do not now have some form of health insurance coverage, either through Medicare, Medicaid or private sources. The ones who would seem to be the core of the problem would come under the heading of working poor—casual laborers and the like—who seem to get the short end of almost everything these days. But the number of people who are being denied medical treatment because of inability to pay probably is small; there is little evidence of an acute problem. The other insurance gap is catastrophe care, for the kind of long-term costly illness which might ruin anyone but the wealthy.

These two problems can undoubtedly be

solved, albeit at some considerable cost. They do not justify a sweeping nationalization of the nation's medical industry, which serves the nation quite well on the whole. It may soon be serving the nation even better, given a little time, as a result of legislation to break down barriers to group practice and other possibly more efficient means of health care delivery.

It won't hurt if Congress puts health care on hold and addresses itself to more urgent problems. And maybe when it looks again it will have a clearer view of what it should do.

A RESPONSE TO TURKEY

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have expressed my deep personal concern over the recent action of the Turkish Government to lift its ban on the production of opium poppy. I believe the President should immediately exercise his authority to cut off assistance to Turkey. This is the only response Turkey will understand and it is a response justified by the tragic and hostile act by that Government.

On July 8, 1974, columnist Pete Hamill writing in the New York Post called the new Turkish policy an "Act of War." The column places this policy in a perspective which is alarming and unfortunately, very real—the stark picture of young Americans being killed by heroin made from Turkish opium.

I am inserting the text of the Pete Hamill column in the RECORD to alert my colleagues to the seriousness of this crisis.

ACT OF WAR (By Pete Hamill)

For the first time since Pearl Harbor, this country has been given sufficient provocation to justify, a full, open declaration of war, and the beginning of armed hostilities. Korea and Vietnam were ideological wars, based on the arrogant assumption that we could kill people in other countries because we disagreed with the way some of them wanted to live. Their quarrels were none of our business. There was never any possibility that Korean or Vietnamese communists could cause us direct harm at home. We killed them simply because they were communists and we were capitalists.

But Turkey is different.

Turkey is killing Americans right this minute. Turkey will be killing Americans at an even greater rate in the future. It is killing us with heroin. Heroin made from Turkish opium kills the brains of the people who O.D. on the streets of Harlem and Bed-Stuy and the South Bronx. That heroin flows in the bodies of people who kill old women in elevators for the price of a nickel bag. Heroin causes more than 50 per cent of all crime in this city, and that is more violence than the Korean, Vietnamese or Chinese communists have committed on our shores throughout history.

Last week, the government of Turkey decided to lift its two-year partial ban on the growing of opium. That was a direct act of aggression against the U.S., most particularly against the people of New York, which is the nation's heroin addiction capital. That

decision is a decision to kill, destroy, steal and terrorize. It should be met with war.

Three years ago, when Nixon was looking forward to the 1972 election, he decided it was time "to do something" about the flow of heroin into the U.S. For years, law enforcement people had known how it worked: Opium was grown in Turkey, processed in French plants in Marseilles and delivered through "the French connection" to the shores of the U.S. The amount of opium gum required for a kilo of heroin was sold in Turkey for \$220; by the time it reached the streets of New York, it was worth \$240,000.

Since Nixon was then still posing as a "law and order" man, he had to do something, so he came up with a solution. He decided to bribe the Turkish government. The Turks took a \$15 million down payment against an eventual bribe of \$35.7 million, to "study" ways to get Turkish farmers to grow other crops besides opium. That "study" money is probably safely ensconced right now in Switzerland.

According to Frank Rogers, the city's special narcotics prosecutor, there was still plenty of opium, even after the Turks announced their partial ban, most of it in the hands of middlemen. But with the Turkish announcement last week that full-scale opium farming would be resumed in six provinces this fall, the opium in "the pipeline" will be released. There has been a heroin shortage in New York; we can look forward now to a heroin glut, with its attendant cycle of homicides, robberies, and overdoses. Rep. Rangle says "New York will feel the effect within 60 to 90 days."

To me, if a government (in this case Turkey) sanctions the killing and terrorizing of another country's citizens (Americans, in this case), that is war. Forget the assurances of the Turkish government that the opium is only for legal pharmaceutical purposes and that illegal smuggling will be controlled. They didn't do it before; there is no reason to believe they will do it now. They are in opium for the money, and they don't care how many lives are destroyed as long as the profits are steady.

Nixon has called home the ambassador to Turkey for consultation, but that is clearly not enough.

The narcotics racketeers can only chuckle. What is needed is direct action. According to Newsday's Pulitzer Prize-winning study of the problem, there are 90,000 farmers engaged in opium growing in Anatolia in Turkey. Since 1971, the crop has legally been grown in only four provinces of Anatolia, but now the ban has been lifted, and opium will be grown to match the demand.

Those 90,000 farmers should be warned that we hold them and their government directly responsible for their acts of war against our citizens. They should be given a seven-day period in which to burn their crops, or move to safe areas, and then our B-52s should begin the systematic carpet-bombing of those fields, an act to be repeated every three months until they get the idea. The Russians will not interfere; the Turks, after all, are part of the "Free World," and have received more than \$3 billion in military and economic aid from us. And if the Communist countries want to rally to the defense of heroin, they are welcome to the opportunity.

In addition, Abe Beame, Malcolm Wilson and the State Dept. should issue a list of all products and businesses owned by Turkish nationals or the Turkish government, and call for a complete boycott of those goods. All foreign aid should be ended. All Turkish assets in the country should be seized and held in escrow against the lives of our children. On our side, all we would be doing is killing opium and money; the Turks are killing people. For the first time since Pearl

Harbor, Americans are the injured party, and its time to start injuring our enemies back.

RUSSIAN OFFICERS KILLED FIGHTING FOR SYRIANS—THIS IS DÉTENTE?

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the London Daily Telegraph of July 3, 1974, recently published information that senior Russian Army officers were killed in the fighting in Syria.

In a related development, Moshe Dayan, the former defense minister of Israel, recently revealed that some 3,000 Cubans—pilots, artillerymen, missilemen, and others—were fighting for Syria. The Pentagon issued a later statement saying that only between 100 and 500 Cubans were fighting for Syria. Thus, this is a wider conflict in the Middle East than we have been lead to believe. It reminds one of the Korean war when Soviet pilots flew against our men and this activity was one of the best kept secrets of that war.

The question arises now as to whether the U.S. Government, in the name of détente, is keeping from the American public the exact extent of involvement by troops from various Communist nations in the Middle East fighting. The article from the Daily Telegraph follows:

RUSSIAN OFFICERS "KILLED FIGHTING FOR SYRIANS"

(By A. J. McIlroy in Tel Aviv)

Senior Russian Army officers were killed in action fighting for the Syrians on the Golan Front in the October War, Mr. Shimon Peres, Defense Minister, told the Israeli Parliament yesterday.

This was the first official statement by Israel about previously unconfirmed reports of Russian officers on the battlefield with Syrian forces.

Russia and the Arab leaders have insisted that only Russian technical advisers were being used. Mr. Peres did not say what rank of Russian officers were involved, but he used the term "high ranking."

Both American and Israeli Intelligence sources were advising their respective governments that Russian officers were manning sophisticated missile systems and radar backing Syrian front line troops and armour.

HEAVY LOSSES

Israel suffered heavy losses in armour and aircraft in the Golan because of Syrian missiles and artillery.

It is understood the American and Israeli reluctance to damage the disengagement agreement and the East-West détente is the reason why until yesterday the Russian active participation in the October War was not confirmed by Israel.

The fact that Mr. Peres was not making a statement yesterday, but was only answering a Parliamentary question, is further evidence that Israel intends to play the matter in low key.

It was the knowledge that Russian officers were in the field in the October War that decided the Israeli Government to reject any attempt at Russian mediation and accept only American good offices in disengagement negotiations.

THE BOORSTIN LITERARY TEAM

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, Dan Boorstin, who grew up in Tulsa, Okla., in my congressional district, recently retired as director of the National Museum of History and Technology. He will remain with the Smithsonian Institution as Senior Historian, while continuing his varied career as author and lecturer.

The third and final volume in his "American Series"—"The Democratic Experience"—has been widely publicized as the recent winner of the Pulitzer Prize in history, but not so many are aware of the important contribution made by his brilliant wife, Ruth, to whom the book is dedicated. She has served as editor and consultant for the entire American series.

The following article from the Tulsa World of July 5, 1974 by Malvina Stephenson gives a close-up of this literary team of which my home State is very proud.

(By Malvina Stephenson)

WASHINGTON.—Brown-eyed Ruth Frankel Boorstin, who sparkles with talent and good humor, firmly believes in "partnership marriage"—free of "domination or submission" by either spouse.

She and husband Dan, a noted American historian, have set a good example.

Their 33-year union has produced three "creative kids," a world of friends, and to cap off a joint "edit-and-write" career, a recent Pulitzer prize for Boorstin's "The Americans—The Democratic Experience."

Ruth says they cherish these results—in that order.

As one who spent a lifetime in an intellectual atmosphere, Ruth agrees with a girlhood neighbor on Long Island, author-philosopher Will Durant, who told her, "I would rather raise a successful family than write 100 books."

Besides a "successful family," former Tulsan Boorstin already has 13 books to his credit, not to mention numerous articles and lectures, and a varied career as a lawyer, professor, and museum director. To his wife Ruth, the experienced editor and idea woman, he gives much credit for his prolific record.

The "For Ruth" on the dedicatory page of Boorstin's "Democratic Experience" represents a vivacious brunette, five feet-two, size 10, and still youthful.

To her, life is just one big adventure, whether they are exploring new areas of American history, skin diving in the U.S., skiing in Switzerland, or climbing the highest mountain at Aspen, Colo., where he is a scholar-in-residence this month.

Boorstin best describes their relationship in the Acknowledgements of "Democratic Experience" when he writes:

"My companion and intimate collaborator in the planning, researching, writing and rewriting of this book has been my wife, Ruth F. Boorstin. She had been my principal editor for all three volumes of 'The Americans,' and has played an especially creative role in this volume.

"My debt to her is beyond words. She has been my co-explorer of the Unknown Coasts

which have become this book. At the end of this effort to rediscover America, I must confess that the most delightful of all the discoveries has been our collaboration."

Ruth modestly insists, "I am not a historian. I don't have a Ph. D. in history. I come in at the editing end. I am more the 'hammer and anvil' to talk over these ideas."

A self-styled "versifier," she adds brightly, "My expertise as an editor includes those great words, 'When in doubt, cut it out'."

Ruth does have a hefty degree in economics from Wellesley College, where she earned a Phi Beta Kappa key, the sixth in her immediate family. She was most interested in English composition and literature but felt "it was too much fun for a major."

With her good looks and brightness, it is not surprising that she and Dan hit it off from the first time they met. Her brother, Bennett Frankel, now a New York lawyer, had just graduated from Harvard Law School, and was remaining to work with Dan on a book on Delaware corporation law.

Bennett played cupid, bringing together his sister Ruth and friend Dan. Dan proposed in a month, she said, and they were married in three—"the longest three months in my whole life," she sighs.

In referring to his first literary effort as indirectly responsible for their permanent team, Ruth quotes Dan as saying, "To this book I owe my wife," not vice-versa, as in their subsequent career.

Their southwest background provides an added tie for this couple.

Ruth was born in Morenci, Ariz., a tiny copper town, where her father was a mining engineer before transferring to New York and philanthropy.

Dan as is well known there, grew up in Tulsa, the son of the late Sam Boorstin, an attorney. Both Dan and Ruth have an affection for Oklahoma, and are proud that he recently was invited to be a member of the Gilcrease Museum board.

A new generation of Boorstin—Dan's and Ruth's three children—promises to add luster to the family name: Paul, 30, a writer and producer of TV documentaries with David Wolper Productions, now in France completing his first novel; Jonathan, 28, also of Hollywood, who has worked with director Alan Pakulis for Universal and Paramount Pictures; and David, 24, a journalist, now in London, who expects to transfer his writing base to Washington in the near future.

SURFACE MINING CONTROL AND RECLAMATION ACT OF 1974

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith the second amendment I intend to offer to H.R. 11500, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1974. This is the corrected version of my amendment that was printed in the Remarks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 15, 1974.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 401 OF H.R. 11500, THE SURFACE MINING CONTROL AND RECLAMATION ACT OF 1974 OFFERED BY REPRESENTATIVE MARK ANDREWS, REPUBLICAN OF NORTH DAKOTA

On page 250, line 14, strike out all after the period down through line 26 and on page 251 strike out lines 1 to 5, and substitute in

lieu thereof the following new subsections (e) and (f) and reletter accordingly:

"(e) For purposes of meeting obligations with respect to schools, roads or health care, twenty per centum of the reclamation fee calculated pursuant to subsection (d) of this section prior to any deduction made pursuant to subsection (f) of this section shall be returned to that county, school district or Indian tribe in which or in whose lands the coal on which said fee has been assessed has been mined. Such funds shall be returned to the appropriate county, school district or Indian tribe on a quarterly basis.

"(f) All operators of surface and underground coal mining operations may deduct from any fee assessed pursuant to subsection (d) above the amount not to exceed 80 per centum of such fee of any reclamation fee, license fee, severance tax, or other similar charge paid by the operator to any state with respect to coal mining operations in such state, in the proportion that the proceeds of such fee, tax or charge are used by the state to support reclamation or conservation activities comparable to those provided for by this title."

On page 251, line 6, reletter subsection 401 (f) to 401 (g).

GAO PROGRESS REPORT ON SOLAR ENERGY FOR COOLING PURPOSES

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just reviewed an interesting GAO report on this country's progress in research and development of solar energy for heating and cooling of homes and other buildings.

With few exceptions, this report points out that most of the technical problems of harnessing and using solar energy have been overcome.

Since 1933, the first year any appreciable effort made at harnessing solar energy in this country, 33 solar energy projects have been started and most are still being used. Currently, 25 projects are moving ahead. Results of these projects are extremely encouraging. It is safe to say that many breakthroughs have been made.

The one area of disappointment, however, is the failure to develop an economically feasible solar collector. This is the major drawback that is halting more use of solar energy. Simply stated, because of this, solar energy cannot compete price-wise with oil, gas, and electricity.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a fallacy in that statement.

That fallacy is this: The GAO report, and this is not to be construed as criticism, it is a fine report, was compiled or being compiled before the recent oil shortage and consequent price rise. The truth of the matter, I believe, is that the cost of solar energy might now be competitive with oil, gas, and electricity.

Mr. Speaker, I say that we should now get on with the application of what we have so far learned through all this research. Let us apply this information.

I believe it is in the best interest of

everyone in this great Nation, and the world for that matter, if we were to give top priority to several large-scale demonstration projects so that our scientific community can coordinate all the beneficial facts learned so far and come up with a workable, economically feasible solar energy system.

For 1974, about \$8.2 million has been allocated for solar heating and cooling research and development. To be sure, it is a lot of money. But let me make an interesting comparison. If we could install solar heating and cooling units tomorrow in 5 percent of all the homes and buildings in the country that could operate at 80 percent of total need, we could save more than one-half million barrels of oil a day.

This would be in the ball park of \$5 million a day in savings assuming oil only cost \$10 a barrel. I cite these figures—the number of homes and buildings and efficiency rate—as a minimum because I have faith in our scientific community to do better than that.

Let us get the show on the road. The Almighty has given us an inexhaustible source of energy. Let us not waste it for a single day more than absolutely necessary.

We cannot afford to.

OUR DISASTER PLAN IS EFFECTIVE

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, health care in its many and varied forms is currently a leading topic of public debate. One segment of the subject of medical care is the role of the voluntary nonprofit hospital. One such facility of which all Montanans are proud is St. Peter's Hospital in Helena. Illustrative of the pride and sense of self-sufficiency of St. Peter's is a letter to me and an employee newsletter both of which speak eloquently for themselves and which I am proud to submit for publication in the RECORD.

ST. PETER'S HOSPITAL,
Helena, Mont., June 25, 1974.

Hon. DICK SHOUP,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHOUP: Since we have been inundated for the last several years with largely critical publicity concerning the operation of the typical voluntary non-profit hospital, I thought you might be interested in reading the enclosed copy of our St. Peter's employees' Newsletter which seems to indicate that hospitals functioning by themselves are still able to provide the kind of care and services that are needed in a near disaster situation. Moreover, we did it by ourselves. Thanks to the tremendous people who work at our hospital and are still dedicated to the concept of taking care of the sick and injured.

Yours very truly,

RALPH H. AYLSOCK,
Assistant Administrator.

OUR DISASTER PLAN IS EFFECTIVE

(Published for the Employees of St. Peter's Hospital)

St. Peter's Hospital had a real test of our disaster ability Wednesday Afternoon, June 19, after the bus crash near Clancy.

On behalf of the Board of Trustees and the Administration of the hospital, we cannot find words to adequately express our gratitude to the fine, selfless way the employees and the medical staff came through when the chips were really down. In the face of a very possibly chaotic situation everyone involved performed with cool heads and steady hands to rapidly treat and process the twenty patients who arrived in the emergency room. At the same time the other 109 patients who were already admitted were receiving their share of tender loving care.

Our thanks and the thanks of the Helena area people go to all of our employees, both those directly functioning at the emergency area and also to those who quickly and graciously took over in other areas to release the necessary staff for emergency service.

Lloyd Linden and his crew did a truly expert job of transporting the injured. His first call was received by him at 3:26 P.M., and the first ambulance arrived at 4:16 P.M. and the last of the patients arrived at 4:50 P.M. Considering the distances involved these results are remarkable.

Excellent cooperation was experienced when calls were made to physicians to ask them to respond. Most had to leave patients in their offices, but all contacted agreed to come right away. Certainly their prompt response resulted in the smooth patient flow and coordinated activity that resulted.

A considerable amount of help was given and offers of additional assistance as required, were received from local law enforcement agencies. Although it was not needed, the local citizen band radio group also committed themselves for any required assistance.

You should all be aware, and the people of Helena area should be aware of a job well done.

Once again, thanks! We are mighty proud!

THE FIRST PRAYER IN CONGRESS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, "The First Prayer in Congress" was offered by the Reverend Jacob Duche before the First Continental Congress, on September 7, 1774, in the presence of many of the most illustrious of the Founding Fathers. This prayer is a classic example of that trust in divine providence which characterized early American history.

I insert the following prayer:

THE FIRST PRAYER IN CONGRESS

O Lord, our Heavenly Father, high and mighty, King of kings, and Lord of Lords, who dost from Thy throne behold all the dwellers on earth, and reignest with power supreme and uncontrolled over all the Kingdoms, Empires and Governments; look down in mercy, we beseech Thee, on these our American States, who have fled to Thee from the rod of the oppressor, and thrown themselves on Thy gracious protection, desiring to be henceforth dependent only on Thee; to Thee have they appealed for the righteousness of their cause; to Thee do they now look up for that countenance and support, which Thou alone canst give; take them, therefore, Heavenly Father, under Thy nurturing care; give them wisdom in Council and valor in the field; defeat the malicious designs of our cruel adversaries; convince them of the unrighteousness of their cause; and if they per-

sist in their sanguinary purposes, O! let the voice of Thine own unerring justice, sounding in their hearts, constrain them to drop the weapons of war, from their unnerved hands in the day of battle! Be Thou present, O God of wisdom, and direct the councils of this honorable assembly; enable them to settle things on the best and surest foundation. That the scene of blood may be speedily closed; that order, harmony and peace may be effectually restored, and truth and justice, religion and piety, prevail and flourish amongst Thy people. Preserve the health of their bodies and vigor of their minds; shower down on them and the millions they here represent, such temporal blessings, as Thou seest expedient for them in this world, and crown them with everlasting glory in the world to come. All this we ask in the name and through the merits of Jesus Christ, Thy Son and our Savior. Amen.

NIX ATTACKS LATEST OUTRAGE AGAINST U.S. DIPLOMAT, IN DEATH OF JOHN PATTERSON OF PHILADELPHIA

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the body of John Patterson, an American diplomat, a Philadelphian, a young husband with his whole life ahead of him, has been found in the State of Sonora in Mexico. He was killed by political terrorists and/or bandits. Ransom had been demanded for his release.

We have been conscious for some time about the attacks on our diplomats and the slaying of another of our diplomats in an African country. Substantial amounts of money have been provided by Congress for the improvement of our security systems.

Those who attack diplomats should be made international criminals to be pursued in whatever nation they seek refuge. Since there is an active investigation in both Mexico and the United States in this case, unlike others, that particular improvement in international law could not protect future John Pattersons.

There is something we can do in this case, however, and that is to give better protection to our diplomats' families in a financial way. Today, it seems that those who represent us abroad are undergoing grave risks. It seems to me that it would be reasonable to enact legislation that would provide a stated sum to care for the families of victims to defray the costs of readjustment for the victims' families. Such a flat sum should be provided in addition to annuities and insurance which is already provided. We must intensify the protection of our diplomats and the investigation of such attacks. Such criminals should be treated as war criminals, so that they will never be safe from American prosecution. Extending the territorial jurisdiction of nations from their embassy grounds to the protection of the persons of diplomats in foreign countries would be a worthwhile step. Political terrorists should be made to fear extradition to the country whose diplomats they attack.

On behalf of the House of Representatives, I want to extend my condolences and the grief of the House to the family of John Patterson, of whom the Nation is proud and the city of Philadelphia is very proud, as an example of what is fine in American life.

ST. CHARLES: A NEW COMMUNITY IN CHARLES COUNTY, MD.

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Washington Post Column, "It's Happening in Real Estate" discusses the development of one of the new towns in the Washington area, St. Charles, located in my district off U.S. Route 301 near Waldorf in Charles County, Md.

This emerging new community is being developed by the Interstate Land Development Co., which is participating in a program sponsored by the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the New Communities Act of 1968. While the master plan for St. Charles calls for the eventual construction of 25,000 housing units, there are only about 1,600 occupied homes at the present time. Both Interstate, the developer, and the Charles County Board of Commissioners favor residential growth that keeps pace with the growth of the industrial and commercial base in the county. Presently a steel plant is located at St. Charles and in the near future other industrial facilities will open in the county.

I commend this article to my colleagues, as an example of constructive cooperation between the developers of residential areas and the local government. St. Charles will provide an orderly and planned growth as well as furnishing the people of the area with needed housing and an adequate industrial and commercial base to provide employment opportunities. St. Charles also illustrates the role that the Federal Government can play in conjunction with private enterprise and the local unit of government to provide for the necessary expansion of housing in this country.

The article follows:

ST. CHARLES A LATE BLOOMER IN AREA RACE OF "NEW TOWNS"

(By John B. Willmann)

If you ask the fellow next door, your favorite bartender or hairdresser to name the new towns in the Washington area, the list would probably include Reston, Columbia and possibly Montgomery Village. Yet, there are at least half a dozen others, including Dale City and Lake Ridge in Prince William County, Sterling Park in Loudoun, Northampton in Prince George's, Crofton in Anne Arundel and a few other major community-type developments that might qualify for description as new towns.

Yet, one of the largest potential new town developments in the area, considerably smaller than now seven-year-old Columbia and about the same size as ten-year-old Reston, is named St. Charles and located on

Route 301 near Waldorf in Charles County, Md.—southeast of Washington.

And St. Charles has several characteristics that distinguish it from other new towns:

It is the only one in this area approved by HUD under the New Communities Act of 1968 and thus has a guarantee for repayment of a loan of \$24.5 million, which Interstate General Corp. (the developer) arranged with a New York syndicate. Also, HUD has provided several new community grants to Charles County for water and sewers, hospital facilities and recreation. Obviously, the federal presence is felt at St. Charles and in Charles County.

Although the master plan for St. Charles includes about 8,000 acres and spans 20 or more years and calls for 25,000 housing units, the pace of development has been relatively slow. There are only about 1,600 who occupy houses there now.

The emphasis is on employment opportunities, with several industrial buildings completed and a branch of Ingalls Iron Works, Birmingham, Ala., operating and nearly finished.

Developers of St. Charles are aware of the Charles County posture to control growth and to expect school sites, sewer and water facilities. For this year and next, at least, the developers of St. Charles do not have to be concerned about being impeded by county action on building permits. The big goal is to attract buyers in this housing market stifled by the expensive-short mortgage money.

The developer has spent about \$5 million on roads, establishing a brighter new entrance, water and sewer lines, and expanding waste water disposal systems of lagoons and effluent spray which waters 75 acres of woodland. In other words, St. Charles has its own sewage facilities until permanent treatment facilities are operable in the county.

Of course, St. Charles is not Charles County and Charles County is not St. Charles. But there are relationships. And a recent Maryland study showed that the Charles County population will likely grow from only 53,590 in 1972 to 66,400 in 1977, a fairly moderate pace (24 per cent) but nonetheless higher than other neighboring Maryland counties, except Howard (42 per cent) where in Columbia is located.

James C. Simpson, full-time chairman of the three-man Charles County Commissioners, pointed out this week that the county is not opposed to growth but that it does presuppose and require that the industrial and commercial base be expanded to keep pace with residential developments. He used the term "self-sustaining" as the goal and noted that a new master plan will be put together because there are overtures for other new towns. Already the Campanelli firm has an eventual 2,000-house community called Pinefield under way in the northern part of the county off Route 301.

Simpson also pointed out that the county has to be attractive for residential dwellings because the tax rate was recently cut from \$3.05 to \$2.42, with appraised values keeping pace with inflated market values. He puts the present population about 56,000 and is doubtful that it will be quite 66,000 by 1977.

Of importance to the Charles County commissioners are the 1975 opening of a big new Embassy Dairy plant on 301 and the new Pepco plant at Morgantown. "Those facilities and the steel plant at St. Charles are the result of our economic development impetus," said Simpson, who also noted that the county staff has been held to a minimum.

Heading the development of St. Charles is Charles E. Stuart, president of Interstate Land Development Co., a wholly owned subsidiary of Interstate General. A tall, outgoing young man with a sense of both assurance and responsibility, Stuart pointed out 1975 plans for development of a regional

shopping center on the west side of 301 on a modest basis but expansion over the years. Already, there are new shopping centers at nearby Waldorf.

In regard to residential construction at St. Charles, Washington Homes was the primary developer for the first few years. But now that firm's building pace has slackened and Pulte Homes now has about half of its planned 200 single houses occupied in St. Charles and also is offering the first townhouses in the county. The Page Corp. has begun construction of 161 triplex units that soon will be offered and custom builder Carl Baldus has approval of 75 houses.

Mid-rise and garden apartments are also planned soon for St. Charles.

Incidentally, Stuart considers the trees on the St. Charles acreage as a key asset of the new town, which also has a bus station (a converted stable) near the entrance on 301. Two buses leave each morning for the District and return in the evening. Bus commuter business began to surge during the gas crisis of last winter. Also, there are organized car pools at St. Charles.

Stuart sees the likely St. Charles residential building pace possibly moving beyond 500 units a year as new neighborhoods are developed. About 15,000 dwellings are planned to be grouped around the started Smallwood Village Center, which will serve four neighborhoods.

Also under construction is a 200 acre public park, with an 18-hole golf course, but neither are part of St. Charles—though highly adjacent. The White Plains Regional Park is a county project. Federal and state grants were obtained to fund the purchase and development.

Master planning at St. Charles has been done by a team including Robert O'Donnell of Denver, Thomas Shafer of Whitman-Quart, Baltimore and Arnold Kronstadt of Silver Spring, and the town's design review committee includes O'Donnell, Shafer, Kronstadt, Lester Finattli, a resident of St. Charles, James E. Redmond, county planning officer, architect F. Michael Leahy and Helen Galen, who represents the developer.

While developer Stuart concedes that the pace of growth at St. Charles has been fairly slow in the last few years, he considers this a positive factor and regards the future as a challenge for orderly, planned growth that probably will change the county image from a tobacco-growing county to a place where more people will live in an atmosphere of neighborhoods, communities, new jobs and generally expanding commerce . . . related to Metro Washington.

MILITARY MOST ADMIRABLE U.S. INSTITUTION

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Washington Post, May 9, 1974]

MILITARY MOST ADMIRABLE U.S. INSTITUTION

(By William Chapman)

Despite the bad name it got during the war in Vietnam, the U.S. military is now the most admired of American institutions, according to a public opinion survey.

The military ranked first among 15 public and private institutions in the survey conducted last fall by the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan.

Almost all other governmental institutions ranked near the bottom. President Nixon

and his administration were rated lowest and the federal government, as a whole, was next to bottom. The news media was in the middle rank, below the public schools but above the Supreme Court.

The survey asked 1,444 persons across the nation how good a job they felt each of the institutions was doing for the country.

They answered by checking one of eight possible responses, ranging from "very poor" to "very good." The military average out to 5.5 on the scale.

Willard Rodgers, who directed the survey analysis, said the results indicated that the military is recovering from the bad image it received during the war years.

The Institute had conducted a number of surveys for the military to determine the causes of the reluctance of young men to join the new volunteer army. One of the reasons was a hostile reaction to the military's role in the war in Vietnam.

"The previous studies showed that one of the big problems of recruitment was the bad image the military got during the war," Rodgers said.

"One interpretation of this (the latest survey) is that there has been an improvement."

In contrast to the military, almost all other governmental institutions ranked near the bottom of the ladder. These include Congress, state governments, the judicial system, local governments, the Federal government, and the Nixon Administration.

Among private institutions, only labor unions ranked as low as did the various branches of government.

The Institute's survey also turned up more evidence that the public is increasingly disenchanted with large corporations.

The esteem has fallen significantly in the past quarter of a century. When the identical questions were asked of a national sample in 1950, 76 per cent of the people said that the positive aspects of big business outweighed the bad. Only 60 per cent agreed with that in the survey last fall.

Rodgers said that the comments in the current survey showed that people were most concerned about the power big corporations wield over other institutions, particularly over the government.

THE PUBLIC'S RATING OF U.S. INSTITUTIONS: HOW WELL THEY SERVED THE COUNTRY

[Scale shows overall rating From 0 to 8 (from very poor job to very good job)]

U.S. Military.....	5.50
Colleges and Universities.....	5.48
Churches and Religious Organizations.....	5.26
Small Businesses.....	5.21
Public Schools.....	4.95
News Media.....	4.89
U.S. Supreme Court.....	4.82
Large Corporations.....	4.72
U.S. Congress.....	4.59
State Governments.....	4.47
All Courts, Judicial System.....	4.35
Local Governments.....	4.33
Labor Unions.....	4.26
Federal Government.....	3.86
President and Administration.....	3.30

THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, quadrupling food and energy prices have had a devastating effect on the ability of the underdeveloped nations in the world to import sufficient quantities of grain and fertilizer to meet their enormous food needs. As many as 20 million people may

starve to death in 1974 alone as a result, according to the United Nations.

The wealthy nations of the world have been unconscionably slow to respond to this crisis, as an article in Monday's Washington Post points out. The article notes that the failure of the United States to take the lead in stepping up food aid is largely responsible for the weak response of other developed nations to the plight of the Fourth World nations.

Any hopes for a more vigorous response to the world food crisis suffered a setback last week in hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on a resolution offered by Senator HUMPHREY calling for a sharp expansion of U.S. food aid. Secretary of State Kissinger's top advisor on the world food crisis expressed the administration's deep concern about the spread of hunger, but told the committee that he could not yet guarantee the kind of commitment the resolution calls for.

The world food crisis has the potential to become the greatest human tragedy the world has ever witnessed. That the United States and other developed nations are reluctant to come forth with a major effort to avert this tragedy is unsettling indeed. I call the attention of my colleagues to the article which appeared in this morning's Post, and urge them to support the Humphrey food aid resolution which has been introduced in the House by Congressman CULVER, myself, and others. The article follows:

POOR NATIONS FACE STARVATION AS RICH ONES DELAY AID

(By Dan Morgan)

In India, the rains that fell on this spring's wheat crop were lighter than hoped, and in places there was drought.

But heavier rains would not have mattered; they fell on a crop already doomed not to fulfill its early promise because of unparalleled changes in the world's economy.

India's oil-import bill is up a billion dollars this year, and fuel shortages idled irrigation pumps in some parts of the country.

Worse than that, India suddenly found itself priced out of the world fertilizer market, so a million tons less than planned was applied to the land.

While the rich countries of the world bought up the high-priced fertilizer or cancelled export contracts, India revised its early crop estimates downward. Instead of 30 million tons of wheat, India harvested only 24 million.

Then, when the country went into the international grain markets to make up some of the difference, it paid twice as much for a bushel of wheat as it had a year earlier.

The significance of this food, fuel and fertilizer price squeeze on India—as the world's other poor nations—is basic. Many may die of hunger this year. Around the world, the United Nations says, 20 million people may starve to death in 1974.

India's food reserves are down to almost nothing. If the summer rice crop is poor, it may have to import still more to head off even worse malnutrition in the world's second most populous country.

But India does not have the money to buy much food on the commercial market. Its money reserves, now about \$1 billion, are enough to last only three months.

The rising costs of basic commodities means that there will be much less left to buy the technology and techniques that are essential to economic growth.

This is also serious, because experts say the only sure way to control the population

spread which brings on hunger is to build such growth. Some pessimists predict that India's economy will not grow at all between 1974 and 1980.

Thus, the price hikes threaten to undermine the gains of the "Green Revolution."

That revolution was promoted by rich countries. Those same countries are now embroiled in political maneuvering to see which, if any, will take the first step to help.

Almost every expert agrees that massive loans on easy terms are needed. But the newly rich oil countries are wary that they might lose control of their funds if they join in any Western rescue effort; the United States is worried about the domestic impact of increased food aid; and the Europeans have their own problems with severe inflation.

While the oil-producing nations are raking in some \$60 billion more in revenues this year, and the United States and other grain producers are profiting from the higher world prices for food, low-income countries have moved a step closer to economic ruin.

According to updated studies by the U.S. government and the World Bank, more expensive fuel, food and fertilizer will cause a net drain of at least \$1 billion this year from the poor nation's foreign exchange reserves.

And officials in Washington concede that the United States, the European Common Market and the newly wealthy oil-producing countries are still months away from adopting a plan for a concerted rescue operation.

The rich countries, said one official, are engaged in a "fast-moving shell game," each waiting to see who will chip in first, and how much.

The Nixon administration, under increasing international pressure to take the lead, has not decided whether to expand its food aid sharply as its contribution to the relief effort.

Last Thursday, Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger's top advisor on the world food problem told senators he could not yet give an assurance the United States will undertake such a "major food initiative."

Such an initiative is essential leverage in getting the Europeans and the oil producers to follow suit, according to diplomats who see a close link between the politics of oil and the politics of food.

Kissinger told the United Nations in April, "A global economy under stress cannot allow the poorest nations to be overwhelmed."

But fears of higher domestic food prices, and pressure to hold down this year's budget deficit have produced political caution. "We don't want another grain deal," said one official.

Meanwhile, the other rich countries are holding back.

On June 28, the nine-nation Common Market cabled U.S. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim that it was prepared to give aid—provided "other industrialized countries," and the oil exporters, gave five-sixths of the total assistance, and the European share didn't exceed \$500 million.

The European offer was "written like an insurance contract," said one U.S. official.

Other officials say the main thrust of the American effort on behalf of the hardest-hit countries should be to get the oil producers to lower prices. By removing its old restrictions on grain production in hopes of pushing food prices down, they say the United States has set an example which the oil exporters should now follow, with or without expanded American food aid.

American officials also want the oil exporters to come through with massive loans at easy terms for the stricken countries. So far no oil producer has made a concrete commitment.

The once highly touted conference of oil producing and consuming countries, which was to have dealt in part with the problem,

has been shoved far into the future, perhaps never to take place because neither the United States, nor the exporting countries are anxious for a "confrontation."

Instead, attention is now focused on the Sept. 30 annual meeting of the finance ministers of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. The joint directorate, which includes oil countries, is expected to formally establish a "Joint Committee on the Transfer of Real Resources" to work on the problem.

The committee will deal with what World Bank officials call the "biggest and fastest shift of wealth in the history of the world."

The shift has struck at the world's poor countries in many ways.

The benefits of foreign development assistance have been eroded by the global inflation. Political support for increased foreign aid has sunk to a low point in Western countries hit by inflation.

To deal with their severe internal problems, industrial countries such as Italy are cutting back on their imports from the less developed countries.

According to still unpublished findings circulating in Washington, the possibility of some affected countries' offsetting the damage by forming cartels to market their minerals is limited.

That findings is challenged by some economists who predict mineral cartels like the oil producers' powerful price-setting organization will soon be a reality.

But according to World Bank experts, the benefits still will be small compared with the world oil bill.

In many cases, substitutes are available for the minerals, or other sources can be tapped. Chile and Zaire can now take advantage of higher copper prices; Brazil can cash in on higher coffee, and iron ore revenues and Bolivia can get more for its tin.

World Bank experts contend that "even if they get together politically, the prices of those minerals will be eroded much faster than oil."

The shift of wealth has caused an erratic reordering of the world's money flow which is still not fully understood.

Not all poor countries have been seriously affected. Some, such as Afghanistan, have been only marginally set back because their predominantly rural economies don't yet depend heavily on energy from oil. Some rich countries, such as Britain and Italy, have been hurt badly.

Some modestly well-off nations, such as Costa Rica have been jolted unexpectedly, because of their heavy dependence on imported oil, while others whose economies were not far ahead, such as Venezuela, will triple their revenues from oil exports alone in 1974.

Officials in Washington say most rich countries can blunt the blow by exporting more technology and commodities, digging into reserves, or turning to commercial banking sources and international money markets.

Medium-income countries such as South Korea, Brazil and the Philippines—with per-capita annual income of between \$300 and \$700—can weather the storm by scaling down their high rates of growth, tightening their belts, taking loans at commercial rates and seeking to increase exports.

However, those alternatives are not open to a number of other countries, now facing economic stagnation or even ruin, officials say. The most affected countries include South Vietnam, Cambodia, India, Bangladesh, eight central African countries including Kenya, and some in Latin America, including Chile, Uruguay, Honduras and possibly Costa Rica.

The price impact is less disastrous than feared in January, government studies have concluded. But the impact will get steadily worse as the decade progresses, the same detailed studies show.

James P. Grant, president of the private Overseas Development Council, told a Sen-

ate panel Thursday that "barring major international action, the combination of quadrupling food and energy prices and the cut-back on fertilizer exports dooms millions in these countries to premature death from increased malnutrition and even outright starvation."

He said the 40 poorest countries will have to pay some \$3 billion more for essential imports than was foreseen a year ago.

"The lives of millions are threatened by the inability of the developing countries to purchase essential quantities of fertilizers—even as Americans are continuing to use scarce fertilizer for such clearly nonpriority purpose as lawns, golf courses and cemeteries in ever increasing amounts," Grant said.

A preliminary World Bank study issued in March shows low income countries will need additional capital of \$2.5 billion to \$3 billion a year between 1976 and 1980 "at highly concessional terms" to offset the higher costs of essentials.

The bank estimated that these same countries will experience an additional net drain of \$1.4 billion this year and \$1.9 billion next year—only a small part of which could be financed from reserves or loans.

Experts say countries with dwindling reserves are least able to take advantage of the various pools of capital which have been set up to cope with the wealth transfer.

The International Monetary Fund has established a special "oil" fund with a value of about \$3.6 billion supported by a number of oil-producing countries. However, officials say the interest rates and payment terms would be beyond the means of many poor countries.

Last week, William J. Casey, chairman of the Export-Import Bank, said the deteriorating credit position of the underdeveloped countries could be a "factor that will reduce our loans" to them.

South Asian countries such as India and Bangladesh, with bleak possibilities of increasing their immediate export revenues, may be the hardest hit of all.

Several weeks ago, the Department of Agriculture's food intelligence service picked up reports that representatives of Bangladesh were shopping for 300,000 tons of wheat on the international grain market.

As of today, the sale has not taken place. "They don't have any money," explained an American diplomat.

Indian monetary reserves are down to about \$1 billion—an estimated three months' supply.

India has not yet officially sought a resumption of U.S. food sales on easy terms, which ended in 1971. As a result of India's explosion of a nuclear device May 18, congressional enthusiasm for increased aid to India is lukewarm.

Congress is considering an amendment to block American approval of "soft" loans through the International Development Association to countries which explode nuclear devices outside the controls of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

At a recent meeting of the World Bank's Aid to India Consortium, \$1.4 billion in help was approved. The United States is offering \$200 million through IDA, \$75 million in bilateral foreign aid, \$45 million in food giveaways and \$29 million in debt refinancing.

CAMBODIAN REFUGEES CONTINUE TO FLEE TO KHMER REPUBLIC STRONGHOLD

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to report to the House the continuing exodus of

Cambodian citizens to government-controlled, non-Communist areas from their homes and villages which have fallen into guerrilla hands.

This is one more indication of endless story of refugees leaving their homes and all that they have, in order to avoid Communist control. Guerrilla movements are supposed to thrive on the support of poor native populations, yet these very same people flee guerrilla and Communist control.

A recent publication of the Khmer Republic outlines in pictures and text, the flight of Cambodians from the countryside to Kompong Thom. The publication is entitled "Vers La Liberte."

It is worthwhile pointing out that the Cambodian Government still survives long after full-scale Communist attacks began in Cambodia in March of 1973 and long after our own bombing of guerrilla concentrations ceased in August of 1973. Cambodian Government forces have continued to fight for Cambodian independence, 15 months after their government was written off by commentators.

Part of the answer has to be that the will to resist, the will to survive as an independent people exists among Cambodians. The human evidence for that is in the continuing flight to the government side of Cambodia's people, and the proof of such desire as measured by the human suffering of these people cannot be ignored by either the Congress or the executive branch of the U.S. Government.

MOSELEY SET EXAMPLE FOR BUSINESSMEN

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the passing of C. C. Moseley was a real loss to the friends of liberty. C. C. Moseley was a native Idahoan, born and raised in Boise, Idaho. I had the privilege of meeting Mr. Moseley through our mutual friend Laurence "Ducky" Bettis of Boise.

"Mose," as he was called by his friends, was a great example to all Americans. He was a champion athlete at USC before World War I, joined the Air Signal Corps in 1917, completed his training in France and flew combat for 7 months as part of the 1st Pursuit Group. He remained in the service for a time after the war and served as an Army test pilot and won the Pulitzer International Air Races in 1920.

Leaving the Army, Major Moseley moved to Los Angeles and operated Grand Central Airport for the Curtiss-Wright Corp., later taking over the field as owner-president of Grand Central Aircraft and Grand Central Industrial Corps. He was a cofounder and first pilot for Western Air Express, which later became Western Airlines. He was also a former director of the Curtiss Wright Corp. and Douglas Aircraft Co.

Before World War II, he expanded the aeronautical schools he had operated at Grand Central, first for training of mechanics and other ground personnel for

the Air Force and then for the near-wholesale training of pilots. By the end of the war, Major Moseley's schools at Glendale, Oxnard, Ontario, and Santa Ana has trained more than 25,000 pilots and 5,000 mechanics for the service.

C. C. Moseley, with a Horatio Alger, Eddie Rickenbacker background and career, made 2,000 mailings every day, fighting the nonaccomplishment record of the United Nations, the ban against Americans owning gold, the destruction of our national birthright by corrupt and wasteful politics and he believed that forward America had its eye on the ball.

I believe the thing I respect the most about Mr. Moseley was the fact he strove at all times to live by the ideals set up by our Founding Fathers. He was not a businessman who was looking for special privileges, but a businessman who only wanted an opportunity to compete.

I commend to the readership of my colleagues the following article about our great friend—C. C. Moseley. He will be sorely missed by so many of his friends and admirers and my sympathies go to his wife and family.

The article follows:

MOSELEY SET EXAMPLE FOR BUSINESSMEN
(By Arnold Steinberg)

A powerful voice in behalf of conservative principles is silent in the passing of C. C. Moseley on June 17. He was not a columnist or author, although he helped fund a number of conservative books and magazines and was a prolific polemicist. He was not an organizational activist and avoided publicity, but he was a consistent financial supporter of numerous conservative organizations and causes. He never ran for office, but generously supported conservative candidates for over 30 years.

As a young man, Moseley was a champion athlete at the University of Southern California before joining the Air Service of the Army Signal Corps in 1917. Following his combat flying, he served as an Army test pilot (following World War I), and he won the Pulitzer International Air Races in 1920. He moved from a distinguished military career into the beginnings of a classic success story of American business.

A pioneer aircraft executive who founded Western Airlines and served as a director of several corporations, including Curtiss Wright, American Airlines and Douglas Aircraft, Moseley owned and operated the Grand Central Aircraft Corp. Following the Korean War, he converted the 180-acre facility into a planned industrial park—helping to pioneer the concept. His aircraft schools trained 25,000 pilots and 5,000 mechanics, and the schools were especially active in training U.S. Air Force personnel during World War II.

C. C. Moseley was that increasingly rare breed of American businessman—he was concerned not simply with the current year's profits, but with the survival of the system that made those profits possible.

He channeled much of his energy into politics as a heavy financial backer of conservative candidates, and he was a special admirer of Barry Goldwater. In 1965 he worked closely with Henry Salvatori and the late Cy Rubel, former head of Union Oil, to provide the initial (and very substantial) funding for the Reagan candidacy for governor of California. He was a generous supporter throughout the subsequent campaign and for later Reagan campaigns. He wanted his candidates to win, but he did not hesitate to back candidates with dismal prospects; for example, he contributed a good deal of money to Max Rafferty's 1968 U.S. Senate campaign in California.

Moseley was fond of telling stories and

anecdotes—especially to his youthful admirers in Young Americans for Freedom. He told of his early support of Earl Warren and Richard Nixon in the 1940s. He helped launch the political careers of both men but became disillusioned with their later words and deeds.

At 79, Moseley continued to mail his opinions and conservative literature or books to newspapers and individuals around the country. When he had something on his mind, he quickly dashed off a letter to the editor of every daily newspaper in the United States, every senator and congressman, and anyone else who, in his judgment, required conservative enlightenment on a particular issue.

He was known for his brevity. His own communications were to the point, sometimes even terse. Shortly after concluding that organized labor's stranglehold over Congress threatened the future of the Republic, he wrote friends that he wanted to use "all available resources to crush the labor unions."

Moseley was interested in many issues, and his contributions reflected diversity. He was especially intrigued with inflation, and his predictions regarding the increased price of gold, double-digit inflation, deficit spending and his criticism of the Federal Reserve were all validated. A careful student of America's strategic posture, he feared the Soviet Union's buildup. He predicted, with tragic accuracy, the Soviet's frenetic pace of nuclear development and also the Russian penetration of the Mideast.

Moseley also knew how to relax. He traveled widely and split his time between his several homes. He bred thoroughbred race horses and purebred cattle at his ranch in Wyoming and once entered a horse in the Kentucky Derby. Each summer he looked forward to the racing season at Del Mar, near San Diego, where he visited with J. Edgar Hoover, who had the adjoining box.

His opposition to East-West trade and his uncompromising views on economic issues sometimes put him at odds with organizations like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. This independence was a very real part of C. C. Moseley's charisma. He would typically Xerox an exchange of correspondence with one of the groups and mail the controversial letters to friends, with his familiar "CCM" abbreviated signature to show the source.

There are many weak, short-sighted American businessmen who have lost sight of the capitalistic ethic. C. C. Moseley was not one of them. Hopefully, his example will inspire other businessmen to speak out and to support the free market and a secure national defense.

SOMETHING WE ALL KNEW

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Watergate Committee issued its final report on the deplorable Watergate affair on Sunday, July 14, 1974. The committee in its findings cleared the air and laid to rest, once and for all, any false implications concerning the involvement of the Republican National Committee and its former chairman, Kansas Senator Bob DOLE. Those of us who have known and worked with Bob DOLE in this House, and since he has served in the other body, consider his honesty and legislative ability beyond reproach. It is regrettable that there are those who

would for partisan reasons impugn the integrity of this public servant.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an excellent editorial written by Mr. Kenneth Bruce, editor of the Hillsboro, Kans., Star-Journal, which underscores the feelings of many Kansans in regard to the junior Senator from Kansas. The editorial follows:

SOMETHING WE ALL KNEW

A story from the Washington Bureau and published in the Kansas City Star Sunday said, "The Senate Watergate Committee goes out of business today with the Republican party and its former national chairman, Sen. Bob Dole of Kansas, cited for avoiding the 1972 campaign abuses in the reelection of President Nixon."

It's pretty hard to be the chairman of a national political party during a presidential election but even harder to be closed out of the main plans and action.

This is exactly what happened to Sen. Dole during his chairmanship of the party. On the surface it always looked good, but intimate friends of the senator often expressed his frustration in being the chairman of the same party as the president, but finding a closed group around the president making the decision to take Nixon and his reelection out of the Republican party and put into an independent Committee to Re-Elect the President.

Sen. Lowell Weicker, prominent member of the Watergate Committee, reported "Because the Republican National Committee and its chairman, Sen. Robert Dole of Kansas, were in the traditional Republican mold of decency and honesty is exactly the why of a Committee to Re-Elect the President—Republicans who now state that 'everybody does it' dishonor the men and the women of their own party organization and Bob Dole, who didn't do it and wouldn't have done it."

We have known Bob Dole for several years and consider his honesty and legislative ability highly. All effort to "tag" Sen. Dole with Watergate should now end.

NLRB AND ITS RELATIONS TO MANAGEMENT

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my concern, as I am sure it has been the concern of every Member of this deliberative body, as to what we are receiving in return for all the tax dollars we vote each session of the Congress. Today, I am most happy to report we are certainly getting full value for every dollar voted one regulatory agency, the National Labor Relations Board. My authority for that statement comes from an extra large, four column news story with a 36-point head, printed Saturday, June 29, 1974, in an excellent newspaper, the Buffalo Evening News.

To me, what makes this news report so authoritative is that it bears the byline of Ed Kelly, the News labor reporter. An inquiry into the background of Mr. Kelly reveals he is one of the Nation's most knowledgeable labor editors or reporters. In his profession, Mr. Kelly has the respect of labor, management, Government, and the public.

In his report Mr. Kelly tells of a meeting addressed by NLRB Chairman Edward B. Miller. The article says the

NLRB Chairman began his speech with a refreshing view of the basic functions of the agency. He told the gathering:

The NLRB basically is an agency that helps prevent or settle disputes between labor and management.

He further informed:

The NLRB was given two functions. First, it was to correct or prevent unfair labor practices committed by either employers or unions and, second, when asked by a union, employer or employee group, it was to conduct elections to determine which, if any, group was to represent employees for purposes of collective bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, in this, the world's most highly industrialized Nation, the Congress gave the NLRB quite a chore. Today, I am happy to see that under the guidance of Chairman Edward B. Miller the five-member National Labor Relations Board sees its job not as a partisan for either side, but as a dispute settler. In recent years the figures also show that this agency is doing an excellent job with a very modest budget and what Mr. Miller has pointed out are outdated tools. From the NLRB, the taxpayer is receiving full value for the dollars allotted him.

Mr. Speaker, the News article referred to follows for the benefit of the readers of the RECORD:

THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD: ITS ROLES ARE OFTEN MISUNDERSTOOD

(By Ed Kelly)

It hadn't occurred to us until we heard Ed Miller point it out. But once he did, we could see it plainly.

Ed Miller's the chairman of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) and what he was pointing out is the fact that, contrary to the popular conception of his agency as a policing and judicial arm of government, the NLRB basically is an agency that helps prevent or settle disputes between labor and management.

The NLRB was set up by Congress as an independent agency in 1935 to administer the National Labor Relations Act, or the Wagner Act as it was then popularly known.

The NLRB was given two functions. First, it was to correct or prevent unfair labor practices committed by either employers or unions and, second, when asked by a union, employer or employee group, it was to conduct elections to determine which, if any, group was to represent employees for purposes of collective bargaining.

Ed Miller told a gathering we attended that what the public doesn't realize is that the NLRB, by the very nature of both its responsibilities and its machinery for carrying them out, actually is fulfilling a dispute-prevention and a dispute-settlement function.

In a recent fiscal year, he pointed out, the board handed down 681 decisions in unfair labor practice cases, but during the same period its agents achieved settlements in 5412 such cases.

During the same year, he went on, the board directed representation elections, or dismissed petitions for such elections, in 1698 cases. Yet during the same year companies and unions, aided by a forum provided by the agency, entered into 6880 wholly-voluntary representation election agreements which made a broad hearing unnecessary.

Every unfair labor practice charge filed with the NLRB, Miller reminded his listeners, "evidences the existence of some kind of industrial dispute," potential or actual.

Prevention of potential disputes and settlement of actual disputes often is accomplished by the board and its agents as they

go about the task of investigating the allegations made by the angered parties.

Helping determine whether employees want to be represented by a labor organization is another NLRB-performed task that's essentially a dispute-solving technique, said Miller, recalling the bitter strikes that once occurred in efforts to compel employers to recognize unions.

Tom Seeler, who directs the NLRB's regional office here, has some statistics that show how his aides in upstate New York are contributing massively to the dispute-settlement role which Chairman Miller attributes to the agency.

With most of his region's cases generated in the labor-management community of Erie County, Seeler says that his office, during the 10 months ending last April, had 304 cases involving union representation. In 159 of them, or 52 per cent, the parties mutually consented to the balloting and ground rules.

And in the nine months ending last March, Tom Seeler's office had 550 unfair labor practice situations placed on its dockets by angry unions, employers or employees.

Of these, 179 were dismissed as having no merit (which ended these allegations as issues), and 155 were withdrawn before any complaint was issued by the NLRB, because the parties themselves mutually adjusted their differences, often as a result of the board's merely bringing them together during its investigation of the alleged unfair labor practice.

Of the remaining unfair labor situations handled here, 150 ended in some sort of settlement, formal or informal. In only 61 cases did NLRB processing of the charge fail to produce a settlement somewhere along the route from the filing of the charge to the agency's issuance of a formal complaint against the respondent (defendant).

The evidence is clear. Here in Tom Seeler's region and in Ed Miller's national jurisdiction, such traditional neutral third-parties in labor-dispute resolution as mediators, fact-finders and arbitrators had better make room for the NLRB.

THE PRICE THEY PAID

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Bicentennial Specialties, a patriotic group in my district, has produced a number of documents of great historical importance. I ask unanimous consent to include as a portion of my remarks in the RECORD the following:

THE PRICE THEY PAID

HAVE YOU EVER WONDERED WHAT HAPPENED TO THOSE MEN WHO SIGNED THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE?

Five signers were captured by the British as traitors, and tortured before they died. Twelve had their homes ransacked and burned. Two lost their sons in the Revolutionary Army, another had two sons captured. Nine of the 56 fought and died from wounds or the hardships of the Revolutionary War.

What kind of men were they? Twenty-four were lawyers and jurists. Eleven were merchants, nine were farmers and large plantation owners, men of means, well educated. But they signed the Declaration of Independence knowing full well that the penalty would be death if they were captured.

They signed and they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Carter Braxton of Virginia, a wealthy planter and trader, saw his ships swept from

the seas by the British navy. He sold his home and properties to pay his debts, and died in rags.

Thomas McKean was so hounded by the British that he was forced to move his family almost constantly. He served in the Congress without pay, and his family was kept in hiding. His possessions were taken from him, and poverty was his reward.

Vandals or soldiers or both, looted the properties of Ellery, Clymer, Hall, Walton, Gwinnett, Heyward, Rutledge, and Middleton.

At the Battle of Yorktown, Thomas Nelson Jr., noted that the British General Cornwallis, had taken over the Nelson home for his headquarters. The owner quietly urged General George Washington to open fire, which was done. The home was destroyed, and Nelson died bankrupt.

Francis Lewis had his home and properties destroyed. The enemy jailed his wife, and she died within a few months.

John Hart was driven from his wife's bedside as she was dying. Their 13 children fled for their lives. His fields and his grist mill were laid waste. For more than a year he lived in forests and caves, returning home after the war to find his wife dead, his children vanished. A few weeks later he died from exhaustion and a broken heart.

Norris and Livingston suffered similar fates.

Such were the stories and sacrifices of the American Revolution. These were not wild-eyed, rabble-rousing ruffians. They were soft-spoken men of means and education. They had security, but they valued liberty more. Standing tall, straight, and unwavering, they pledged: "For the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of the Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

DÉTENTE MINUS DEFENSE EQUALS DEFEAT

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, the July issue of Sea Power, the monthly publication of the Navy League, contains a simple but urgent message on its cover: "Détente minus defense equals defeat." That message sets the theme for much of the material in the issue, including a very fine editorial on the subject of détente by the magazine's editor, James D. Hessman.

Mr. Hessman writes:

It is somewhat ironic that the late June summit meetings between U.S. President Richard M. Nixon and Soviet Communist Party Chairman Leonid Brezhnev are already being termed a "failure" by some elements of the American press—ironic because any greater "success" in Moscow might, in the context of present world conditions, eventually have proven as disastrous for the West as did success in Munich in 1939.

He goes on to warn that the United States cannot afford to allow the Soviet Union to use détente simply as a cover for a massive military buildup which will leave us at their mercy in the years to come.

Most Americans would welcome détente, he notes, provided that it will mean a real move down the road toward a more lasting peace. He cautions:

But it should be a realistic détente, not one in which Slavic smiles and paper promises are traded for unilateral disarmament.

I could not agree more, and at this point I would like to share Mr. Hessman's thoughts on the subject with the Members by inserting his editorial in the RECORD:

OF DEFENSE AND DÉTENTE—IRON CURTAINS, GOSSAMER HOPES, AND THE LONG HAUL AHEAD
(By James D. Hessman)

Few if any Americans are opposed to détente, to the "relaxation of tensions" with the Soviet Union inherent in the traditional definition of the term, or even to the much broader range of possibilities—including expanded trade and cultural relations, an increase of trust and mutual good faith between the U.S. and Soviet governments, and eventually an end to the Cold War itself—implied in the more recent politically-expanded meaning of the word.

It can be taken for granted, moreover, that few if any of the great mass of the people of the Soviet Union are opposed to détente, either—even détente according to the Western definition.

But the policy of the Soviet people is not always the policy of the Soviet government, as history has proven on numerous occasions. And many discerning Americans, including not a few in Congress, would unhappily agree that the Soviet government's real détente objectives—as spelled out in "Detente: An Evaluation" (a multi-authored article originally printed in *International Review*, Spring 1974, and reprinted on 20 June 1974 by the Senate Armed Services Committee's Subcommittee on Arms Control)—are approximately as follows:

"(1) To weaken the Western alliance by making it appear to be unnecessary, indeed, dangerous to peace.

"(2) To reduce the pace of the American defense effort and to eliminate the U.S. presence in Europe.

"(3) To secure from the West financial and technological assistance which would directly enhance Soviet military power by making easier the continuous build-up of the military sector of the economy.

"(4) To isolate China and to counter the political consequences to the fact that the Soviet Union is involved in a hostile confrontation with both East and West.

"(5) To legitimize its domination over Eastern Europe by making it appear as historically irreversible."

SUCCESSFUL FAILURE

It is somewhat ironic that the late June summit meetings between U.S. President Richard M. Nixon and Soviet Communist Party Chairman Leonid Brezhnev are already being termed a "failure" by some elements of the American press—ironic because any greater "success" in Moscow might, in the context of present world conditions, eventually have proven as disastrous for the West as did success in Munich in 1939.

The meager agreements, that were signed at "Summit III," and the promise of additional summits on a steady almost-institutionalized basis, insure that evolutionary if frustratingly slow progress toward real peace may yet be achieved, even if more spectacular (but unenforceable) accords must be postponed.

Those, particularly on the U.S. side, not content with embryonic beginnings, who want "peace" to spring full-blown and fully grown from the womb of the summit, will inevitably be dissatisfied with the cautious approach.

There are many others, however—both within the Administration (Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger is usually singled out as leader of the Executive Branch "hawks") and on Capitol Hill (a bipartisan coalition led by, among others, Senator Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.), Strom Thurmond

(R-S.C.), and Harry F. Byrd, Jr. (Ind-D-Va.)—who believe, not unreasonably, that Soviet leaders should be judged not by their words but by their acts.

And the record shows that the acts of Soviet leaders, even in the recent years of détente, can in no way be described as peace-loving.

Item—While the U.S. defense budget has been cut by \$38.8 billion (in constant dollars) since fiscal year 1968, the Soviet defense budget has increased spectacularly, particularly in the critical R&D area.

Item—The United States has reduced its forces worldwide by approximately 1.4 million men from FY 1968 to FY 1975. During the same time frame the USSR vastly expanded and modernized the Soviet Navy, modernized and improved the Soviet Air Force, and, in Central Europe, according to published reports, added 9,000 tanks, 4,000 armored personnel carriers, and more than 1,000 additional guns to the already bulging Warsaw Pact inventory.

Item—During a decade in which the United States, among other things, pulled out of Vietnam, returned Okinawa to Japan, and cut its forces on Taiwan and elsewhere, the Soviet Union, among other things, invaded Czechoslovakia (to restore the Soviet equivalent of law and order), built up, to an estimated million men, its forces on the USSR/PRC (Peoples Republic of China) border, and opened up a new string of naval/merchant marine bases in the Persian Gulf and northern half of the Indian Ocean.

LENIN'S LEGACY

Given the reality of such actions, not words, it is difficult not to agree with the opinion expressed (in *Army magazine*, May 1974) by Dr. H. A. DeWeerd as to the real purpose of the Soviets in accepting détente as at least a temporary political tactic: "They may have wanted 10 or 15 years of relaxed tensions in order to build up Soviet military strength with Western help. This is the explanation reported to have been given to Warsaw Pact representatives by the Communist Party Chairman, Leonid Brezhnev, in a speech in Bulgaria shortly after the 1973 San Clemente meeting with President Nixon. It is also the basis of the warnings against the détente given to the West by such Soviet dissidents as Andrei Sakharov and Alexander Solzhenitsyn."

That the Kremlin's rulers might so cynically use publicly-stated policies of peace for militaristic purposes undoubtedly would surprise those many Americans—long on ideals is somewhat short on history—who so frequently urge that the United States take the (unilateral) first step toward disarmament "as a sign of our own good intentions." The fact that U.S. good intentions have been proven repeatedly through the years by a long series of such first steps, many rather ill-advised, it would later turn out, is usually either not believed or is downgraded in importance.

A large part of the problem in a society in which political dissent is not only legal but distressingly popular is that many Americans accept the idea, assiduously nurtured by the Soviet Union, that differences between the U.S. and Soviet Union are more matters of degree than fundamental in nature. Neither system of government is perfect, runs the "fairminded" argument.

But those who are truly fairminded will recognize that the difference between U.S. involvement in Vietnam (and later withdrawal therefrom) and the Soviet Union's permanent occupation of Eastern Europe is more than a matter of degree, that occasional aberrations such as the slaying of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. (the act of an individual, not the government) cannot begin to compare with the wholesale slaughter, by government edict, literally millions of the USSR's own citizens, and that those infrequent instances in which various U.S. administrations have abused their authority (much to their own regret when, as has always hap-

pened so far, such transgressions have been discovered and reversed by the courts, the Congress, the press, and the American electorate) should not be confused with the deliberate, systematic, and continuous acts of aggression, physical as well as political, by the Soviet Union against its own people.

Those who do remember history know that Soviet policy in regard to détente has been consistent since the days of the October Revolution. And the USSR's opportunism in such matters has also been consistent, as would seem proven by the following (undated) remarks by V. I. Lenin inserted into the 24 April 1974 *Congressional Record* by Representative Robert J. Huber (R-Mich.): "The capitalists of the whole world and their governments in their rush to conquer the Soviet market will close their eyes . . . and will thereby be turned into blind deaf mutes. They will furnish credits which will serve us for the support of the Communist Party in their countries and, by supplying us materials and technical equipment which we lack, will restore our military industry necessary for our future attacks against our suppliers. To put it in other words, they will work on the preparation of their own suicide."

COMPUTERS FOR VODKA

The rush of world events and the rush of world capitalists have both vindicated Lenin's judgment. Soviet agricultural failures led to the 1972 wheat deal—at considerable subsequent cost to American consumers. The Yom Kippur War, Arab oil embargo, and subsequent energy crisis in the West (brought about in large part because of the USSR's repeated suggestions to Arab leaders that they use oil as a "weapon" to coerce the West into Mideast neutrality) led to U.S. purchase of oil from the Soviet Union. And the U.N. boycott of Rhodesia has made the United States now partly dependent on the Soviet Union itself for America's supplies of chromium. The net result is that the Soviet and American economies have become intertwined—but the United States is buying, for the most part, raw materials, whereas (except for the wheat) the Soviet Union is buying technology which might one day, it is feared, be used against the United States and/or its allies. (The two-way U.S./Soviet trade, reports *Time magazine* in its 1 July 1974 issue, "has jumped from \$200 million in 1971 to \$1.5 billion in 1973, with the dollar-ruble balance seven to one in favor of the United States, which buys Soviet vodka, platinum, diamonds and chrome ore and sells oil- and gas-drilling equipment, machinery and electronic gear, including computers. The Russians have been eager for loans and technological know-how, and so far they have got some of both.")

Not all the fruits of détente have been plucked by the Soviet Union, of course. And not all concessions have been made by the United States. The USSR is generally credited with an assist in the tenuous Mideast cease-fire (not achieved, however, until after a worldwide U.S. military alert had been called by President Nixon to halt a planned airlift of three Soviet divisions to Egypt). Soviet help in ending U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War is also acknowledged (but not too noisily) by leaders on both sides—once again, however, Soviet moves toward peace did not occur until well after several convincing demonstrations by President Nixon that the United States would not and could not be forced out of Southeast Asia by military means.

M'INTYRE'S FISH

The question now is: should détente be pursued further? The answer would appear to be a most cautious "Yes." But it should be a realistic détente, not one in which Slavic smiles and paper promises are traded for unilateral disarmament. A mutual détente, in which neither side gives up a present advantage without a corresponding concession from the other side. And probably, therefore,

a very deliberately ripening detente, in which confidence and trust are built up—by actions—slowly and solidly, step by step.

As Senator Thurmond said on the floor of the Senate of 10 April 1974: "All of us favor detente but we must have a true detente and not permit a screen behind which the Soviets would attempt to gain a military advantage. The Congress should remember the Soviets have broken agreements throughout the history of the Communist regime and there is nothing in the record to indicate they will not continue to do so if it would serve their purposes."

The problem for American policymakers, therefore, will be to insure that a continuation of detente, true detente, does serve Soviet as well as American purposes.

It will not be an easy policy to follow, for either side. As Thurmond's Armed Services Committee colleague, Senator Thomas J. McIntyre (D-N.H.) expressed it, in another context, during a speech before the Electronic Industries Association's government/industry symposium in early May: "It is a question of balance and discrimination. We are like the fisherman who having hooked a fish will lose it if he gives the line too much slack, but will also lose it if he pulls the line so tight that it breaks."

A LINK IN POLYUNSATURATES— CANCER?

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, although our society is rightly concerned with the health of its people, in many cases this concern has been carried to the extent of becoming a mass hypochondria. In this regard, the following article which has been called to my attention by Mr. John May, of Sturgis, S. Dak., will be of interest to the readers of the RECORD:

A LINK IN POLYUNSATURATES—CANCER?

Perhaps. A west coast medical study indicates a connection between vegetable oils and the incidence of cancer. This may cause medical researchers to take another look at the whole subject of natural fats-polyunsaturates-heart disease-cancer.

An eight year controlled clinical trial on polyunsaturated fats and oils in diets was conducted by the Research Service, Wadsworth Hospital Medical Service, and Domiciliary Medical Service of Veterans Administration Center, Los Angeles, and the Department of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles School of Medicine, Los Angeles. The test involved 846 elderly men who were divided randomly. Half were given a conventional diet; the other half an identical diet except vegetable oils (polyunsaturates) were substituted for natural or saturated fats.

The reason for the test was to see if those on the polyunsaturated diet experienced less fatalities due to atherosclerotic event (heart and artery disease and problems). The trial called this group the experimental group. Those on a normal diet were called the control group.

The results of the trial showed that fatal atherosclerotic events numbered 40% in the control group and 70% in the experimental group. However, total mortalities of 174 in the control group and 178 in the experimental group indicated to the medical researchers that something other than heart disease was causing an inordinate number of deaths in the experimental group.

Going back over their data, they determined the high death rate in the experimental group was due to a greater incidence of carcinomas, or in other words, cancer.

After finding a higher than expected incidence of carcinoma caused deaths in the experimental group, the researchers did a detailed retrospective study to identify all the malignancies in the men. They also added two years of results obtained when the men were returned to normal diets.

Beyond that they considered all pre-existing conditions and cigarette smoking habits. Neither had any significant effect on the trial. The men in the control group who died of cancer averaged 68.4 years of age; those in the experimental group who died of cancer were 65.5 years.

The results and analyses bore out the fact that those on the high polyunsaturated diet experienced a higher incidence of death due to cancer.

In the two years following the study after the men were taken off the diet an interesting result appeared. During the first year after the men were placed back on normal diets, those in the experimental group continued to suffer death due to cancer at a higher rate than those on normal diets (3 deaths to 0 deaths). However in the second year, four experimental died from cancer as opposed to 10 in the normal dietary group, indicating that once the subjects were back on normal diets, the toxicity associated with the polyunsaturated fats was by then lessened in the experimental group.

The researchers commented their results were different from those of other studies, which did not indicate an increase in cancer with an increase in polyunsaturates in the diet. However, this eight year study was the longest of its kind and the other trials had different patient population and design.

The researchers felt their study was not conclusive, but deserved consideration in light of animal experiments which suggest that unsaturated fat intake has an effect on the incidence of cancer.

The researchers suggested that unsaturated fats may not initiate cancer, but instead promote it. In other words, the possibility exists that if you have a latent cancer in your body, or a propensity for cancer, a diet high in unsaturates may enhance the growth of that cancer.

The meat and dairy industries will be watching trials like these carefully, since they are the prime sources of the natural fats in American diets. They have been waging a battle with the American Heart Association who through their publicists have implied that a saturated fat diet results in heart disease. These assumptions were not based on any more scientific data than is the polyunsaturated—cancer assumption.

Doubt exists in both cases, and until evidence is secured to substantiate one claim or the other, it would appear moderation in the diet is the best course for Americans. What people eat is of some importance, how much they eat may be more significant.

The physical activity of a great portion of the population has been reduced through modern machines, the automobile and power equipment. While physical activity has been reduced, the amount eaten at the table hasn't. This more than anything may be the primary cause of high mortality due to heart disease and cancer.

REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have sent to my constituents my most recent

newsletter. I am including the contents of that newsletter in the RECORD at this point:

REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN ED ESHLEMAN

BALLPLAYERS AND CONGRESSMEN

The guest of honor at flag day ceremonies held in the House chamber this year was Hank Aaron. He told us that his career was not all that different from that of a member of Congress. To the baseball fan just like the politician's constituent, it doesn't matter what you did yesterday or even today. The question is always: What are you going to do for me tomorrow?

SPRINGING A LEAK

Many people have been telling me that with so much attention devoted to Watergate, they're afraid some other important issues are being ignored—especially in news media coverage. Sometimes it almost looks like the only solution is to make up a list of all those other problems, stamp the list "top secret" and let it leak.

POINT-IN-FACT

It really isn't hard to do right! What is hard—so many times—is knowing what is the right thing to do!

KISSINGER ON DECISION-MAKING

Secretary of State Kissinger, in addition to his historic peace-making missions, is learning the frustrations of dealing with the federal bureaucracy. A recent statement on decision-making points out his problem. "I have seen it happen more often than not that when one asks for choices one is always given three: Two absurd ones and the preferred one. And the experienced bureaucrat, which I am slowly becoming, can usually tell the preferred one because it is almost always the one that is typed in the middle."

DIFFERENT DEFINITIONS

I've noticed that what we call part-time work in Lancaster, Lebanon and Chester Counties gets called consulting in Washington, and the price is considerably higher.

COST ANALYSIS

Each new Government requirement adds to the cost of the products made by American manufacturers. For example, the August, 1972 issue of *Engineering News Record* reported that the basic price of a new caterpillar D-9 tractor went up \$4,315 because of occupational health and safety requirements. Now, most of us aren't in the market for a caterpillar tractor, but the illustration adds credibility to the claim that OSHA has added 10% to 30% to the general cost of business. And, of course, all of us who are consumers bear the brunt of that extra cost.

SENSIBLE BUDGET-MAKING

Congress, in a strongly bi-partisan move, has acted to over-haul its present chaotic method of handling the Federal budget.

Under the new system, targets will be set early in the year both for income and spending. The appropriations committees will be required to stick reasonably close to the spending targets.

When all appropriations have been individually approved, Congress will be required to go back and bring the totals in line with the targets. This will mean either cutting some spending plans or finding additional revenue to cover increased spending.

The law also sets up a congressional budget office so that we will have our own experts providing us with information and analysis.

The new system cannot guarantee that irresponsible budget-making will not continue. But the new procedures should assure that Congress, from now on, will be making its economic decisions with its eyes wide open.

INFLATION—THE THIEF IN EVERYONE'S POCKET

Doesn't anyone in Washington understand that it's the price of food, climbing interest rates and other rising costs that are the real problems facing Americans? Can't anyone see beyond Watergate far enough to realize that inflation is robbing everyone and tearing this country apart?

Those are very basic questions, and similar ones are thrown at me nearly every day. The rising cost of living is by far people's biggest concern.

The answer is that many of us are very concerned about this problem, but there can be no doubt that it's a concern that has been played down by the news media in its concentration on other stories out of Washington.

Arthur Burns, head of the Federal Reserve Board, is a major economist who has expressed alarm about the inflationary situation. "Inflationary forces are now rampant in every major industrial nation of the world," Dr. Burns said recently. "For many years our economy and that of other nations has had a serious underlying bias toward inflation."

He went on to point out that inflation breeds fear. It saps public confidence in a more personal way than almost any other threat; it produces generalized anxiety likely to lash out against politicians, institutions, foreigners, social classes—against any handy target.

"The gravity of our current inflationary problems," Burns says, "can hardly be overestimated. If past experience is any guide, the future of our country is in jeopardy. If continued, inflation at anything like the present rate would threaten the very foundations of our society."

That is an ominous warning coming from so scholarly a gentleman. But the reaction of many people to higher prices at the grocery store, reduced pensions, increased education expenses and all the other personal economic problems caused by inflation should be enough to convince national leaders of the wisdom in Burns' evaluation. People are angry and they want action. The danger comes when the action some politicians propose threatens our whole way of life.

Even after our unhappy experience with partial wage and price controls a few months ago, you hear talk again about going to that kind of policy. Obviously they can't be talking about a program of partial controls, because we saw that they don't work either equitably or economically. So the proposal must be for complete controls, and complete economic control can only be accomplished by nationalizing all major means of production—in other words, socialism. That would be a drastic change in our way of life and one that I am doubtful many Americans want to take.

It puzzles me that this kind of proposal gets talked about when there is another more reasonable route to getting our economy back in order. The main problem with this route is that it does not appeal to the politicians, particularly the politicians in Congress. The reason it lacks appeal is that it would bring screams from every special interest group in the country, and nearly every American is the member of at least one such special interest.

This route to economic stability is cutting government spending. Obviously, that's nothing new or novel, but, so far, it has proved almost impossible to bring about.

Let me give you some figures to make it a little clearer why government expenditures are so much a part of the inflationary problems. In the past 44 years, annual federal spending has risen from \$3 billion to \$304 billion. That is a 10,000% increase in spending during a period when the nation's

population only doubled. It has to be a major inflationary factor.

In that same 44 year period, the Federal Bureaucracy has increased 450%. Since the end of World War II, the Federal pay has gone up 146%. The combination of a bigger and bigger bureaucracy at higher and higher pay just has to be very inflationary.

Meanwhile the average percent of earnings paid out by all Americans to all levels of Government has jumped from 11.6% to 31.3%. Therefore, not only has increased Government spending contributed significantly to the cost-of-living problem, but the tax dollars needed to support that spending have cut into the spendable income you need to personally cope with the inflationary spiral.

Yet another set of statistics suggest Government's role in fueling inflation. In the past 20 years, Congress has rolled up \$218 billion in budget deficits adding \$234 billion to the national debt. Exactly twenty years ago, in the 1954-55 period, the rise in the cost-of-living averaged out to almost nothing. It is not hard to calculate that two decades of deficits have been significant contributors to our present inflationary problem.

The answer to inflation for anyone involved in Government is rather obvious—cut spending. It is necessary not only to balance the budget, but reduce spending to a point that we can begin paying off the national debt. Only then will Government dollars stop interfering with the free market, and thus stop pushing prices upward.

But, the solution, while obvious, is not so easy. Everyone is for cutting Government spending—until it affects them adversely. If we are to make the cuts necessary to do the job of halting inflation no program can be sacred. These cuts cannot all come out of some favorite whipping boy like Defense. They will have to be made across the board. And they will, without a doubt, hurt.

That's where the political problem comes in. Are people upset enough about inflation to hurt a little to stop it? Too many politicians think not. Thus, the spending goes on and the inflation follows it. But, if Arthur Burns is correct that in the near future that attitude could destroy our society, maybe it's time to get the word to those politicians.

The word is this—inflation is serious and we must act to stabilize the economy. We must face up to the pressures that will be brought by special interest as they seek to save their portion of the dole. We must act in the national interest which does not necessarily mean satisfying each little special interest. The national interest is getting the inflation thief out of everyone's pocket. And that means cutting Federal spending.

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 11500

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the Hechler substitute, H.R. 15000, to H.R. 11500, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1974, is defeated, I plan to introduce the following amendments to H.R. 11500:

Page 165, line 21, after the word "person" strike all through the word "affected" on line 22.

Page 205, line 16, after the word "person" strike all through the word "interest".

Page 215, line 17, after the word "person" strike all through the word "interest".

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 11500

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following amendments to the bill H.R. 11500:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SEIBERLING TO H.R. 11500

Section 401, page 250, line 5 through page 251, line 5, strike subsection (d) and (c), substitute the following new subsections, and renumber the remaining subsection accordingly:

(d) All operators of coal mining operations which are subject to this Act shall, not later than 60 days following the end of the calendar year 1975 and each calendar year thereafter, pay a reclamation fee to the Secretary equal in amount to \$2.50 per ton of coal mined by the operator during the preceding calendar year, except that:

(1) A credit, in the amount of \$0.10 for each 1000 British Thermal Units (BTU) or major fraction thereof by which the weighted average BTU value of coal mined by the operator during the year falls below 16,000 BTU per pound, shall be allowed upon presentation of reasonable proof; and

(2) A credit not to exceed 90 per centum of the total fee due shall upon presentation of reasonable proof be allowed for any incremental costs and expenses which have been incurred by the operator during such year for—

(A) reclamation activities, facilities and equipment required in order to comply with the standards established by or pursuant to sections 201, 211, and 212 of this Act;

(B) activities, facilities and equipment required in order to comply with the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 as amended (Public Law 91-173; 83 Stat. 742);

(C) activities, facilities and equipment required in order to comply with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1151-1175) in connection with the mining operation; and

(D) the amount of any reclamation fee, license fee, severance tax or other similar charge required by law to be paid by the operator to any State with respect to coal mining operations in such State, in the proportion that the proceeds of such fee, tax or charge are used by the State to support reclamation activities comparable to those provided for by this Title, but not to exceed 16 per cent of the total fee due before the credits allowable under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection.

(3) Incremental costs and expenses, as used in paragraph (2) of this subsection, means all costs and expenses (including costs of equipment and facilities previously purchased but not previously amortized in accordance with generally accepted accounting practices) which have been necessarily incurred by the operator for the purpose of complying with the particular provisions of law referred to in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (2) and which would not have been necessary in the absence of such provisions of law. In no event shall the total of such costs and expenses allowable to the operator under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) for a particular calendar year exceed the total amount of the bond or bonds required under section 216(a) with respect to the area in which the operator has completed the extraction of coal during such calendar year.

(e) The Secretary shall make a study of the effect of the reclamation fee and, within six months after the close of the twelve-

month period ending June 30, 1977, and in each twelve-month period thereafter, shall report to Congress the results of the study with respect to its effects on the coal mining industry, including the relative competitive positions of deep coal mining and surface coal mining in each major coal mining region of the United States. With his report, he shall include his recommendations as to the extent, if any, that the reclamation fee should be increased or decreased in order to enable the deep coal mining industry to compete effectively with the surface coal mining industry.

(f) The Secretary shall periodically cause an audit to be made of the operations and records of each operator required to pay a reclamation fee under subsection (d) of this section, to determine the correctness of any credits claimed under said subsection. The Secretary shall promulgate regulations governing the imposition, collection, and audit of the reclamation fee and credits. In preparing such regulations, the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of the Treasury to arrange, so far as feasible, for the Internal Revenue Service to assist in performing auditing activities under this subsection. Any amount taken by the operator as a credit under subsection (d) of this section that has been finally determined as not qualifying for credit thereunder shall be repaid by the operator to the Secretary promptly after such final determination shall have been made, together with interest, at the rate of 6% per annum from the date such credit was taken, and any penalty imposed by law. A determination by the Secretary as to the amount of fee or credit payable by or allowable to an operator shall be deemed prima facie correct.

(g) On or before July 1 of each year, 37½ per centum of the amounts received into the fund from reclamation fees paid under subsection (d) of this section with respect to coal mined in each State shall be paid back to the governments of the respective States in which the coal was mined; provided however, that 37½ per centum of the amounts received into the fund from mining done on Indian reservations shall be paid back to the respective Indian tribes. Such money shall be used by such State, or political subdivisions thereof, or Indian tribe for acquisition, reclamation, conservation or development of the public lands of the State, or political subdivisions thereof, or Indian tribe, giving prime consideration, in accordance with the priorities set forth in section 402, to the needs of communities which supply or have supplied the major part of the work force for current or former coal mining operations.

EVANS WATER AMENDMENTS

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1974

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I will be offering two amendments to H.R. 11500, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1974. The first will deal with alluvial valley floors and the second will strengthen the protection of water rights under the bill.

Both amendments focus on the impacts of surface mining on water resources in arid and semiarid areas. Most Members are aware that strip mining alters dramatically the quality and quantity of water in and around mined areas. For the most part, such changes have been detrimental—large increases in sedimentation; polluting of waters by acid, salts, or other toxic drainage; and

the disruption of ground water and surface water flows which can reduce the availability of water. These impacts are detailed in the committee report on H.R. 11500. The seriousness of these impacts is magnified in arid and semiarid regions. I believe it is necessary to assure that any bill passed by the House to regulate the impacts of surface mining contain adequate provisions for the protection of water resources in the West.

My first amendment will create a new subsection 209(d) (12) preventing the location of coal surface mining operations within or adversely affecting alluvial valley floors in semiarid and arid regions.

In reporting H.R. 11500, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee did a commendable job in trying to find a middle course where coal could be surface mined but appropriate safeguards would be taken. Many believe that if we are truly to protect the water resources of the West we must preserve aquifers—a move that would prohibit most strip mining in the Northern Plains, since the shallow coal seams often serve as aquifers. In proposing the protection of alluvial valley floors, I am taking a middle course that is much more limited in impact than a provision protecting aquifers would be. We should be honest and forthright in recognizing that it is impossible to restore the hydrologic function of an alluvial valley floor.

In the most comprehensive study completed to date on surface mining in the West, an impartial study committee formed by the National Academy of Sciences concluded the following:

In the planning of any proposed mining and rehabilitation it is essential to stipulate that alluvial floors and stream channels be preserved.

Alluvial valley floors are characterized by unconsolidated deposits of materials such as clay, silt, sand, or gravel formed by streams where the water table is so near the surface that it directly supports vegetation. Alluvial valley floors receive recharge from a large area, and water availability in the valley floor is far in excess of the actual precipitation on the surface of the valley.

The danger posed by surface mining is to the sub-irrigated hay meadows, wheatlands, and grazing lands supported by the high water table in an alluvial valley floor. If the water table is lowered as a result of surface mining, the surface vegetation cannot survive and water may not be available for domestic and livestock uses. In addition, the water that is available after surface mining is likely to be significantly higher in sediment, salts, and other dissolved chemicals and metals.

The classic case of a damaged alluvial valley floor is the Rio Puerco River Basin in New Mexico. The river is a tributary of the Rio Grande and comprises about 25 percent of its drainage basin. In the 1870's it was a thriving agricultural area. Today it is virtually a desert. Briefly stated, the principal cause was overgrazing, which increased erosion and thereby upset the hydrologic balance. The water table was lowered by erosion of the stream channel which had deepened 40 feet by 1946. During this period, plants could no longer tap the moisture of the lowered water table and

died, increasing erosion and worsening the cycle. The potential damage caused by strip mining would not be from overgrazing, of course, but the results could be the same as in the Rio Puerco Basin.

Another study conducted by the forest service and Bureau of Land Management for the Decker-Birney area in Montana recommends no leasing of Federal coal lands in flood plains to avoid downstream pollution. Even though many alluvial valley floors are larger than commonly defined flood plains, most flood plains in the semiarid and arid regions of the West are on alluvial valley floors.

The Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology has recently issued a report by Wayne A. Van Voast evaluating the hydrologic effects of a strip mine located on an alluvial valley floor near Decker, Mont. Van Voast, a State hydrologist, has found that water levels in the area have dropped 10 to 50 feet in an area over six times as large as that actually mined and that the water coming out of the spoils into the Tongue River is highly mineralized. Its quality is similar to that of saline seeps.

My second amendment will strengthen the provisions protecting owners of water rights in section 709 of the bill.

In section 709(d) (2) my amendment adds a requirement to show willingness in addition to the capability to provide a substitute water supply, and insures that the provision of substitute water is not temporary. Section 709(d) (3) would be stricken. This subsection as it is contained in H.R. 11500 is simply a means of condemnation through the execution of a bond if neither written consent nor the capability to provide substitute water are possible.

A new subsection (e) would allow an owner of water rights adversely affected to file a complaint with the regulatory authority detailing a loss in quality and quantity. The regulatory authority would investigate the complaint and issue a written finding within 30 days as to the cause of the loss in water quality or quantity. The regulatory authority would investigate the complaint and issue a written finding within 30 days as to the cause of the loss in water quality or quantity. If the mining operator is found to be at fault, the regulatory authority would order the mining operator to replace the water within 30 days and suspend his operating permit until the operator has provided the substitute water supply.

Lastly, a new subsection (f) would provide that nothing in this section would affect in any way the right of any person to protect and enforce his water rights under applicable State laws.

This amendment is moderate and a matter of simple justice. If a coal operator cannot get the written consent of an affected owner of water rights, he can still proceed if he can show evidence of a willingness and capability to provide a substitute water supply. In the West, water is essential to ranchers and farmers who depend on scarce supplies. If you deprive a man of his water, you deprive him the opportunity to earn a livelihood for himself and his family.

Without my amendments, I am afraid that this bill would not be an expression of congressional judgment that the surface

mining of coal should be of the highest priority ahead of other uses of land and water. In the arid and semiarid parts of the country, I believe such a conclusion would result in irretrievable loss of vast areas of agriculturally productive land.

These amendments are designed to protect the water resources of the West, but they could also have an impact reaching far beyond the western coal lands. If your State depends on water from the Missouri or Colorado River basins for municipal, industrial, or agricultural uses, you should share our concern about the possibility of diminishing the water flow and increasing the dissolved salts, chemicals, metals, and sediments in these river systems. In the Colorado basin, this affects the States of California, Arizona, Utah, and Colorado. In the Missouri basin, this affects Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, and Missouri.

Beyond that, I simply ask my eastern colleagues to heed the words of North Dakota Governor, Arthur Link. Governor Link has said:

People representing the cities have as great a stake in the restoration of this land as the people of North Dakota. From these

lands come the food and fiber their constituents will need long after the coal is removed.

The people I represent will remain in Colorado after the strippable coal is gone and the coal companies move elsewhere. It is my hope in sponsoring these amendments that we can help insure that our land will still be productive and that our friends from other States can still come to enjoy the natural beauty of our Rocky Mountain States in the future:

The text of my amendments follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 11500, AS REPORTED,
OFFERED BY MR. EVANS OF COLORADO

Page 172, line 4, strike out "and", and immediately before line 5 insert the following, and renumber the following paragraph accordingly:

(12) the surface coal mine operations are not located within, and would not adversely affect, an alluvial valley floor in semi-arid and arid regions;

Page 287, line 9, strike out "PROTECTION OF THE SURFACE OWNER" and insert in lieu thereof "PROTECTION OF THE SURFACE OWNER AND OWNERS OF WATER RIGHTS".

Page 288, beginning on line 23, strike out "affect the hydrologic balance of water on or off site," and insert in lieu thereof "adversely affect the hydrologic balance of water on or off site, or diminish the supply or quality of such water."

Page 289, strike out lines 3 through 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(2) evidence of the capability and willingness to provide substitute water supply, at least equal in quality, quantity, and duration to the affected water rights of such owners.

(e) (1) An owner of water rights adversely affected may file a complaint detailing the loss in quality and quantity of his water with the regulatory authority.

(2) Upon receipt of such complaint the regulatory authority shall—

(A) investigate such complaint using all available information including the monitoring data gathered pursuant to section 219(b) (2);

(B) within 30 days issue a specific written finding as to the cause of the water loss in quantity or quality, if any;

(C) order the mining operator to replace the water, in like quality, quantity, and duration, within 30 days if the loss of such water was found to be due to the surface coal mining operations; and

(D) order the suspension of the operator's permit for failure to replace such water until such time as the operator has provided the substitute water supply.

(f) Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting in any way the right of any person to enforce or protect, under applicable State law, his interest in water resources affected by a surface coal mining operation.

(g) For the purposes of this section, the term, "surface coal mining operation" does not include underground mining for coal.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 17, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lord, who shall abide in Thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell in Thy holy hill? He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart.—Psalms 15: 1, 2.

O Lord and Father of us all, fit us fully for the duties of this day and make us ready for the responsibilities which demand our attention. In this quiet moment help us to realize that Thou art God and that Thy grace is sufficient for all our needs.

Strengthen us to put first things first and last things last, that we may not find ourselves majoring in minor matters nor allowing the second best to take the place of the best. In all our work give us the spirit to discern the good from the bad, the high from the low, the important from the unimportant, and to lift our labors into the realm of Thy righteousness and good will.

"Just as we are, strong and free,
To be the best that we can be
For truth and righteousness and Thee,
Lord of our lives, we come."
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

CRISIS IN CYPRUS

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned over the present crisis in Cyprus. It is urgent that the United States use its good offices to prevent open warfare. However, of equal concern to the people of our Nation should be that the State Department not use the present crisis to make secret concessions to Turkey on opium that would subvert and undermine the continuing U.S. war on drugs and crime.

If the United States caves on its determination to prevent the flow of deadly drugs to the United States, it would, in President Nixon's own words, be as disastrous as "foreign troops landing on our shores and invading the United States."

STRIP MINING AND GARBAGE

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, some of the Members of Congress were distressed by a public opinion poll that was published some months ago that indicated that garbage rate higher than Congressmen in the public esteem. I have given some reflection to this. There may be a reason back of this: people like the fact that the garbage men go directly to the pile of trash and pick it up and take it away.

Unfortunately in the strip mining legislation we are concerning, we have one bill, the Hosmer bill, that piles up more garbage, and we have the committee bill (H.R. 11500) which is a compromise, which takes away half of the garbage. That is really temporizing with the problem.

Therefore, I think the sensible way to approach the garbage and strip mining problem is to clean it up entirely, as contained in a proposal I will present as H.R. 15000. It will clearly restore the esteem of Congress to face up to the problem directly instead of pussyfooting around the edge of the problem.

KEEP POLITICS OUT OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I can honestly state that committee members and staff have maintained a conscious effort to promote a nonpartisan climate which is so important for purposes of the impeachment inquiry.

It is with much regret, therefore, that I am informed that the chairman of my party, Robert Strauss, after a weekend's perusal of part of the evidence, found that the evidence merits impeachment of the President. I had previously found satisfaction in his decision that he would not comment because it would introduce partisanship. I regret that he has now chosen to intrude his political nose into this highly nonpartisan proceeding.

The Judiciary Committee members over the past several months have expended hundreds of hours listening to tapes, studying documents, and questioning witnesses. This thorough and judicious investigation of raw evidence, presented without prejudgment by our counsel, is testimony to the committee's expressed conviction that all relevant material be reviewed before rendering a