

First. Inclusion in payments under the impact aid program—Public Law 874—of children living in public housing.

Second. Retention of the Bayh amendment providing for an authorization of \$15.7 million to bring up to 90 percent hold harmless those local educational agencies suffering a diminution in title I-A funding.

Third. Retention of part B—State incentive grants—of title I as now written in law.

Fourth. Retention of the Senate provision for part C for areas with the heaviest concentrations of disadvantaged children for fiscal year 1975.

Fifth. Adoption of a 100-percent hold harmless for title I State agency programs for handicapped and other institutionalized children.

Finally, I should like to refer to title II of the bill pertaining to the issue of busing. I withheld discussion of this provision until last because I wish to stress that, despite headlines to the contrary, H.R. 69 is—and always has been—an education bill rather than a busing bill. Busing occupies really only a small portion in this legislation although it occupies a major portion of the news stories concerning it.

While I have my own personal doubts about the constitutionality of either the House or Senate language, both of which attempted to restrict the courts in their efforts to desegregate public schools, the House position was insistent and endorsed by that body in three successive votes, to instruct their conferees, each by a margin of better than 2 to 1. Bearing that in mind, I think the compromise language should be acceptable to both bodies.

The House bill, you will recall, would have provided for automatic reopeners of all existing busing orders not in compliance with the guidelines of the bill. This, we felt was disruptive to the point of being very dangerous, and we are pleased that the House conferees accepted our provision. As to the House provision allowing termination of court orders involving transportation upon a showing that a freedom-of-choice system was in operation; that section now allows it but that such motions shall be granted only if the school district is presently in compliance and if the judge specifically finds that such compliance will continue.

Essentially the final language of the bill preserves the Senate language which conditions future court actions on a showing that the fifth or fourteenth amendment has been complied with—that is, the courts are only bound to follow the guidelines set forth in the bill if these rights would not be infringed.

Second, we were able essentially to preserve the Senate language on reopener (though not on termination of orders), namely, that old cases can be reopened only if the health or educational advancement of the children involved were being adversely affected by busing.

Finally, on the question of the use of Federal funds, the Ashbrook amendment—which would have prohibited totally the use of such funds for busing—was amended to provide that funds appropriated under the impacted area program could be used for such a purpose, though all other funds cannot. We had proposed that the funds appropriated for the emergency school aid program be similarly exempted, but we were not successful.

In conclusion, I would be remiss if I did not express to my colleagues on the conference—and especially our distinguished chairman, Senator PELL—my appreciation for a difficult and arduous job, well done. The bill before us is landmark legislation which should be approved by the Senate and enactment into law as the best practicable result for a bill we must have.

Mr. President, I again suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene at the hour of 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized in the order stated and each for not to exceed 15 minutes: Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. BUCKLEY, Mr. MCCLURE, and Mr. ROTH. 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 conclusions of which period the Senate will take up the conference report on the education bill, H.R. 69. Roll-call votes are expected to occur tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate

stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and at 4:52 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 24, 1974, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 23, 1974:

IN THE U.S. NAVY

Vice Adm. Frank W. Vannoy, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Vice Adm. Kenneth R. Wheeler, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Vice Adm. William W. Behrens, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Vice Adm. John P. Welnel, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Edwin K. Snyder, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties of great importance and responsibility commensurate with the grade of vice admiral within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

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. Winton W. Marshall, XXXX
XXXX (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named Army Medical Department officer for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Col. John W. White, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Howard Wilson Penney, XXXX
XXXX Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BILL SCOTT REPORTS

HON. WILLIAM L. SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Mr. President, since coming to the Congress I have

endeavored to keep constituents informed regarding our activities, and ask unanimous consent that a copy of my current newsletter be printed in the RECORD for the information of Senate colleagues.

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

BILL SCOTT REPORTS, JULY-AUGUST 1974

CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY

A measure now under consideration in the Senate, known as the Consumer Protection Agency Act, sounds like a very desirable bill. Everyone would like to rid the marketplace of faulty products and of shoddy merchandise, but the proposed establishment of a new federal agency with an administrator who would be a government-sponsored

consumer lobbyist before existing government agencies does not appear to be the proper way to accomplish a worthy purpose.

We have existing departments and agencies of government with experts in every conceivable field charged with the responsibility of protecting the public interest within their respective fields. This new agency would not make any decision on behalf of the government but would lobby before all decision-making branches of government in favor of what the administrator considered to be the consumer point of view. Since we are all consumers, having differing views and preferences on almost any matter, the consumer advocate would undoubtedly be representing the views of only a portion of the people at a given time.

Some method should be found under which existing agencies would operate in the public interest without having another agency of government looking over their shoulders and telling them what needs to be done within a field where they have a specialized expertise.

I have studied this bill very carefully and have spoken on the floor of the Senate in some detail with regard to the various aspects of the proposal. Somehow it reminds me of an ancient crime known as common-law barratry which has been adopted by statute in 36 of our states. The crime may be committed by private persons or public officials and consists of needlessly stirring up strife and litigation. An early English Judge, Blackstone, referred to those who commit the offense as "pests of civil society who are perpetually endeavoring to disturb the repose of their neighbors and officiously interfering with other men's quarrels"; and at another time referring to barratry as "the trafficking and merchandising in quarrels; the huckstering in litigious discord".

This proposal would permit the head of the new agency not only to advocate a particular position before existing government agencies but to take the agencies to court if they did not follow his suggestions. The Attorney General is charged with the responsibility of representing government agencies in the courts, and if this consumer protection agency would hire its own lawyers as the proposal authorizes it to do, it could well result in the government paying two sets of attorneys with different points of view and become a case of the United States versus the United States, an untenable position.

Public policy requires that we have as much unity within the government as possible for its effective operation; and duplication of agencies and functions is a very costly and unwise practice. Even though the goal of the proponents is a worthy one, I am opposing the bill in its entirety and have prepared a number of amendments to it. Should you desire a copy of the somewhat lengthy statement, please let me know and it will be forwarded to you.

TAX AMENDMENTS

As you know, the Senate recently debated a variety of proposed tax amendments to a debt ceiling bill, designed to keep the government functioning properly. However, the debt ceiling bill, as it came from the House merely raised the amount of indebtedness which could lawfully be incurred by the government and made no mention of taxes. The proposals, for the most part, increased the tax burden of the business community and gave tax relief to low income citizens. Most people would agree that every citizen should share a portion of the tax burden, and undoubtedly reforms in our tax laws are needed. Because of this, the House Ways and Means Committee has been holding hearings and considering tax reform legislation for many months and will probably report a bill for floor action soon.

When we are talking about changes in our tax laws involving many billions of dollars,

it seems irresponsible to have the proposals made on the floor of the Senate without committee hearings; but it is hoped and expected that the tax writing Ways and Means Committee will report out a tax bill within the very near future. Copies of my own remarks on the proposed amendments will be furnished upon request.

RICHMOND VISIT

On August 2, I will be in the Richmond office all day to meet with constituents regarding their views on legislation or any matter they care to discuss. While you are welcome to visit without an appointment, it would be helpful in scheduling if you would call the office manager in Richmond at 649-0049 so that a mutually agreeable time for meeting can be arranged. Our Richmond office is located in Room 8000 of the Federal Building, 400 North 8th Street.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET

Congress will be operating in the near future under new budget procedures because of a recently enacted budget control measure. This bill, known as the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act, is intended to help Congress reassert its authority over the budget-making process which in recent years has been assumed, to a large extent, by the Executive Branch of the government. Under the new law, a budget committee will be established in each house of Congress. There will be a Congressional Budget Office and a detailed timetable within the Congress for various phases of budget approval and appropriation process. In addition, October 1 will mark the beginning of a new fiscal year in the future rather than the present July 1.

The importance of establishing firmer Congressional control over the budget is illustrated by the fact that as of July 11, the national debt stood at \$471,662,200,475.05, according to the Treasury Department; and estimated interest on the indebtedness for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1974, at \$29,350,000,000. Therefore, it is understandable that citizens are more concerned about inflation, taxes and the high cost of living than other issues confronting the country. One of the major contributors to the inflationary spiral is deficit financing and excessive spending by the federal government. It is hoped that this new budget control act will assist the government in putting its fiscal house in order, but I believe the Congress must also learn to say "no" to many suggested new programs.

VETERANS BENEFITS

The Senate has recently passed the Vietnam Era Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974 which increases the rates of monthly educational assistance by 18.2 percent, establishes a partial tuition assistance allowance of up to \$720 a school year, extends the maximum entitlement of educational benefits from 36 to 45 months, raises the maximum work-study allowance from \$250 to \$625, and authorizes direct loans up to \$2000 a year to cover educational costs not otherwise provided for.

The House bill did not contain tuition assistance allowances and retained the 36-month benefit entitlement. In conference between the House and Senate there is some division regarding both of these items and especially tuition allowance, some conferees feeling it is wrong to give additional allowance to a veteran who chooses to attend a high-cost school. These differences must be resolved before the bill can become law.

ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS

Members of Congress are given the opportunity each year to nominate young men for appointment to the Army, Navy and Air Force Service Academies. They may have five of their constituents in each academy at a given time. We were fortunate this year to be able to fill two vacancies in each of the three academies and also to have 24 addi-

tional young men we named as alternates be appointed to fill vacancies from throughout the country. Therefore, we now have 30 new Virginians entering the academies in the freshman class which commenced on the 8th of this month.

The office is now starting to process the applications of young people interested in entering the service academies in July 1975. First it is necessary for those interested in entering the academies to obtain and submit completed applications to us prior to September 1, 1974. Thereafter, they will be notified of the time and place to take competitive examinations. The grades they receive on these written tests are the most important consideration in determining whether or not they will be nominated, but their records in secondary school and extra-curricular activities are also considered. Let me add that we have more than ten applications for each nomination the office is able to make. So far only young men have been admitted to the academies and, in order to be eligible, they must have reached their 17th birthday by July 1 of the year of admission but not have reached their 22nd birthday by that date. I would suggest that those who are interested let the office know promptly so that applications and other information can be forwarded in sufficient time for them to be returned to us before the September deadline.

CORRESPONDENCE

Our office receives more than 1000 letters each week from constituents on a wide variety of subjects. Of course, we welcome their views on any matter and the opportunity to assist them in their relationships with the federal government.

The following observations may be helpful even though we are glad for constituents to share their thoughts in any manner they choose:

Mimeographed or printed letters, to which the constituent merely signs his name and address, indicate that an organization or a group working in concert wants to present a point of view but do not show the same concern that a well-thought-out individual letter or post card indicates.

Because of the great bulk of mail received, all Members appreciate a concise letter which clearly sets forth why one believes a bill is good or bad and how he believes it will affect others.

There is no need to remind the Congressman of the large number of persons who the writer represents or threaten to support his opponent at the polls during the next election if he doesn't vote the way the writer suggests. In fact, Members of Congress like to believe that their vote is always based upon what they feel is the best interest of their constituents and of the country generally. Having the views of constituents several days or more prior to a vote gives the Congressman or Senator an opportunity to know the opinions of the people he represents before he has made a determination on how he will vote.

FOUR-MILE RUN

The Ariandria area, both in Arlington County and the City of Alexandria, has been subject to periodic flooding for a number of years resulting in damage to commercial and residential property and considerable inconvenience to citizens of the general area. Congress has previously authorized a flood control project, but rising costs and greater hazards increased the costs beyond the amount authorized. An agreement, however, was worked out so that the Federal government would bear a substantial majority of the costs with Alexandria, Arlington and the RF&P railroad adding contributions to assist. It is also understood that all jurisdictions within the basin area will regulate future development so that it will not materially add to the danger of flooding.

Our Public Works Committee recom-

mended, and the Congress approved, new authorization of funds to construct the flood control project. Ground breaking ceremonies were held on July 12. It is good to know that this long-needed project is now under way, and even though it will take several years to complete, citizens can look forward to the elimination of a problem which has plagued the area for more than a decade.

MAILING LISTS

Our newsletter is mailed throughout Virginia to every constituent who lets us know of his desire to receive it, and we are always glad to add the name of others not presently on the mailing list. It is difficult, however, to maintain an accurate statewide list as people move from place, marry, or for some reason we make an error in the listing. Therefore, if anyone is receiving duplicate copies of the newsletter, if their name or address is incorrect, or if they are not presently on the mailing list and would like to receive the newsletter, please let us know.

CAMPSITE RESERVATIONS

Legislation enacted earlier this year permits individuals to reserve campsites in a number of national parks. The nearby parks and campgrounds for which reservations can be made in advance are listed below.

Park: Blue Ridge Parkway, VA and NC; Campsites: Crabtree Meadows, Mt. Pisgah, Peaks of Otter, Roanoke Mt., Doughton Park, Otter Creek, Rocky Knob, Price Park, and Linville Falls (Fee \$2.00).

Park: Cape Hatteras, NC; Campsites: Oregon Inlet, Salvo, Cape Point, and Frisco (Fee \$3.00).

Park: Greenbelt Park, MD; Campsite: Greenbelt (Fee \$2.00).

Park: Catoctin Mountain, MD; Campsite: Owens Creek (Fee \$2.00).

Park: Prince William, VA; Campsite: Oak Ridge (Fee \$2.00).

Park: Assateague, MD; Campsites: Bay Side and North Beach (Fee \$2.00).

A list of more distant parks, reservation forms, or further information may be obtained from this office upon request. If the reserved period requested begins from 10 to 90 days from the date of request, the request should be mailed to: Park Reservations System, Inc., P.O. Box 1976, Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52406.

CONTROLLING THE DATA BANKS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, over 2 years of Watergate has unquestionably raised public consciousness on the matter of civil liberties and the individual's right to privacy. Today, more than ever, the average American is sensitive to any invasion of his basic constitutional rights. Hence, the subject of data banks is in the public arena. A Washington Post editorial of July 19 placed this subject in its proper perspective. The editorial, entitled "Controlling the Data Banks," is now submitted for the thoughtful attention of my colleagues:

CONTROLLING THE DATA BANKS

Congressional concern about preserving civil liberties has been, over the years, a sometimes thing, so many people will be surprised if the current surge of legislative interest in protecting individual privacy actually produces much legislation. There are growing indications, however, that this year Congress might really follow through on at least one major privacy issue by enacting a

measure to regulate data banks and protect citizens against the improper or undisclosed collection and use of personal information by the government.

The need for controls has been amply documented. After four years of work, Sen. Sam J. Ervin's Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has just released a landmark study which itemizes 858 federal data banks containing over 1.2 billion records on identifiable individuals. Over 86 per cent of these files are computerized. Various data banks hold information on citizens' employment records, medical problems, driving habits, criminal histories, financial dealings, military service and other sensitive subjects. At least 29 files concentrate on derogatory information. In more than 42 per cent of the cases, citizens are not notified that such records about them are being kept. And only 16 per cent of all these data banks have been expressly authorized by law. All this is doubly awesome because the study is incomplete. It does not include the White House "enemies lists" or the records maintained by some agencies which refused to cooperate.

Clearly some basic rules need to be set before the government's penchant for collecting information grows any further out of hand. Last year an HEW advisory committee proposed several fundamental principles: that there should be no files whose existence is undisclosed; that citizens should be able to review and correct almost all records about themselves; that information gathered for one purpose should not be used for another without the subject's consent; and that extensive efforts should be made to protect the security and confidentiality of all files. These principles have been incorporated in the Koch-Goldwater bill in the House and in Senate measures sponsored by Sen. Ervin and several colleagues. On both sides of the Capitol, useful hearings have already been held. The legislative efforts have received a strong assist from Vice President Ford, who pushed the Office of Management and Budget to submit some specific recommendations to the Hill.

For all this progress, however, the hard work is just beginning. Major disagreements have surfaced about the way that basic policies should be applied to governmental files as different as, for instance, the FBI's investigative dossiers and the masses of inactive records in the National Archives. Agencies have already started lobbying for exemptions for national security files, personnel records, census data and other categories. Indeed, some modifications will be required. For example, notifying the subjects of all files would be self-defeating for law enforcement agencies; for the Archives it would be impossible. But Congress should resist the pressures to write such broad, permanent exemptions into a law. The prudent course would be to authorize an oversight board to make exemptions in accord with strict guidelines and with ample opportunity for public comment before any data-collecting is allowed to proceed in secrecy.

Another major issue is how ambitious legislation should be. Some bills would reach not only federal files but also state, local and private data banks. Ultimately those files should also be subject to controls, since citizens can be hurt just as badly by the misuse of private records as by federal mistakes. Yet Congress may not know enough about the multitude of nonfederal files to deal intelligently with them all at once. The difficulties encountered in trying to regulate credit reporting and limit the traffic in arrest records suggest that a careful, step-by-step approach is best outside the federal domains. By reforming the policies for federal agencies and federal aid recipients, this Congress can set a strong example for the states and give citizens far more assurance that they won't be hurt by information lurking somewhere in a data bank.

SURFACE COAL MINING LEGISLATION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, during the past week, we have had the opportunity to discuss in depth three bills that would regulate the surface mining of coal. Of these three bills, I strongly support H.R. 12898, and I oppose H.R. 11500 and H.R. 15000. Only H.R. 12898 is a reasonable compromise between the energy needs and environmental concerns of our Nation.

Surface coal mining is necessary to provide the United States with critically needed energy resources. Currently about half of our coal is derived from surface mining, three-fourths of which is used in the production of electricity. Since our oil and natural gas reserves are already inadequate, any cut in coal production would probably result in serious electrical shortages.

H.R. 15000, however, would ban surface mining within 6 months in the mountains and within 18 months in other areas. Given our current energy problems, a complete phaseout of surface mining seems totally unrealistic at this time. We simply must have the coal to keep our economy running.

H.R. 11500, although more realistic than H.R. 15000, also would sharply reduce U.S. coal production. According to the Bureau of Mines, 187 million tons of coal would be lost next year if H.R. 11500 is adopted. This amounts to approximately one-third of all U.S. coal production. Again, I do not believe that we can afford to sacrifice these coal reserves.

H.R. 12898, on the other hand, guarantees continued access to the surface coal that we must have to meet our energy needs. At the same time, it establishes a detailed list of strict land reclamation standards.

Under the bill, land must be restored "to a condition capable of supporting the uses which it was capable of supporting prior to any mining, or an equal or better economic or public use suitable to the locality." Affected lands must have "a stable and self-regenerating vegetative cover." The coal operator is responsible for successful revegetation for 5 years after the completion of reclamation and for 10 years if the annual average precipitation is 26 inches or less.

Slopes must be stable and all surface areas must be protected from erosion. Streams must be protected against siltation and acid runoff. These and many more environmental safeguards would be instituted by passage of H.R. 12898.

If a coal operator fails to abide by these restrictions, Federal inspectors can close down the operations or impose a heavy fine. In addition, any citizen adversely affected by the actions of a regulatory authority may file a civil action on his own behalf.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12898 would assure production of the coal we must have for our energy needs and still protect our environment. The other bills would deny us access to these vital reserves.

PRESSURE ON THE IRS

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am herewith submitting for the RECORD a number of articles detailing White House pressure on the Internal Revenue Service. This pressure was designed to bring the powerful administrative measures against those the White House considered enemies or uncooperative. It is my contention that this evidence substantiates the need for an independent IRS contained in my proposed legislation, H.R. 14793.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1974]

INQUIRY TO FOCUS ON IRS POLICIES; INDEPENDENT FEDERAL AGENCY PLANS REVIEW TO PINPOINT SERVICE SHORTCOMINGS

(By David Burnham)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—For the first time in 20 years, the Internal Revenue Service's treatment of taxpayers is to be the subject of a major investigation and review by an independent Federal agency.

The yearlong study, which is expected to cost at least \$100,000, will examine the policies and practices of the I.R.S. in such areas as the summary seizure of the assets of delinquent taxpayers, the extent to which confidential taxpayer information is given to other agencies and the manner in which taxpayers are selected for auditing of their tax returns.

The initiation of the study was announced this week by the Administrative Conference of United States, a little known agency set up to identify the causes of inefficiency, delay and unfairness in the administrative proceedings of all Federal agencies and to recommend how these proceedings can be improved.

The conference, which began operating in 1968, now has a \$750,000 annual budget and a professional staff of about eight lawyers and conducts most of its investigations through consultant reports prepared by law professors.

The announcement of the concentrated examination of the revenue service came at a time when the agency has been under increasing criticism from a number of Congressmen and consumer groups.

At a news conference Thursday, the project's director, Charles Davenport, a professor at the University of California Law School at Davis, outlined the major subjects that would be examined during the study.

Mr. Davenport said these were the confidentiality of taxpayer information, collection procedures such as the seizure of property, settlement procedures and the use of civil money penalties.

The law professor said other major areas were the way the service handled citizen complaints, methods by which the public could be assured of the fairness and consistency in the selection of who was audited, and what information the agency should make public.

The Congressional Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has a mandate to monitor the service, but because of the heavy pressure of writing substantive tax laws, the question of how the laws are administered has been mostly ignored.

The last major investigation of the tax agency was initiated by Congress in the early nineteen-fifties at the end of the Truman Administration and the beginning of the Eisenhower Administration. Though prompted by allegations of widespread corruption in the service, the investigation considered

many procedural and organization problems.

Antonin Scalia, chairman of the Administrative Conference, sponsor of the present investigation, said he hoped the project would serve "to provide needed public assurance" that the problems of the service "are being looked into by a responsible Government agency."

Both Mr. Scalia and Mr. Davenport said Donald C. Alexander, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, had assured them of the service's full cooperation.

The study will be under the supervision of a steering committee, including Mr. Scalia and Walter J. Blum, professor at the University of Chicago Law School; Sheldon S. Cohen, former I.R.S. Commissioner now in private law practice here; Victor H. Kramer, director of the Institute for Public Interest Representation, Georgetown University Law School; Harry K. Mansfield of the Boston law firm of Ropes & Gray; Don J. Summa, a certified public accountant with Arthur Young & Co., New York, and Dean Benard Wolfman, University of Pennsylvania Law School.

[From the Washington Post, June 14, 1974]

IRS LINK TO NIXON QUERIED; DEMOCRATS EYE SERVICE'S USE TO HARASS

(By Richard L. Lyons and William Chapman)

Several Democrats on the House Judiciary Committee said they heard evidence yesterday that raised serious questions whether President Nixon was involved in the use of the Internal Revenue Service to harass political enemies and help friends.

"My impression," said Rep. Edward Mezvinsky (D-Iowa), "is that the use of IRS is as significant as, if not more so than, Watergate" as a possible impeachable offense. "Legitimate questions were raised and should be pursued."

Rep. Wayne Owens (D-Utah) said the evidence raised the possibility that serious criminal acts had been committed. "The question of whether the President will be tied to them is a question" which has to be answered, he said.

Committee Chairman Peter W. Rodino (D-N.J.) said the allegation of misuse of the IRS "goes to the heart of the question of whether there has been a serious abuse of power by the President." He said the committee will deal with the issue "very seriously."

On the other hand, Rep. Robert McClory (R-Ill.), acting senior committee Republican, said: "I didn't feel the presentation was too serious" so far as showing any improper act by the President.

The committee is seeking a 17-minute tape of a Sept. 15, 1972, conversation in which then White House counsel John W. Dean III said he talked with the President about the use of the IRS to attack political enemies, and a report on an IRS investigation of Lawrence F. O'Brien, then Democratic National Committee chairman. This was seven weeks before Mr. Nixon won re-election in a landslide.

Committee special counsel John Doar told newsmen he will ask the committee to issue a subpoena ordering the President to turn over this tape.

Two versions of this tape are already on the public record. In the edited version released by the White House, the President said to Dean:

"I want the most comprehensive notes on all those who tried to do us in. . . We have not used the power in this first four years, as you know. . . We have not used the bureau and we have not used the Justice Department but things are going to change now. . ." The "bureau" presumably referred to the FBI. No mention was made of the IRS in the White House version.

In transcribing the tape, the committee found that an earlier segment has been

omitted. In that portion, H. R. (Bob) Halde- man, then White House chief of staff, said to the President: "Chuck has gone through you know, has worked on the list and Dean's working the, the thing through IRS. . . He turned out to be tougher than I thought he would. . ."

This was a four-minute conversation between Halde- man and the President before Dean joined the meeting. It was played for the committee again yesterday. The 17-minute segment that the committee hopes will shed light on the President's involvement in political use of the IRS was the final 17 minutes of the meeting.

When sorting out tapes that should be given to the Watergate special prosecutor, U.S. District Court Judge John J. Sirica held back the 17-minute segment on grounds that it was not related to the Watergate issue. Last week he said he would give it to the Watergate prosecutors, but not to the Judiciary Committee.

Committee lawyers said it is a felony either to interfere with the administration of the IRS or to impede an IRS investigation. It has been alleged that someone in the White House tried to get the IRS to audit tax returns of 490 White House "enemies" and to give special favorable treatment to some presidential friends, such as actor John Wayne and evangelist Billy Graham.

A staff report by the congressional Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation last winter said former IRS Commissioner Johnnie M. Walters ignored a 1972 White House request for special audits of the 490 White House enemies. Most of the names were supplied by Dean, the report said. O'Brien's name was said to be on the list.

Last year O'Brien said he had been under scrutiny by the IRS since 1970, when he returned as Democratic national chairman but had no previous reason to believe it was politically motivated. He said the audits resulted in upward adjustments of tax due by a few hundred dollars.

Committee sources said evidence presented yesterday showed that one request for an audit of O'Brien's returns originated with John D. Ehrlichman, a top White House aide. He reportedly asked for a check on a report that O'Brien had received a large amount of money he had not reported as income.

The sources said Walters subsequently reported back through then Secretary of the Treasury George P. Shultz that the IRS had closed its investigation. Ehrlichman reportedly was displeased. This evidence originated in closed session testimony given the Senate Watergate committee, the sources said. This apparently was a separate request from the blanket list of enemies Dean gave the IRS in 1972.

Another former IRS commissioner, Randolph W. Thrower, confirmed last June that he had resisted strong White House pressure to hire John J. Caulfield and G. Gordon Liddy Jr. in 1970 when the White House wanted to crack down on radicals in the peace movement and elsewhere. Caulfield and Liddy figured in events leading up to the Watergate break-in, and Liddy is serving a prison term for his role.

Thrower later resigned after failing to get an appointment with the President. However, he denied published reports yesterday that he resigned specifically to protest political tampering with the revenue service.

A series of leaks of material from the impeachment inquiry, most of it not helpful to the President, apparently stopped yesterday as members feared it would damage the image of the committee for fairness and responsible action.

House Speaker Carl Albert (D-Okla.) reportedly took a hand in urging members to stop leaking secrets. One Democratic committee member refused to talk to a reporter for fear of contributing to polarizing the committee and Congress along partisan lines.

PRIVATE PENSION REFORM

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the near future, the Members of the House of Representatives will have before us landmark legislation in the field of private pension reform. As a strong supporter of that legislation, I wish to share with my colleagues my views on the need for private pension reform:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CLARENCE J. BROWN TO THE HOUSE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate the opportunity to testify before the Subcommittee today on the subject of pension reform legislation. It is an area in which I am deeply interested and for which I have the highest hopes of enactment during the 93rd Congress. My appearance here today is motivated out of a situation which developed last year in my own Congressional district. I would like to briefly share that experience and my thoughts about it with you this morning in the hope that it will contribute constructively to the task you have undertaken.

For many years prior to its sale to Textron, Inc., on January 3, 1967, the Thompson Grinder Company of Springfield, Ohio, was a locally owned and operated manufacturing plant. Its owner was a pillar of the Springfield community and his relations with the approximately 200 employees of his machine tool firm were based on trust and a mutual commitment to and local interest in the business. That relationship unfortunately changed, however, when the plant was sold to Textron in 1967.

As you know, Textron is one of our Nation's largest conglomerates with subsidiaries located throughout the country and annual gross revenues of almost 2 billion dollars. Suddenly the rather personal relationship which Thompson Grinder employees had had with their management ceased to exist and was replaced by the impersonality of an absentee owner a thousand miles away. Specifically, Thompson Grinder became a subsidiary of Waterbury-Farrel of Cheshire, Connecticut, which in turn, was a subsidiary of Textron, Inc., with home offices located in Providence, Rhode Island.

The Thompson Grinder pension plan has a long history. The firm unilaterally established a pension trust on June 1, 1942. On May 29, 1961, the firm accepted in negotiations with its local union of United Auto Workers a non-contributory pension plan for full-time hourly rated employees, and merged the assets of the June, 1942, pension trust into the new plan. Subsequently, the new plan was amended by the company and the union on March 7, 1966.

Following the 1967 purchase by Textron, a pension agreement, dated June 23, 1969, was propounded by the new owners. To quote the new document, Textron "assumed the obligations of the company (Thompson Grinder) under the plan and the related trust".

Subsequent to the assumption of the obligations of the pension plan, Textron twice negotiated pension benefit increases totalling \$249,400. of added liability. This new unfunded accrued liability was added to the previous unfunded accrued liability of the Thompson Grinder firm prior to its purchase by Textron, also approximately a quarter of a million dollars. The original owners of Thompson had agreed to funding of the plan being financed over a twenty-five year period. A similar 25 year funding period was implemented by Textron for the two benefit increases negotiated after their purchase of the firm.

On May 25, 1972, Textron shocked the Springfield community when it announced it was closing the Thompson Grinder plant. During the next several months negotiations were undertaken to reach a Termination Agreement, and a document was signed on October 9, 1972. Paragraph Six of the Termination Agreement provided that the company's obligation to contribute to the pension plan would terminate as of the termination date of the labor agreement then in effect, and that the assets of the pension plan would be applied in accordance with the terms of the plan.

The effect of the plant closing and the provision of the Termination Agreement just referred to, was, of course, to leave a substantial unfunded accrued liability amounting to approximately one-half million dollars. Typical of the impact of this deficit was the situation of my constituent, Mr. Cletus Frederick, an employee of the Thompson Grinder firm for 21 years and 7 months prior to its closing last year. By letter dated February 16, 1973, Mr. Frederick was advised by the Vice President for Administration of Waterbury-Farrel that his annual annuity under the pension plan would be \$100.72, starting at age 65 and continuing until his death. Had the pension plan been fully funded, Mr. Frederick would have been entitled to \$1367.16 annually. The amount finally offered, therefore, represents a settlement of approximately 7.3% of the figure which would have been his normal entitlement. One hundred dollars and seventy-two cents seems to me a small annual pension for a man who has invested almost 22 years of his life with one firm. More than that, however, it seems to me a cheap price for Textron to have paid for the half million dollar liability it had assumed.

The economic implications of Textron's decision should be considered for a moment from Textron's perspective. It is difficult to believe that Textron, when it purchased the firm, did not take into some account the approximately \$250,000 of accrued pension fund liability which existed in 1967. Accountants tell me that unfunded pension commitments represent a balance sheet liability. The logical conclusion I draw is that Textron paid less for the plant than they would had no pension plan existed, and that the former owner accepted less because he recognized it as an obligation he would have fulfilled had he not sold the plant.

I am further bothered by the thought that the two pension increases negotiated by Textron subsequent to their purchase of the plant—totalling a quarter of a million dollars—must necessarily have resulted in smaller paycheck increases or fewer other fringe benefits. It is difficult, if not impossible, to assess whether Textron acted in good faith when they originally purchased the Thompson Grinder plant, or later when they negotiated the two pension increases. I hope that their intention in either case was to keep the plant open and viable, but in view of the closing of the plant in 1972, I have some question in my mind whether that was the case.

After the decision to close the plant and move its production to Connecticut, I was interested to see how far Textron was willing to go in taking care of its employees. The details are illuminating. They graciously offered to 192 employees jobs in a plant in New Hampshire with no seniority rights and no assurance they would be kept on after the day they arrived. The fact that not a single Thompson Grinder employee took advantage of this "offer", in spite of poor employment prospects in the Springfield area, speaks eloquently of Textron's generosity.

The pity is that everything Textron did was, as one might imagine, completely within the letter of the law. Whether it was morally correct is another question—a question about which Textron does not seem concerned. What they did to 192 employees—some of whom had invested their entire work lives in Thompson Grinder—was to leave

them high and dry. Very legal, but cruelly tragic in human terms.

It was, nevertheless, my hope that Textron could be persuaded to fund at least a portion of the unfunded liability, and I set up a meeting in my office recently with Textron representatives to explore that possibility. Unfortunately, the meeting proved to be fruitless as it was Textron's position that they had acquitted all their legal responsibilities and were unwilling to go any further in meeting what was at best only a moral obligation.

Mr. Chairman, three years ago I doubt whether I would have testified before you on behalf of pension reform legislation. I come from an area of the country which values self-sufficiency and abhors the intrusion of government in the lives of its citizens. The Thompson Grinder episode has changed my mind. In a very direct and personal way the plight of this comparative handful of workers has brought home to me the callousness of some companies and their views about pension systems.

Perhaps, "system" is not even the right word, for in reality there is nothing but a hodge-podge of varying responses to the pension question. Sadly, most pension plans seem to be more concerned with providing the appearance of a pension plan than with addressing the substantive need of American working people. The fact that a man can spend 22 years of his life at a job, believing that he will be adequately taken care of by a pension plan upon retirement, and then can end up with \$100.72 a year in pension benefits adequately makes the point.

Congress, especially in recent years, has been increasingly concerned and involved through broad legislation in the establishment of a national social policy. Some legislation in the pension reform field now being considered by this Subcommittee has to make good sense when considered from this perspective. Every time a plant closes in this country, there are significant but uncalculated burdens passed on to individuals or to society as a whole in the form of higher taxes. Every worker unexpectedly deprived of his pension must, upon retirement, find support from some other source. For many it comes from social welfare programs financed by the American taxpayer. Ironically, a substantial portion of the 50% corporate income tax Textron pays each year goes to support the welfare system which their own business practices help perpetuate.

Perhaps it is unfair to single Textron out as an example, but I use it because it represents a meaningful personal experience. And it is fair to say that Thompson Grinder represents only the tip of a great iceberg of human tragedy. If such things continue to occur, it will do increasing damage to the relationships between American industry and labor. This Subcommittee has within its purview the responsibility to do something about such practices and thereby improve the lives of countless millions of citizens in the years ahead. I urge you to make that bold move and pledge my support for your efforts. In closing I would mention that my bill, HR 3784, is identical to the bill, HR 2, introduced by Chairman Dent, and now under consideration by this Subcommittee.

Thank you, again, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to appear before you.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY
MR. DELLENBACK

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I intend to introduce the following pro-

posed amendment to H.R. 11500 when in the course of consideration of this bill we reach the appropriate point.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE II PROPOSED BY
MR. DELLENBACK

Line 19, page 232, insert "having an interest which is or may be adversely affected" between "person" and "may."

Delete line 25 on page 232, and line 1 on page 233 through "as the case may be", and insert in place thereof "order such violation or failure to be corrected".

Beginning on line 7, and continuing on line 8, page 233, delete "regardless of the amount involved or citizenship of the parties".

THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF
ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 1974

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last week, Thursday, July 18, I submitted H.R. 16008, the Outer Continental Shelf Energy Policy Act of 1974. The bill amends the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1963, the statute governing the leasing of offshore areas for oil and natural gas development, and has three major premises. First, the Federal Government should improve its capacity to gather the best possible measurements of oil and gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf. Second, any decision to go forward with further leasing of offshore areas should be made only within the context of comprehensive national energy policy planning. Third, major questions of policy concerning the Outer Continental Shelf should be made with assured and adequate input from environmental and consumer activists within and outside Government, from representatives of State and local governments, and from private parties of all types with an active interest in such operations.

Underlying these premises is the major theme of the legislation: that the case for immediately developing the reserves on the Outer Continental Shelf has yet to be made, and that the Federal Government requires additional planning mechanisms in order to choose among the policy alternatives open to it.

Nearly every authority agrees that energy resources on the OCS will play an important part in meeting future energy needs. With the Department of the Interior as custodian, the American people own the bulk of the Nation's remaining fossil fuel resources; including an estimated 35 percent of the oil and gas, most of it offshore.

The manner in which the Federal Government manages these resources over the next few decades will be critical. The pace at which the shelf is developed, for example, can play a key role in determining the overall rate of energy growth, the mix of fuels, and the degree to which the Nation must rely on imported fuels. Whether environmental values are protected in the process can determine the usefulness of coastal zones and open space to future generations.

Given the importance of the Outer Continental Shelf as a store of energy for the United States, I am troubled by the failure to consider the broadest possible array of options for managing these resources. The bills amending the OCS Lands Act which were considered in hearings in the Senate several weeks ago include worthy refinements in environmental standards for offshore drilling, plans to share production revenues with coastal States, reforms of the Interior Department's oversight role in the letting of leases, and other commendable provisions. But every bill also accepts the unquestioned and unexamined assumption that the leasing of offshore lands to the oil companies should go forward in the near future. One major bill, for example, declares as a matter of policy that all Outer Continental Shelf lands on which oil could be produced without unreasonable environmental harm should be made available "as soon as practicable."

Yet, we realize, makers of public policy do not even know how much oil large areas of the Continental Shelf contain. A year ago, for example, the Geological Survey assured us that the Atlantic OCS has 48 billion barrels of oil and 220 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. This year, we were informed that estimates had decreased to 10 to 20 billion barrels of oil, and 55 to 110 trillion cubic feet of gas. Not only have the figures gone down in absolute terms, but the wide range of the latest estimates suggests that these measurements remain uncertain. The Council on Environmental Quality, in its preliminary statement on Atlantic OCS energy resources last month, justifiably cautioned:

Whether oil and gas are present in the Atlantic and Gulf of Alaska areas is highly speculative. There may be large commercial reservoirs in these regions exploitable with today's technology, or only small, non-commercial reservoirs, or only trace amounts.

I am not asserting that planning for OCS production should stop because of these statistics; I am, instead, urging that it go further than is now required. In reaching our present supply projections, we have not only counted our eggs before they have hatched; we have also sold them and consumed them before we even know they exist.

A first step in formulating national energy policies, therefore, is to improve the country's very imprecise means of measuring the extent of its resources. Presently, in the case of unexplored areas like the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf, the Interior Department issues preliminary exploratory permits to interested oil companies, who in turn hire geophysical experts to survey ocean areas by measuring certain magnetic, gravitational, and seismic qualities of the underwater rock formations. The surface of these formations is not disturbed by more direct probing, like the drilling of exploratory wells.

Government managers of the property can purchase the results of the initial surveys, but some of the information can be withheld as "proprietary" at the companies' discretion, and the Government has no authority to conduct exploratory work on its own. Individual tracts in the

ocean are "nominated" for leasing by the oil companies as a result of their indirect examination of reserves, put up for auction at public sessions where companies who participated in exploratory work can theoretically compete with each other in bids, and only after a tract is won by a given company or consortium of companies are exploratory wells drilled to confirm the amount of oil and gas believed to reside there.

The trouble is that without having dependable estimates of reserves in OCS locations, especially in "virgin" areas like the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico, it is difficult to evaluate the place these areas should hold in a national energy plan.

The Outer Continental Shelf Energy Policy Act authorizes the Federal Government to conduct a thorough inventory of oil and natural gas resources on the Shelf. This inventory is designed to provide information about the extent, location, and characteristics of such resources in order to provide a basis for, first, development and revision of the present leasing programs of the Shelf; second, greater and better informed interest by potential producers in the oil and gas resources of the Shelf; and third, more informed decisions regarding the publicly owned resources on the Shelf and the revenues to be expected from leasing these resources.

In making the inventory, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to directly conduct or contract for seismic, geomagnetic, and gravitational investigations or drilling on the shelf. Presently, as I mentioned, this kind of direct activity by government is not permitted.

In addition, the Secretary is authorized to acquire all data held by private oil companies—ultimately if it should prove necessary, by issuing subpoenas for this information.

The task confronting the Federal Government, however, is larger even than the very important problem of adequate information. I would suggest, for example, that even if the Atlantic OCS is found to contain considerable amounts of oil, we might want to consider preserving that energy for our children, or for national security purposes, rather than using it "as soon as practicable." As long as we do not have a national policy which includes consideration of our energy needs for the next three decades, I do not believe that leasing on the OCS should be accelerated, as several Senate bills propose. Conceivably, our energy requirements through the 1980's could be satisfied by a combination of conservation, reliance on existing oil and gas sources, geothermal energy, and coal and oil shale recovered in environmentally acceptable ways. Perhaps OCS energy should be held in reserve in the event solar energy and nuclear fusion do not evolve as anticipated by the end of this century. But instead of our insisting on the formation of a comprehensive energy policy in which OCS resources have their well-considered role, we seem about to go forward—in an overall policy vacuum—with development on the Outer Continental Shelf.

As an example, however, of the array of options that purposeful energy plan-

ning might offer the country, I would refer to a booklet published by the Ford Foundation's energy policy project, "Exploring Energy Choices." The study presents various "scenarios" of energy consumption, and therefore, of energy development. It is through analyses like these that all the possibilities for use of the OCS's resources emerge.

First, "Exploring Energy Choices" examines a scenario in which the United States would continue its recent historical growth in energy consumption. During 1950-72, energy use grew at the rate of about 3.4 percent a year. If that rate is to be continued, all of the U.S. domestic sources of supply, including the Atlantic OCS, would have to be developed simultaneously. Such a policy seems inherent, incidentally, in the Interior Department's drive to expand leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf tenfold by next year.

The energy policy project goes on, however, to propose a set of options differing dramatically from those of Interior and the oil industry. The project describes a "technical fix" scenario which would require a concerted national effort to reduce growth in demand to about 2 percent a year. In such a situation, the project states:

Domestic oil production would have to grow only about half as much by 1985 and 2000 as it would under the comparable "historical growth" case. The pace of Outer Continental Shelf development . . . could be much lower [yet] self-sufficiency could be achieved sooner.

The country would have the option, in other words, of leaving the Atlantic undisturbed, in the event its cache of oil is deemed too small and the attendant social and environmental problems too serious. Or of holding Atlantic resources in reserve, in case solar energy and nuclear technology do not evolve as anticipated by the end of the century.

Perhaps, after an assessment of the environmental consequences, levels of national energy demand, and alternatives for satisfying these demand levels, development of Atlantic Ocean oil and natural gas would emerge as an acceptable option. In that case, the low-growth scenario of the energy policy project could be modified so as to avoid reliance on nuclear power, because of unresolved safety problems, or to remove the need for strip-mining coal, if that were viewed as environmentally or socially unworkable.

In order to encourage the kind of broad policy approach exemplified by the work of the energy policy project, the Outer Continental Shelf Energy Policy Act requires, as a condition of further leasing of tracts on the shelf, the prior preparation of energy policy impact statements. The impact statement provision is an ambitious, back door approach to requiring national energy policies. The statement for each geographic area proposed to be leased would include information on:

First, the location, extent, and characteristics of the oil and natural gas reserves existing within that geographic area;

Second, the energy policy considerations of which the decision to designate

for leasing that geographic area is a part, including the projected annual levels of national energy consumption to be satisfied in whole or in part by energy resources derived from that area;

Third, a description of alternative means of deriving energy resources sufficient to satisfy the energy needs intended to be met by development of energy resource derived from that geographic area, together with the reasons why these alternative means are not to be relied upon to fulfill these needs; and

Fourth, an evaluation of the capacity of the government agency or agencies with regulatory and oversight responsibility related to such tracts, to supervise the development of such tracts in accordance with intended energy policies.

Finally, in order to encourage the broad input on policy which I believe national decisions of this kind require, the Outer Continental Shelf Energy Policy Act creates an Operations Advisory Board. The Board would be composed of the Secretary or his designees, who would serve as Chairman, and ten additional members appointed by the President. One would serve from the Environmental Protection Agency, and the others would be representative of the appropriate State, interstate, and local government agencies in coastal areas, experts in the fields of operations in the Outer Continental Shelf, private industry involved in such operations and organizations or groups demonstrating an active interest in such operations and the environmental effects thereof.

The Board would be empowered to review the provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and the accompanying regulations, monitor enforcement of these provisions, and make recommendations to the Secretary for any necessary changes in them. The Board would also be empowered to hold public hearings whenever and wherever it considered them appropriate for carrying out its functions. Most importantly, perhaps, the Board would assist the Secretary in compiling the policy impact statements I described earlier.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize that my legislation, if adopted, would in effect impose a moratorium on leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf until preparation of the suitable energy policy impact statement. I don't intend this provision to be as drastic as it might at first appear; the objective is merely to insure that a decision, for example, to lease areas off the coast of the Eastern United States, is reached prudently and with due consideration for all possible alternatives.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reprint the text of the legislation in the RECORD:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to insure that the Federal Government has available to it reliable information on the nature and extent of energy resources in the undeveloped areas of the Outer Continental Shelf, and that any decision to develop said resources take place within the context of a national energy policy.

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Outer Continental Shelf Energy Policy Act."

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(a) Energy resources and their management are of overriding national importance for the public health, safety, and welfare, and for the national security of the United States.

(b) Some mineral resources, especially petroleum and its products and natural gas, are in short supply, causing or threatening inconvenience, hardship, and economic disruption for the present and succeeding generations.

(c) In the absence of intelligent planning, the impact of national and international energy shortages will become increasingly severe.

(d) It is particularly appropriate that the Federal Government exercise direct control and oversight of the resources on the Outer Continental Shelf, since these resources are the heritage and property of the people of the United States.

(e) In order to develop our Nation's energy resources in a timely and orderly manner, protect the environment in the process, and insure a fair return to the public from the sale or lease of these resources, it is essential for government to have the best possible measurements of our oil and gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf.

(f) In undeveloped areas of the Outer Continental Shelf, the Federal Government presently has extremely limited information with which to assess the role these areas should play in a national energy policy structured to satisfy the needs of future as well as present generations.

(g) Serious questions have been raised about the capacity and willingness of the major oil companies, which have dominated Outer Continental Shelf development in the Gulf of Mexico and Santa Barbara Channel, to supply the government with the needed information on the nature and extent of reserves.

(h) Before the commencement of leasing in the undeveloped areas of the Outer Continental Shelf, it is necessary that reliable, detailed information on resources be available to the government, and that the decision to go forward with the leasing of promising tracts, or, as an alternative, hold such tracts in abeyance to satisfy future national needs, be made only in the context of a comprehensive national energy policy in which present and future energy resources and requirements are duly evaluated.

PURPOSES

SEC. 3. It is the purpose of this Act to insure that—

(a) the Federal Government has reliable and firsthand information on the nature and extent of energy in the undeveloped areas of the Outer Continental Shelf;

(b) development of these areas only proceed after this data has been received and evaluated; and

(c) development of these areas, at whatever time and place, take place within the context of a comprehensive national energy policy considerations.

INVENTORY OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF ENERGY RESOURCES

SEC. 4. The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331-1343) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 18. Inventory of Outer Continental Shelf Energy Resources.—(a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to conduct an inventory of oil and gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf. This inventory shall be designed to provide information about the probable location, extent, and characteristics

of such resources in order to provide a basis for—

"(1) development and revision of the present leasing program on the outer Continental Shelf;

"(2) greater and better informed competitive interest by potential producers in the oil and gas resources of the outer Continental Shelf; and

"(3) more informed decisions regarding the value of public resources and revenues to be expected from leasing these resources.

"(b) In making the inventory required by this section, the Secretary (at any stage of investigation or drilling) is authorized to—

"(1) conduct or contract for seismic, geomagnetic, gravitational, geophysical, geological, or geochemical investigations or drilling on the outer Continental Shelf;

"(2) acquire, by purchase or otherwise, the results of seismic, geomagnetic, gravitational, geophysical, geological, or geochemical investigations or drilling conducted by any person on the outer Continental Shelf;

"(3) consult all data pertaining to that area held by State and local governments and other Federal Government agencies; and

"(4) consult all data pertaining to that area obtained by any person under exploratory permits issued by the Secretary.

The Secretary shall have authority, for purposes of this subsection, to sign, and issue subpoenas for the production of relevant books, papers, charts, and other documents or materials, and, in case of refusal to obey a subpoena served upon any person under the provisions of this subsection, the Secretary may request the Attorney General to seek the aid of the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found to compel such person, after notice, to appear and produce such relevant books, papers, charts, and other documents or materials before the Secretary. No person shall be permitted to conduct further exploration or to bid for or hold a lease in the designated area unless he submits the requisite information to the Secretary.

"(c) The Secretary shall make certain that the investigations or drilling referred to in subsection (b) utilize the best available technology, and that his Department, in assessing the results of such investigations or drilling, utilizes adequate numbers of expert personnel;

"(d) The Secretary shall make available to the public all information obtained by him under this section, except any information pertaining to specific tracts shall be kept confidential until the tract to which such information pertains has been leased under this Act. Any information obtained by the Secretary under this section, regardless of how obtained, may be disclosed to any other person who is administering this Act solely for the purpose of such administration, and, when relevant, in any proceeding under this Act. Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the withholding of any information from the Congress.

"(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this section during the two fiscal years ending June 30, 1975, and June 30, 1976.

"Sec. 19. Outer Continental Shelf Operations Advisory Board—

"(a) There is established in the Department of the Interior an Outer Continental Shelf Operations Advisory Board. The Board shall be composed of the Secretary or his designee, who shall be Chairman, and ten members appointed by the President, one from the Environmental Protection Agency and the others to represent appropriate State, interstate, and local government agencies in coastal areas, experts in the fields of operations in the Outer Continental Shelf, private industry involved in such operations

and organizations or groups demonstrating an active interest in such operations and the environmental effects thereof.

"(b) The Board shall meet at the call of the Chairman or a majority of the members thereof. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of establishing official positions of the Board.

"(c) The Board shall

"(1) review the provisions of this Act and the regulations pursuant thereto;

"(2) monitor the enforcement of such provisions and regulations;

"(3) make recommendations to the Secretary for any necessary changes in such provisions or regulations;

"(4) hold public hearings whenever and wherever appropriate in carrying out its functions, and

"(5) assist the Secretary in compiling the Policy Impact Statements described in Section 20.

"(d) Members of the Board from Federal departments and agencies and from State and local governments shall receive no additional compensation for their services as members of the Board. Members of the Board selected from the private sector, while serving on business of the Board, shall receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding \$100 per day, if service on the Board would result in loss of income which would otherwise be earned. All members of the Board, while serving away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. The Secretary shall make available to the Board such office space and facilities, and such secretarial, clerical, technical, and other assistance and such information and data in his possession or under his control, as the Board may require to carry out its functions.

"Sec. 20. Preparation of Energy Policy Impact Statement—

"(a) After the designation of a geographic area on the Outer Continental Shelf for leasing, and before the solicitation of nominations for the sale of individual tracts within said geographic area, the Secretary shall prepare and make public a detailed statement including:

"(1) the location, extent, and characteristics of the oil and natural gas reserves existing within said geographic area;

"(2) the energy policy considerations of which the decision to designate for leasing said geographic area is part, including the projected annual levels of national energy consumption to be satisfied in whole or in part by energy resources derived from said area;

"(3) a description of alternative means of deriving energy resources sufficient to satisfy the energy needs intended to be met by development of energy resource derived from said geographic area, together with the reasons why these alternative means are not to be relied upon to fulfill these needs;

"(4) an evaluation of the capacity of the government agency or agencies with regulatory and oversight responsibility related to said tracts, to supervise the development of said tracts in accord with intended energy policies;

"(b) In compiling the Policy Impact Statements described in this section, the Secretary shall:

"(1) consult on a continuing basis with the Outer Continental Shelf Advisory Board, and shall solicit additional views from all concerned parties, including representatives of local, state, and interstate government agencies in coastal areas, experts in the fields of operations in the Outer Continental Shelf, private industry involved in such operations, and private individuals and organizations

demonstrating an active interest in such operations and the environmental effects thereof;

"(2) utilize the data resulting from the inventory of Outer Continental Shelf energy resources described in Section 18.

"Sec. 21. No heretofore unleased tracts on the Outer Continental Shelf shall be leased until at least sixty (60) days following the submission to Congress of the Policy Impact Statement pertaining to said tracts.

WELFARE OUTSTRIPS SOME PAY

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the problem of what to do with our national welfare system has plagued the Congress for some years. Everyone knows that welfare reform is needed. It has always been suspected that some of our present laws were encouraging people to make a career out of welfare. Recently, a study released by the Joint Economic Committee showed that welfare in some cases actually beats working—something many of us have been asserting for some time. The Washington, D.C. Area is an example of how the present system is not working as the article that appeared in the Washington Post on July 22, 1974, points out. The item from the Post follows:

WELFARE OUTSTRIPS SOME PAY

(By Stephen Green)

A congressional study released yesterday indicates that under some circumstances it can be more profitable to be on welfare in the District of Columbia than to hold a job.

The study, conducted by the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, says the welfare systems are so structured in the District and elsewhere in the country that they financially encourage unemployment, higher birth rates and separation of families.

However, the study contains no material showing that persons actually make decisions to have children or leave their jobs or families based on financial benefits they may receive from public assistance.

In the District, according to the study, a family consisting of an unemployed mother and her two children could get annual public assistance benefits equivalent to a taxable income of \$5,160 a year. The report gives median salary for women workers in the city as \$5,144 a year.

The median salary is the wage that lies in the middle of the group of salaries being surveyed. Thus, half the employed women earn less than the median and half earn more.

According to statistics in the study, the combined income of a family in which a working father is separated from his wife and children, permitting them to obtain public assistance benefits, is higher than the income of a similar family living together.

Also, the report shows that the public assistance benefits for an unemployed woman with one child in the District can be more than 800 per cent higher than the benefits obtained by an unemployed woman without children.

"This analysis reveals the welfare system's average financial incentives for family break-up, motherhood and for not working," said Rep. Martha W. Griffiths (D-Mich.) chairman of the Joint Economic Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy.

The figures in the report are July, 1972, statistics supplied by the D.C. Government and 99 other local governments from around the country. The 100 localities were selected to present a "nationally valid picture" of what welfare benefits are available to different groups of people, the report said.

Nationally, according to the report, the average cash, food and housing benefits potentially available to a nonworking welfare mother with three children exceed median women's wages by about 10 per cent.

Such a family, the report states, would be entitled to an average of \$4,579 in tax- and expense-free benefits a year that equal about \$5,006 in taxable income. This is \$398 above the median wage and salary income of all women workers, according to the report.

In the District, according to the report, the annual median wage for women is \$527 less than the equivalent annual taxable income available through public assistance to a family consisting of an unemployed mother with three children.

Such a family in the District, according to the report, could get annual public assistance benefits that include \$2,862 in aid to families with dependent children (AFDC), \$900 in food stamps, at least \$80 in free school lunches and public housing worth \$1,320 a year. These benefits, come to \$5,164. The committee staff, in the report, states this is equivalent to a taxable income of \$5,671 a year.

Not all welfare families in D.C. have public housing. There is a waiting list for such housing in the city.

The report also states that in the District a mother of three who works for the median wage would be eligible for some public assistance benefits worth \$1,617 a year. The value of these benefits added to her median salary would total \$6,761 a year.

But, the report states, with the deduction of working expenses and childcare expenses, she would be left with the equivalent of an annual taxable income of \$5,440. This is \$231 less than the equivalent taxable income for the unemployed mother of three.

There are about 106,000 persons on the D.C. welfare rolls, according to a recent testimony by city officials before the House District Appropriations Subcommittee. About 101,000 receive AFDC payments.

Joseph Yeldell, head of the city's department of human resources, which handles the city's welfare program, could not be contacted yesterday for his reaction to the report.

The report states the national statistics show welfare benefits available to an unemployed single woman without children are 50 per cent, or \$1,159, less than the annual benefits available to an unemployed woman with one child.

In D.C., according to the report, an unemployed woman with one child could get benefits worth \$3,131 a year more than the benefits available to a childless, unemployed woman.

A childless, unemployed woman in D.C. who is not eligible for unemployment insurance, could get in annual public assistance benefits only \$432 in food stamps. An unemployed woman with one or more children would be eligible for AFDC payments and public housing.

Mrs. Griffiths said the committee's study shows that "by splitting up, poor families generally can increase joint income by more than enough to pay for the cost of maintaining a separate household. Benefit gains in cash and food range as high as 50 per cent of original family income."

In the District, according to the report, a family consisting of an unemployed mother, three children and a father working 40 hours a week for \$2 an hour, would have an income from wages and public assistance equivalent

to a taxable income of \$5,328, the report said.

The public assistance benefits received by such a family could include only food stamps and public housing.

If the father moved out, he still would have his wages of \$4,160 a year. The mother and three children, according to the report, would get public assistance benefits equivalent to a taxable annual income of \$5,671. This would place the combined family income at a taxable equivalent of more than \$9,000 a year, according to the report.

U.S. JAYCEES HONOR PITTSBURGH SELF-HELP GROUPS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Jaycees have just published a book, "UPLIFT: What People Themselves Can Do," which analyzes the scope and success of small scale self-help projects, operating in low income communities throughout the country.

I am pleased and proud to report that the Jaycees chose four such operations in my congressional district.

These four projects, along with 96 others, we picked from some 1,000 similar activities isolated by the Jaycee research project.

I wish to include in the RECORD at this time a brief description of the neighborhood programs singled out by the Jaycees, and offer my sincere congratulations for jobs well done to Pittsburghers: Mr. Leon Hickman, director of the homemaker skills program; Mr. Richard Barber, director of urban talent development; Mr. Bernard Jones, director of urban youth action; and Mr. James Givner, director of Operation Better Block.

The material follows:

HOMEMAKER SKILLS

Her admirers call Cora Raiford the "miracle worker" of Pittsburgh's Homewood-Brushton district because of her ability to brighten the drab lives of the poor.

During the last five years she has become a friend, a teacher and confidante to more than a thousand people—poor people who have long been victims of poverty, imprisoned without hope in the city's slums.

She has touched their lives through compassion and caring, through helping them and teaching them. She has taught them about decorating their homes, about stretching the family income, about flower arranging and ceramics. She has given them lessons in sewing, knitting, cooking, and the art of candle making. But what she does best is to help people learn about the most important art of all—the art of living.

Cora Raiford's story is a large part of the story of a special program started in the late 1960s called Homemaker Skills. It was launched by ACTION-Housing, Inc., which is a privately funded self-help agency founded in 1957 to provide new and rehabilitated housing for low- and "no"-income families.

"Its one thing to take people out of the slums and give them a place to live," says ACTION-Housing's executive director, William Farkas. "But it's something altogether different to expect them to know how to live once they've gotten a place."

The challenge of the Homemaker Skills program, continues Farkas, is "to find out how in the hell we can deliver the myriad of services and abilities people must have to maintain homes at near or below poverty levels—so that they can live with the dignity and pride of their more affluent neighbors."

Homemaker Skills concentrates its efforts in two low-income areas of Pittsburgh. One is the Homewood-Brushton district which is predominantly black; the other is the Perry-Hilltop district, about one-third black, on the city's North Side. Although ACTION-Housing says the program is available to the general community without regard to place of residence or income level, the primary thrust of Homemaker Skills is clearly directed toward families living in new or rehabilitated housing that is sponsored by ACTION-Housing and other nonprofit leasing enterprises.

The twin driving forces of Homemaker Skills are a pair of dedicated, energetic women: Cora Raiford, who works in the Homewood-Brushton area, and Aurelia Demus, who is active in the Perry-Hilltop area. "They, not us, make Homemaker Skills tick," says Jonathan Zimmer, director of supportive services for ACTION-Housing.

What makes the approaches of Cora Raiford and Aurelia Demus tick is sensitivity. Both know the problems of poverty. Both have seen the deterioration of their neighborhoods and communities. They have different ways of going about it, but they both know how to develop a sense of self-confidence and dignity in the "ladies" of the program.

Their constant reference to "ladies" reflects the importance they attach to human dignity in their overall attack on the problems. A lady is a symbol of achievement, and to Cora Raiford and Aurelia Demus all the women in Homemaker Skills are ladies.

The Homemaker Skills program provides the ladies with free classes in a great variety of subjects. These include the basics of homemaking, such as sewing, cooking, and interior decorating, as well as more advanced topics, such as nutrition, budget stretching, upholstery, and art.

"Our hope is to build the necessary skills for people to live in public housing so that they can become self-sufficient," says Farkas. "This is the real bread and butter of housing programs."

It is also what sets ACTION-Housing apart from other housing programs.

Homemaker Skills classes are conducted on an informal basis, without rigid structuring. In general they have had no official beginning or ending point. Some participants tend to drop out after reaching a certain level of skill, while others continue to attend over a long period of time. The classes are held in a variety of places—in the four Homemaker centers, in the homes of the "students" themselves, or some other place.

All of the class sessions are kept free of anything that would lead to them being mistaken for welfare or social development programs. Cora Raiford and Aurelia Demus want to make it instantly clear that they are homemakers, not caseworkers. There is a one-to-one relationship with each lady, not a teacher-student or caseworker-client relationship.

"I guess the real thing is that they get to know us and trust us as friends," says the soft-spoken Aurelia Demus. "It really becomes a social situation when they begin sharing all their problems with us. Once you start working in the same kitchen with a person or sit in the living room with her, there's a certain bond of friendship and trust that automatically begins to develop."

Both Cora Raiford and Aurelia Demus come by their talents naturally. Mrs. Demus has been sewing or knitting all her life. And Mrs. Raiford says, "I can't remember when

I couldn't sew or read a pattern. I love to cook, and any kind of art work I see I want to try." She is an experienced home economist who learned her craft at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama.

The Homemaker Skills program has gone far beyond just knitting, sewing, cooking, and other routine skills. Mrs. Demus, for example, has added a charm class for teenage girls, is experimenting with cooking courses for boys, and has started special piano and music classes for adolescents and adults.

One of the most exciting new ideas she has brought to the Perry-Hilltop area is a course in junk art—the art of making such things as wall hangings and centerpieces from bottle caps and coat hangers. The course is being taught by Dorothy Richardson, a long-time civil rights worker and the person who got Aurelia Demus involved with ACTION-Housing in the first place.

Cora Raiford has also expanded her offerings to include classes in candle making and foliage arrangement. Tutorial classes for boys have been launched. And even the men of the neighborhood have become involved in the basics of plastering, upholstering, and home repairs.

The results of Cora Raiford's classes can be found throughout the homes in the Homewood-Brushton area. One woman, for example, did all her own drapes and curtains, turning her home into a showpiece for the rest of the neighborhood. Both her pride and reputation are now spreading, as others follow her example.

One interesting result of Homemaker Skills' success has been that Allegheny County Community College has called on Mrs. Raiford to teach a special ten-week, 30-hour creative home economics skills course right at her Tloga Street Center. "Our hope," says Zimmer, "is that a college certificate will stimulate some of the people involved in Cora's program to go on to other areas of education and training."

Homemaker Skills operates four centers, two in Homewood-Brushton and two in Perry-Hilltop. The centers themselves reflect the creativity of the Homemaker Skills program. Cora Raiford, for example, has converted the Tloga Street center—an abandoned sheet mill—into a veritable rose garden of homely pleasantness. Combining her own with that of her participants, she has completely revamped the inside with bright and decorative wall hangings, attractive furniture, and colorful foliage arrangements.

All of the centers are beehives of activity throughout the week, with a variety of activities in full swing on any given day. Consider a typical evening at Aurelia Demus' three-story thatched row house headquarters on Charles Street. The center is filled to overflowing. Eight women ranging in age from 21 to 86 are on the second floor for their regular sewing class. A group of neighborhood men are meeting on the first floor to discuss furnace maintenance with an expert from one of the local gas companies. And the third floor is jammed with teenagers talking about a school project, as their record player blares forth the music of Aretha Franklin and Robert Flack.

And this is how Aurelia Demus likes it. "When we're busy," she says, "that means we're reaching people," and she goes on to recall her very first sewing class in a makeshift trailer two years ago—when only two people showed up.

Some of the participants are turning their new-found talents to profit-making ventures.

A woman in Mrs. Demus' sewing class, for example, has begun making turbans, for which she has found a good market. And then there is Ann McCoy, one of the veterans of Cora Raiford's program, who has learned how to make fancy napkin holders using empty detergent bottles. In 1973 she

sold over one hundred of her popular creations to friends and neighbors for Christmas gifts.

"It would have cost \$5 to get something that pretty at a store," says one woman. "Ann only charged \$3."

Funding is a continuing problem for both Homemaker Skills and ACTION-Housing. Although Homemaker Skills has largely been supported by private foundations, these sources are beginning to dry up somewhat.

As Cora Raiford puts it: "We've had to beg, borrow, and steal to get the necessities, such as stoves, refrigerators, sewing machines, and other materials. So far the supply has been ample."

But with or without equipment, Homemaker Skills will go on.

"By itself," admits Zimmer, "it has not solved all the problems associated with poverty. Far from it. We are never satisfied and feel much more can be done. But through people like Cora Raiford and Aurelia Demus we have improved the housekeeping and maintenance skills of the residents we serve in our more than one thousand housing units. This in turn has begun to provide a beneficial impact on the quality of life in our housing developments and the community as a whole."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SYMMS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I introduce the following amendment for protection of the 5-minute time rule:

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

On page 234, following line 17, add a new subsection "f" as follows and reletter the subsequent subsections.

"Sec. —. Every citizen of and within the United States may seek to enjoin before any United States District Court every effort to restrict the surface mining of coal upon a showing that such restriction will increase United States dependence upon imported fuels or will impair employment security among citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That any such injunction which may be issued by the U.S. District Court does not impair the obligation of surface mining operations to restore the mined land to substantially useful and relatively attractive condition."

EXPLANATION OF SYMMS AMENDMENT

1. Under the present committee Bill every citizen has the right to sue in court to stop mining if an individual citizen or group of citizens consider it to be damaging to the environment.

2. The Committee Bill states that the area that is surface mined must be returned to the "approximate contour" that existed before any mining occurred. This term is vague and leaves the door open for excessive law suits and litigation under the above mentioned provision.

3. Such a halt to mining operations that could arise as a result of these suits and litigation would cause excessive unemployment. Unemployment reduces tax revenue from which welfare and unemployment compensation are paid.

4. Any reduction in energy production will produce unemployment. In fact, the Chase Manhattan Bank predicts unemployment would rise to 25% by the mid 1980's if energy production remains level; if it declines the

result will be worse. This is based on people already born entering the work force.

5. This amendment protects the workers of America and at the same time insures land reclamation. The legitimate ends of conservation are adequately met. This vote will test the wishes of those who want to control surface mining: Is their concern for the American worker as great as for the landscape?

HEARING ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN SOUTH KOREA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittees on International Organizations and Movements and Asian and Pacific Affairs will hold a joint hearing on human rights in South Korea. The hearing will be held at 2 p.m., Tuesday, July 30, in room H-236 in the Capitol.

The hearing on July 30 will include testimony from the following witnesses: Prof. Edwin O. Reischauer of Harvard University, former U. S. Ambassador to Japan;

William Butler, attorney, recently returned from South Korea as an observer for Amnesty International;

A witness from the Department of State; and a witness from the Department of Defense.

The hearing is being held to examine the growing repression by the South Korean Government. President Chung Hee Park appears unwilling to tolerate any criticism of his regime. Recently military court martials have sentenced 14 persons to death, 15 persons to life imprisonment, 20 persons to 20 years, and 6 others to 15 years in prison for organizing student demonstrations which called for democratic rule in South Korea. The lawyer who defended the nation's leading poet and 10 students in these political trials has been arrested because he denounced the military judges who imposed death sentences on several of his clients.

The administration proposes to allocate \$252 million to South Korea in fiscal 1975. Military assistance, under the terms of the Foreign Assistance Act, is supposed to prevent international communism from attempting "to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent. . . ."

The Park government may be South Korea's own worst enemy.

I include after my remarks, an article which appeared in the New York Times on July 19 reporting the arrest of Kang Shin Ok, the South Korean lawyer who defended a number of persons involved in the political trials mentioned above.

Also, I include the statement by the Committee for Human Rights in Korea which is composed of 40 Americans and Korean residents in the United States. The list of persons includes church leaders, university professors and former ambassadors.

Finally, I include an editorial which

appeared in the July 22 New York Times urging the United States to warn the South Korean Government that:

The 38,000 American troops that still defend South Korea cannot be expected to remain there very long if a tightening dictatorship continues to make the government of South Korea less and less distinguishable from that of the North.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, July 19, 1974]

LAWYER IN SEOUL HELD AFTER TRIAL

(By Fox Butterfield)

SEOUL, SOUTH KOREA, July 18.—A prominent South Korean lawyer who defended the nation's leading poet and 10 students in political trials last week has been arrested, associates disclosed today.

The lawyer, Kang Shin Ok, was taken from his office by plainclothes agents last Monday, apparently because he had denounced in court the military judges who imposed death sentences on several of his clients, including the poet, Kim Chi Ha. Mr. Kang, a leading advocate of civil liberties, holds a graduate degree from George Washington University and also studied at Yale.

Kim Young Sam, vice president of the New Democratic party, the major opposition was detained this morning, apparently only for interrogation. He had scheduled a news conference at which, according to aides, he planned to call for suspension of the sweeping emergency decrees proclaimed by President Park Chung Hee this year.

The arrests are part of a steadily lengthening series of political detentions, trials and convictions designed to suppress all opposition to President Park. In recent months 91 people have been convicted of subversion, with 14 sentenced to death. Over 100 others are awaiting trial, informed diplomats say.

The two other major court actions continued.

In one a former President, Yun Po Sun, two Protestant clergymen and a professor of American history appeared for the second day before a closed court-martial in the Defense Ministry. They are accused of violating emergency decrees by giving money to dissident students and calling for Mr. Park's ouster.

Foreign correspondents have not been allowed to attend, and the strictly controlled press has not reported the proceedings.

In a civilian appellate court another well-known Korean Kim Dae Jung, argued that the case charging him with election law violations in 1967 and 1971 be thrown out because the judge was prejudiced. Mr. Kim is the opposition leader who was kidnapped from his Tokyo hotel room last August by agents of the South Korean Central Intelligence Agency. His appeal is given little chance of success.

The series of trials has produced a palpable atmosphere of fear, reducing conversations to whispers or shrugs of the shoulders and often leading to outright refusals to receive visitors.

Partners in the law office of Mr. Kang declined to comment on why he had been arrested or what he had said in court that led to his arrest. "Do you think we want to be arrested too?" one of them asked.

BROAD PROHIBITION

Under an emergency decree issued April 3, it is a crime punishable by death for anyone "to advocate, instigate, propagate, broadcast, report, publish or otherwise communicate to others such act or acts as are prohibited" by the other emergency measures.

Others familiar with Mr. Kang's case said that in his criticism of the three judges he termed the trial a farce and asserted that he was ashamed to be a lawyer in Korea and that if he was a student he would have done just what the students did.

Mr. Kang, who is 39 years old, was arrested outside the courtroom with another defense lawyer. They were held for two days, then released, but Mr. Kang was rearrested.

The Korean Lawyers Association met to discuss Mr. Kang's arrest, believed to be the first instance in which a lawyer has been detained in South Korea for his words in the courtroom.

Mr. Kim Shin Ok of the New Democratic party has been one of the more outspoken members of the opposition in the National Assembly. According to his aides, he had intended to call not only for suspension of the emergency decrees but for the end of the courts-martial and freedom for Mr. Kim Dae Jung, who has been under virtual house arrest since his abduction.

STATEMENT OF COMMITTEE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN KOREA

Friends of the Korean people and persons concerned with human rights there and elsewhere have watched with mounting distress the acts of President Chung Hee Park during the past six months which have systematically sought to eradicate all criticism or protest against his dictatorial rule in Korea.

These acts now culminate with the sentencing by Courts Martial of fourteen persons to death, fifteen persons to life imprisonment, twenty persons to twenty years and six others to fifteen years in prison for the "crime" of organizing student demonstrations which called for the return of a more democratic government and a more just society.

More than two hundred others are yet to be tried while the previous opposition candidate for Presidency, Kim Dae Chun, who was kidnapped from Tokyo, is under trial and the previous president, Yun Po Sun, has been called to trial.

More than thirty others including clergymen, professors and students are known to have been sentenced to imprisonment for periods of from five to fifteen years for expressing the belief that the Korean people have the right to discuss the form of government under which they live.

The injustice and the inhumanity of these sentences against students, intellectuals and religious leaders and the detention of outstanding democratic political leaders calls for international protest in the name of humanity and human rights. We call on the United States to distance itself promptly from oppressive acts against the people of Korea which the Government of President Park has carried out (supported by U.S. arms) and to use its influence for the restoration of participatory government in Korea. In so protesting these acts, and by limiting further aid, the U.S. Government would fulfill the policy enunciated by Secretary of State Acheson in 1950: "United States aid, both military and economic, to the Republic of Korea has been predicated upon the existence and growth of democratic institutions within the Republic" and Section 32 of the Foreign Aid Law of 1973 which states it is the sense of the United States Congress that aid should not be given to the government of countries which carry out political repression of their citizenry.

Professor Hugh Borton, East Asia Institute, Columbia University and former President, Haverford College.

Professor Jerome A. Cohen, Director, East Asian Legal Studies, Law School, Harvard University.

Professor John K. Fairbank, Chairman, Council East Asian Studies, History, Harvard University.

Professor Gregory Henderson, Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy, Tufts University.

Professor Donald W. Klein, Political Science, Tufts University.

Professor Robert Legvold, Political Science, Tufts University.

Professor Edwin O. Reischauer, Former U.S. Ambassador to Japan, University Professor, Harvard University.

Professor Benjamin S. Schwartz, History & Government, Harvard University.

Dean Krister Standahl, Divinity School, Harvard University.

Professor James C. Thomas, Jr., Curator Nieman Foundation, Harvard University.

Professor Ezra F. Vogel, Director East Asia Research Center, Harvard University.

Rev. James E. Anderson, Stated Clerk, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.

Rev. Dr. Lawrence W. Bottoms, Moderator, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.

Rev. Dr. W. Sterling Cary, President, National Council of Churches.

Rev. Dr. Tracey Jones, General Secretary, Board of Global Ministries, United Methodist Church.

Rev. Dr. Robert J. Marshall, President Lutheran Church of America.

Rev. Dr. Robert B. Moss, Jr., President, United Church of Christ.

Father William McIntyre, Secretary General of Maryknoll Fathers.

Rev. Dr. John Coventry Smith, President of the World Council of Churches.

Rev. Dr. Eugene Stockwell, Associate General Secretary for Overseas Ministries, National Council of Churches.

Rev. Dr. Kenneth Teegarden, General Minister & President, Christian Church, (Disciples of Christ).

Dr. William P. Thompson, President World Alliance of Reformed Churches, Stated Clerk of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Mr. Sung Nam Chang, Publisher, *Free Republic*.

General Bung Nam Choi, Former Brigadier General, Army of the Republic of Korea.

Dr. Kyu Hong Chyun, Former Ambassador of Korea to Germany & France.

Dr. Young Che Kan, Editor, *Free Republic*.

Dr. B. S. Kim, Chairman, Sociology Department, Montclair State University.

Dr. Jai Hyon Lee, Former Director, Information Officer, Korean Embassy in the U.S.A.

Mr. Keun Pal Lee, Executive, director, Korean Institute for Democracy & Unification.

Professor Channing Liem, Former Ambassador of Korea to the United Nations, Political Science, New Paltz State University.

Dr. Paul Kichon Ryu, Former President, Seoul National University.

Dr. Harold Hakwon Sunoo, Professor of Asian Studies, The City College, City University of New York.

Dr. Soon Nam Rhim, Sociology, William Paterson College of New Jersey.

Dr. Syngman Rhee, Associate for Internationalization, The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Dr. Wi Jo Kang, President, Association of Korean Christian Scholars in the U.S., Associate Professor of Comparative Religions, Concordia Seminary.

Dr. Hai Won Chang, Columbia University, Vice-President—Association of Korean Christian Scholars in the U.S.

Mr. Harry S. Ashmore, Executive Vice-President, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Mr. Theodore Richard Conant, Director, J. Henry Schroder Banking Corporation.

Mrs. Ellen Pasaty Conant, Far Eastern Fine Arts Authority.

Dr. Andrew Cordier, President Emeritus Columbia University.

Mr. Joseph E. Johnson, Princeton, New Jersey.

Rev. Vern Rossman, Executive Director, Intermedia, National Council of Churches.

Rev. L. Newton Thurber, Liaison with East

Asia, The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1974]
REPRESSION IN KOREA

The arrests and military trials of dissidents in South Korea—highlighted by the fourteen death sentences handed down in one week—have suddenly taken on a scope and character that demand American attention.

President Park Chung Hee's repressive measures, designed to perpetuate himself in power, have led to the arrest of hundreds of students, intellectuals and opposition politicians. More than 90 have now been convicted by a military court, 35 of them sentenced this month to terms running from 20 years to life. The Defense Minister's decision to commute to life terms the sentences of five of those who had been condemned to die, including that of the dissident poet Kim Chi Ha, will be welcomed but hardly alters the repugnant thrust of the Government's harsh crackdown.

Others now on trial include two clergymen, former President Yun Po Sun and—in a civilian court—Kim Dae Jung, the 1971 presidential candidate who captured 46 per cent of the popular vote against General Park, then left the country and was kidnapped from a Tokyo hotel room last August by South Korean agents. And now a defense lawyer has been arrested for his strong words in court.

The current political turbulence followed President Park's revision of the country's Constitution in November 1972, under cover of martial law. The revision enables him to retain office as long as he likes, to control the National Assembly and to exercise virtually unlimited powers. Student demonstrations last fall, followed by mass signing of petitions for restoration of a democratic constitution, led to emergency decrees that now make almost any dissent punishable by death.

This disgraceful situation makes a mockery of the principles for which the United States has expended blood and treasure in Korea for a quarter-century. A four-month cut-off of Japanese economic aid last year brought the temporary release of Kim Dae Jung. What is needed now is a joint demarche by Washington and Tokyo and a clear warning that the 38,000 American troops that still defend South Korea cannot be expected to remain there very long if a tightening dictatorship continues to make the government of South Korea less and less distinguishable from that of the North.

H.R. 15995 WOULD EXTEND LOAN

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that earlier this afternoon the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment voted unanimously to report H.R. 15995, a bill which would extend the loan and scholarship provisions of the Health Manpower Training Act, and the Nurse Training Act for 1 year as well as extending the National Health Service Corps Scholarship program. We agreed to one amendment to H.R. 15995 in which we would increase authorizations for the National Health Service Corps Scholarship program to \$40 million. A "clean" bill is being introduced today.

DAIRYMEN PAY TRIBUTE TO
AVERY A. VOSE

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the July 1974 issue of Dairymen's Digest—Mid-States Region bears on its cover the likeness of my long-time friend and constituent, Avery A. Vose, who for many years actively served the dairy industry. Included among the prominent organizations so competently represented are the Associated Milk Producers, Inc., the American Dairy Association of Illinois and the Illinois Milk Producer Association.

The article, which summarizes all too briefly Avery Vose's long experience and many contributions to the dairy industry, follows:

AVERY A. VOSE IS CREAM OF THE CROP

Some 45 years ago in his first year at the big University of Illinois, Avery Vose, of Antioch, Ill., came under the influence of a professor of agricultural economics who inspired him to devote his life to improving the lot of dairy farmers.

He became a dairyman himself, milking 40 purebred Holsteins to make a living. But helping the dairy industry eventually became his full time job with dairying taking second place in his life.

Avery scrutinized dairy co-op's financial statistics as closely as he watched the butterfat and production records of his own herd.

Today at age 65, he is retiring as treasurer of both the Associated Milk Producers, Inc., and the Mid-States Region of AMPI.

During his lifetime he pioneered as an officer in many dairy farmer organizations and gained the unofficial reputation of "professional president."

He was president of the Federated Dairy Cooperatives, the first Chicago order area bargaining group for dairy farmers. He was president of Associated Dairymen, Inc., which originated the standby pool.

He was president of the Chicago Milk Foundation, a director and chairman of the board of the National Dairy Council. Under his guidance the councils became the major educational tool of dairymen in many of the nation's city schools.

He was a director of both the American Dairy Association of Illinois and the Illinois Milk Producers Association.

Characteristically whenever an organization gained a full head of steam he willingly stepped down from the presidency to make way for new ideas.

He learned the dairy farming business on the farm taking five cans of milk to the train as a youngster for shipment to the Chicago market, and for seven years as one of the original fieldmen for the Pure Milk Association.

For two years he managed a Kraft cheese plant and for another two years a PMA powder plant, both in Wisconsin.

One of his major triumphs was the merger of the PMA with the Pure Milk Products Cooperative of Fond du Lac to make the strongest dairy farmer bargaining agent, with the largest membership, in the nation.

With the two groups merging into AMPI, it gave Avery another reason to cheer. Aiding in both mergers was his quiet and unassuming leadership.

Avery has the capacity to respect the opinions of others and as a testimonial to him, one dairy leader said at a retirement

party: "Mr. Vose is the only man I've ever known who has never flown off the handle at a meeting."

He also has always been and will continue to be a source of information and counsel for dairy farmers and AMPI on major issues.

While serving all dairymen, largely in efforts to sell more milk and to create stronger bargaining positions, Avery also is devoted to his family.

His son, David, received a doctorate in economics from the University of Wisconsin and is now vice-provost at the University of Minnesota—Duluth.

His wife suffered a stroke in 1951 and died four years later.

(He later married his wife's sister, Helen, stating, "I didn't want to have the chore of breaking in a new mother-in-law.")

Another tragedy came with the allegations of illegal campaign contributions of AMPI while Avery was treasurer. This was carefully hid from him, and a chagrined Avery demands that cooperatives find a way to prevent farmer board members from being deceived by high handed management.

Because Avery refused to toot his own horn or to jockey for the seat of power although he had the ability to inspire the staffs of many major national dairy organizations may account for the fact that while he is Mr. Big in service, he has never received the Mr. Big awards by contemporaries in the dairy industry.

He does have the personal satisfaction of being a major influence in making the Mid-States Region of AMPI the most powerful bargaining organization for dairy farmers in the nation.

Embarrassed by the praise from associates who have a genuine fondness for him at one of the many testimonial parties on his retirement at age 65, Avery, said: "If I'd have known all these tributes were coming I wouldn't have retired."

And what were the words of the professor who inspired him to this lifetime of dedication and accomplishment when he was a young green lad from a Lake County dairy farm?

The professor said, and, unfortunately still says today: "Milk prices to farmers are too high and consumers are being gouged."

BAY STATE AWARD

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the Massachusetts State Society of Washington, D.C., awarded its fourth Bay State Award to a Member of this House, Congresswoman MARGARET M. HECKLER.

The Bay State Award does not have a long history—but its recipients have been long on dedicated service to the Commonwealth and the Nation.

The first recipient was our beloved former Speaker, John McCormack. The second recipient was Arthur Fiedler, who has brought so much joy to music lovers throughout the world through the vehicle of his Boston Pops Orchestra.

Last year, we honored Majority Leader THOMAS P. O'NEILL with this award. And this year we continued the tradition by honoring our colleague MARGARET HECKLER, who is completing her fourth term in the House.

PEG HECKLER has distinguished herself

in the Congress in many areas. Just to single out one in which we share a deep concern—I want to mention her work on the House Veterans Affairs Committee.

PEG HECKLER has represented the people of the 10th District of Massachusetts, the Commonwealth, and the Nation in the finest tradition. I was pleased to join my fellow members of the Massachusetts State Society in honoring PEG HECKLER and at this time insert into the RECORD the text of the citation awarded today:

The Massachusetts State Society of Washington, D.C., presents to the Honorable Margaret Heckler, M.C., the Bay State Award as the exemplification of a courageous legislative leader who has focused attention, provided expertise, gained recognition and earned the highest regard for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the people of the United States and the leaders of other countries in the community of nations. Her outstanding accomplishments to the present are but a prelude to her achievements we envision for the future.

WILLIAM COLBY, DIRECTOR OF
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in exercising its oversight responsibilities in the intelligence area, the Special Armed Services Subcommittee on Intelligence is conducting hearings on H.R. 15845 with the view to clarifying the role of the Central Intelligence Agency in our organization for national security.

Mr. Speaker, I consider that the article published in the Parade magazine of the Washington Post on Sunday, July 21, 1974, concerning the Director of Central Intelligence, Mr. William E. Colby, was most timely and I insert that article for the information of our colleagues: WILLIAM COLBY, NEW DIRECTOR OF THE CIA: HE'S CHANGING THE AGENCY'S IMAGE

(By Lloyd Shearer)

The Central Intelligence Agency is suffering from a badly tarnished image, and its new director, William Egan Colby, 54, is charged with burnishing it.

This is no easy job, since over the years the CIA has generated on the domestic front a closed, mysterious, excessively secretive and sinister image. It has also violated the legislation of its origin.

Created in 1947 specifically to gather "Foreign Intelligence," it has intervened in American student organizations. It has trained about 50 police officers from a dozen American cities in intelligence theory and technique.

And worse yet, from a public relations viewpoint, it has stupidly involved itself in the domestic scandals of the Nixon Administration by furnishing equipment to E. Howard Hunt Jr. to help break into and burglarize the Beverly Hills office of Dr. Lewis Fielding, psychiatrist of Daniel Ellsberg of Pentagon Papers notoriety.

The CIA also provided Hunt with false identity equipment so that he could fly to Denver and try to talk Dita Beard into denying that she ever wrote the infamous ITT memo, coupling a favorable anti-trust Justice Department ruling with the promise of a \$400,000 contribution to the Republican campaign fund of 1972. Moreover, it allowed

its personnel to prepare a psychological profile on Ellsberg for the White House.

LEADING PARTICIPANTS

And two of its former employees, E. Howard Hunt and James McCord, were leading characters in the Watergate fiasco, to say nothing of the four Cuban-Americans who were hired to do the actual dirty work.

Overseas, of course, where most of its clandestine as well as overt activities take place, the CIA has hired mercenaries in Southeast Asia, overflowed the Soviet Union, dropped agents into Red China, structured its own airline out of Taiwan, conspired to overthrow various regimes in various parts of the world from Iran to Cambodia to Cuba, and in general, has consistently intervened in the domestic affairs of foreign nations.

With that agency background of controversial hits and misses, Director Colby has his image-changing work cut out for him. He is approaching it with care and vigor. He is inviting newsmen to lunch with him, to ask questions, to visit CIA headquarters in Langley, Va., where the access road now bears a sign, plainly lettered CIA. It used to say Bureau of Public Roads. He even allowed Parade to interview his wife, the former Barbara Heinzen, a delightful woman with printer's ink in her blood who helped put him through Columbia University Law School by working as a department store copywriter and editor of a New York State labor publication. Soft-speaking and low-key, Colby, a 24-year unpretentious veteran of the spy business, believes in opening up the CIA without disclosing its secrets.

He is allowing the TV networks to take a guided tour of the agency. He is permitting his men to identify themselves over the telephone instead of switching the caller to an extension number. He is preparing succinct intelligence summaries instead of ponderous, bulky reports and forwarding them to interested parties with a phone number to call in case they need more detailed information.

CONSCIOUS OF PUBLIC OPINION

He is aware of the mounting public criticism which holds that his 16,000-man agency is spending approximately \$750 million of the taxpayers' money each year without enough public accountability through the various Congressional subcommittees charged with tracking the CIA. And he is mindful of inadequacies in the agency's recruiting program, especially of minorities.

"What we're looking for," he explains, "are young men and women who are interested in intellectual and technical pursuits. Intelligence is technical these days. We're in the market for something like 130 specialist disciplines, running all the way from nuclear physicists to financial economists. We need every kind of specialty to help in our total intelligence process.

"We especially need women and blacks. We don't have enough of them as professional intelligence officers. A few months ago I gathered all the middle managers in the agency and I gave them a very direct talk. I told them I wanted to see the number of blacks and the number of women in responsible jobs rise sharply.

OPPORTUNITY AND CHALLENGE

"We also need," Colby concedes, "some fellows who will run some clandestine operations for us. They have to be fellows with a little bit of adventure in their spirit and frequently quite a lot of courage. But I'm not going around saying, 'Join the CIA instead of the Fish and Wildlife Service.' And I'm not going around saying, 'Join the CIA and save the world.' People who want an interesting, fascinating challenging career can find it in the CIA, and that includes those who are more student than activist, those who are more activist than student, those who are more the engineer than liberal art buff. We're wide open for the person who

believes we have an essential function to perform."

According to Colby, the primary function of the CIA is apple-pie simple: "We gather information from all over the world in order to learn as much as we can about foreign problems so that we can decide what to do about them.

"We have various ways of gathering information—reading newspapers, taking photographs, listening to electronic noises in the atmosphere, and employing clandestine activity where it's essential. We gather the information, analyze it, think about it, come to some judgment or estimate the situation and relay it to the national leadership, executive, legislative, and indirectly, even to the public so that the U.S. can make informed judgments and decisions."

Colby, who will finish his first year as director of the CIA on Sept. 4 this year, believes the agency is indispensable, "because I do not think the U.S. today can afford the luxury of being blind in the world or of hoping to learn enough of what's going on through the public press and other media."

He knows, he says, that the U.S. has no intention of invading the Soviet Union and is sure the Soviet Union has no intention of invading us. "But I think the Soviet Union has a philosophy which holds that America is run by an imperialist conspiracy, a class society and that there must be, according to their doctrine, a revolution, a change in our society.

"It's a religious belief, and from time to time the Soviets have engaged in the process of trying to encourage it along.

"America has gotten into several wars in this century, started by people who thought we either would not or could not stand up to them. Kaiser Wilhelm thought we would not join World War I. Adolph Hitler was quite certain that we would stay out of World War II. Josef Stalin thought we would not fight in Korea and Ho Chi Minh certainly felt we could not stop his effort to take over South Vietnam. Where people realized we not only could but would fight—for example, in the Berlin Crisis, the Cuban Missile Crisis—we have had no war. Having a CIA is like having insurance. You pay for it, but hopefully it's worth it."

HEAD OF "BLACK OPERATIONS"

Bill Colby, 5 feet 11, thin, trim, with pale blue myopic eyes helped by glasses, is a lawyer by training. He looks like a lawyer, also like a teacher, a minister, a banker, a doctor, anything except what he is—the nation's chief spokesman who for years was deputy director of the CIA's clandestine or "black operations" directorate.

He was born in St. Paul, Minn., in 1920, the only child of Elbridge Colby, an Army officer. He was reared at various Army posts, spent three years of his youth (1929-32) in Tientsin, China, entered Princeton in 1936 and was graduated four years later. He entered Columbia University Law School but left after his first year to join the parachute corps.

"He had to memorize the eye chart in order to get in," his wife reveals. "But he memorized one line backwards. When he took the eye test, he cited the letters incorrectly. He wanted so badly to get in, however, that they looked the other way and the examining officer said, 'So long as you can see the ground we'll take you.'"

Colby served as a staff lieutenant in the 462d Parachute Artillery Battalion (he had attended the ROTC at Princeton) and was fired when a new commander joined the 462d and replaced the old staff with a new one. Lieutenant Colby found himself in a replacement pool, which he didn't like. When an officer came through, looking for volunteers for an overseas operation, code-named JEDBURGH, he quickly volunteered, thus, becoming a member of Gen. William Donovan's intelligence service, the Office of

Strategic Services. As a member of the JED's Colby parachuted in uniform to help resistance groups in France during the weeks following the Allied landing.

He was so cool and outstanding in action that he was chosen despite his young age, 24, to command a group of Norwegian-American paratroopers charged with sabotaging German railway operations in Norway. According to Harris Smith, an historian of the OSS: "The drop was finally made from American aircraft staffed by inexperienced crews in late March, 1945. Two of the planes crashed and ten OSS men were killed. Colby and those OSS men who did reach their destination were forced to operate with a minimum of supplies; the American planes had dropped their equipment a bit off target—in Sweden."

COLLEGE SWEETHEART

Discharged from the Army as a major, young Colby married Barbara Heinzen whom he'd dated in 1941 when she was a junior at Barnard College and he a first-year law student at Columbia.

They were married in St. Patrick's Cathedral on Fifth Avenue, and then Colby re-entered Columbia Law. Before he was graduated he went to work for Maj. Gen. Bill Donovan's prestigious New York law firm, Donovan, Leisure, Newton, Lombard and Irvine, many of whose members had served with him in the OSS.

In 1949 after a two-year stint with the Donovan firm, Colby joined the National Labor Relations Board in Washington. He wasn't particularly happy or fulfilled as a lawyer, and one evening he remarked to his wife. "I don't know. I just don't want to go through life saving \$100,000 a year for American Can—or some other corporation."

CALL OF THE CIA

When the Korean War broke out, Bill Colby, an adventurer by heart, joined the Central Intelligence Agency. Under one guise or another he has been with the agency ever since, generally fighting communism.

In Stockholm from 1951 to 1953 he was listed as a foreign service attache. In Rome from 1953 to 1958, where he was unofficially known as "one of Clare Boothe Luce's boys," he was officially carried as "first secretary and special assistant to the ambassador." In Rome where his wife recalls, "we lived five of our loveliest years," Colby worked underground to prevent the Italian Communist Party from winning a majority in Parliament.

Came next his first three-year stint in Vietnam, ostensibly as first secretary of the American Embassy in Saigon, his first assignment in Asia. Colby was, of course, much more than that. He was probably the shining light of the intelligence community, performing so well in his situational assignments and various cloak-and-dagger assignments that he was brought back to CIA headquarters in Washington and appointed chief of its Far Eastern Division.

The most controversial segment of William Colby's intelligence career concerns his involvement in the Vietnamese pacification program known as "CORDS," an acronym for "Civil Operations and Revolutionary Development Support." One part of this program was the operation code-named Phoenix.

Just as he was about to become chief of the CIA's Soviet operations in 1968, Colby was sent back to Vietnam on the request of Robert Komer, a former CIA man, and given ambassadorial rank. He was placed in charge of South Vietnam's overall pacification program, supposedly designed "to win the hearts and minds of the people."

ABUSES DURING PHOENIX

The Phoenix portion of the program, which aimed to neutralize the Vietcong infrastructure, involved the capture, imprisonment, defection, and murder of the Vietcong. There were abuses in its execution, and as Colby conceded in February, 1970, to the Senate

Foreign Relations Committee, "... I would not want to testify that nobody was killed wrongly or executed in this kind of a program. I think it has probably happened, unfortunately." But there are excesses in all wars, and in seems manifestly unfair to brand Colby a "mass murderer and war criminal" which was done by those in the intelligence community who last year opposed his appointment as CIA director. No one ever called him such names in World War II when he was killing Germans. And few people realize how chaotic "Phoenix" was until he took it over.

LEGENDARY ON POSTERS

Colby does not look or act like an exquisitely sensitive man, but during the period of his Senatorial confirmation, when posters bearing his photo with the legend, "mass murderer and war criminal," were tacked to posts and walls in Washington, D.C., he was deeply hurt. One night he drove home to the unpretentious house he owns in Springfield, Va., a capital suburb, plaintively asked his wife, "How does it feel being married to a war criminal?"

A WIFE'S FEELINGS

"My heart went out to him," Barbara Colby recalls, "because if ever there was a good, decent man who has served his country and his family—Bill has served every President from Franklin D. Roosevelt to Nixon—well, it's Bill."

Although Colby is a Nixon appointee, he, unlike so many others, is not about to follow orders blindly or to traffic with White House types like Ehrlichman and Dean who sought to compromise the CIA in the Watergate coverup.

"I will do the proper and legitimate things under the statute that CIA has been charged to do," he says. "And if I'm asked to do something beyond that legal authority, then I won't do it. I'll resign."

In line with that, Colby recently supported an amendment to the National Security Act of 1947 which originally authorized the founding of the CIA. The amendment was introduced by Sen. William Proxmire (D., Wis.) to protect the CIA from abuses emanating from the political system. It limits the CIA to its basic mission of collecting foreign intelligence and closes a loophole in the 1947 act which permitted the agency to get itself so disastrously involved in domestic intelligence.

Under Colby's regime the CIA is not only projecting a more open and candid image, it is undergoing a structural transformation. Colby has abolished the 10-man Board of National Estimates founded in 1950 and replaced it with a group of national intelligence officers, each charged with preparing a series of short-term intelligence assessments of their special areas. He has reduced the number of covert, so-called "black operations" largely because satellite equipment is so sophisticated today that it can photograph and relay far more reliable information than that provided by an agent dropped by plane or landed by submarine on foreign land.

A practicing Roman Catholic, a pillar in community affairs, a hard-working (Saturdays until 3 p.m.) civil servant who earns \$42,000 a year, a good and understanding father to his four surviving children—a fifth died early this year of epilepsy—a loving and dutiful husband, William Colby has been a professional intelligence officer for half his adult years.

NO FLAG LAPEL PIN

The United States is indeed fortunate in having him. As a lawyer he could be earning three times in civilian life what he earns in government service. "But it wouldn't give me the satisfaction," he says, "that I find in this job." Colby wears no flag pins in his lapel to demonstrate his patriotism. It goes much deeper than that.

LAND USE PLANNING

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting into the RECORD the text of my letter to the editor of the Miami Herald on the failure of the House to pass the rule which would have enabled us to debate the merits of the Land Use Planning Act:

A NATIONAL LOSS OF LAND PLANNING

Unfortunately, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 204 to 211, failed to pass the rule to even consider the Federal Land Use Planning Act. This would have been a very valuable piece of legislation for South Florida, for we are going to have to build more than twice the number of structures that we have existing today before the turn of the century.

This needed construction will create tremendous burdens on the services provided by state and local governments.

The Land Use Planning Act would have provided assistance to the states for the development of a comprehensive land use planning process and its implementation. The act called upon the states to voluntarily develop a land use planning process if they willingly accepted Federal money. The federal assistance would have enabled local agencies to designate certain areas which they consider to be areas of critical environmental importance, and to look for ways to protect them.

Florida has already enacted several pieces of land use legislation, including the Environmental Land and Water Management Act, which provides for the preparation of regulations for areas of critical state concern, and requires review and approval of developments of regional impact. A \$100 million grant program, as was provided for in H.R. 10294, would have provided federal funds to help implement Florida's planning process.

Land is our most valuable and important natural resource. Americans have taken for granted an endless supply of land, and clean water and air. This view of our environment as a cheap resource has resulted in rash and unplanned land destruction, as well as pollution of our rivers, aircraft noise over our residential areas, filth in our air and water. It is time for us now, before it is too late, to take the action necessary to protect our vital environmental resources.

This bill would have provided our cities, towns and other political subdivisions with the means of settling land use questions that regularly come before them. This bill would have reduced isolated and chaotic development, replacing it with a land use partnership among state and local governments.

The proposal did not authorize acquisition of any private property or easements, and contrary to the claims of its opponents, did not authorize federal zoning. In fact, this measure actually gave local governments more control over federal decisions than they have ever had before.

The remaining supply of underdeveloped land is rapidly dwindling. Industrial planners, condominium developers, lumberers, environmentalists, highway builders and countless other groups struggle over every available area. The people of South Florida badly needed this legislation and the funds it would have made available for proper land use planning.

WILLIAM LEHMAN,
Member of Congress.

CARRIER ADMIRAL

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, there was recently brought to my attention a poem written about a great American naval hero, Adm. J. J. "Jocko" Clark. This man distinguished himself by directing our naval forces in attacks on the Japanese fleet.

His widow, Olga Clark, has written a beautiful poem which she dedicated to Jocko. I believe my colleagues would be pleased and honored to read it:

CARRIER ADMIRAL

TO JOCKO

In his old navy uniform that had seen the times of war
The Admiral was buried.
As he was laid for the reception in the sad house for the dead,
His sister, hurriedly, had tintured with some ink the seams
Of his worn-out jacket.
His face with eagle-like profile was proud and serene,
He never was afraid of death, and endured suffering
Uncomplainingly.
He was a brave man, stoic, loyal, true to his Indian lineage,
The many generations of the first Americans who never bent their honor.
The Cherokees, his tribe, endowed him with a certain magic—
"A cowboy from Oklahoma," as he often called himself,
And a no-nonsense man, he nevertheless admitted having heard
"The drums over the hill . . ."
His frankness and sincerity inspired such confidence
Men followed him into danger willingly.
His simple faith in God was perhaps the secret
Of his strength.
A strict disciplinarian, beginning with himself,
Used to command and being obeyed, yet quick to acknowledge and reward,
He was lordly.
His warmth of heart, coupled with a rich sense of humor, and
Outstanding generosity, were most endearing, especially since
He remained his unassuming modest self as the truly great one can be.
When in the hospital his eyes were closed
His corpsman who attended him at his nadir
Of human frailty
Approached me sobbingly, "Your husband was the giant of a man.
The likes of him we shall not see again."
So came the day he was no more.
I pressed my face into the dent left on the pillow by his head.
Strangely, I did not cry.
The sky was clear when from the chapel in Arlington
We came to the cemetery.
It was a lovely day, although the sun-rays, tinted with the sorrow,
Seemed to reflect a deathly pallor—
Falling into nothingness.
The narrow cart brought from the chapel a simple military coffin
Covered with the U.S. flag.
I believe on top was a large cross I sent
Of orchids and pale roses.
Six pairs of horses drove the coffin
Up the hilly road.
Perhaps there was a military band—
One's memory gets blurred.

The cannons roared—great many times—in a salute

To the four-star Admiral,
The hero referred to as the fightingest,
The leader known to have taken awesome risks

To save the fliers' lives.

To put into his coffin I had brought a gift:
A silver anchor with the inscription, "Happy Landings,"

But the aides, whisperingly, had begged it off for a museum,
Same as his Navy hat.

No one, though, knew that in his pocket went a small old picture
Of the face remembered.

A long, long time ago, in Europe, at a reception,

We had very nearly met.
Fate had denied us then the introduction,
Until years later. Many years . . .

As the large crowd stood in silence, the mountain of wreaths

Was pushed aside. The flag was taken off the coffin and

Folded reverently. One of his foremost fliers presented it

To me with a kind smile.

The Taps!

Clutching the flag to my breast I thought of the Fighting Lady,

The beloved carrier, USS YORKTOWN, he led into a legend—

If the great ship could fly,
She would have sailed across the air

To pay him homage, at the open grave.

The gigantic shadow seemed to be hovering above

As I stood praying the Almighty for a miracle:

To lend my humble hands the strength

To hold on to that vision,
So that the Admiral could get on board,
To roam, as it befitted him, the oceans—

Into the mists of time.

He was The Carrier Admiral.

—OLGA CLARK.

DISCRIMINATION IN CREDIT

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs is currently considering legislation dealing with discrimination in extensions of credit. It is important that this Congress obtain passage of legislation that would provide equal credit to women without regard to their sex or marital status. I received the following letter from one woman who experienced outrageous discrimination in applying for a mortgage. Such practices must cease and I am appending a copy of her letter so our colleagues might be aware of some current mortgage practices:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: I would like to commend you on the work you are doing on behalf of equal credit legislation, and your sponsorship of H.R. 14856. This subject is of special interest to me because of the problems my husband and I faced when we tried to obtain a mortgage.

My husband had been weekending in Vermont for many years, and last summer we decided to purchase a small vacation home of our own. Although the housing market was quite inflated, we finally managed to

locate a house that was within our budget. We applied for a \$10,000 mortgage, and were prepared to pay the balance of the purchase price, \$7,500 in cash. We were both employed by the New York City Department of Social Services, and had a combined income of \$28,000 per year. Our mortgage application was turned down by three Vermont banks. Their reasons were all the same: we had been married for less than a year; the difference in our ages was questionable (I am 27, my husband is 44); and finally, my income could not be counted because I was, as one bank president delicately put it, still in my 'dangerous years'. Although the bank officials felt my husband was too old for me, they still feared that I would become pregnant and have to stop working.

Our story does have a happy ending. We were able to arrange for a private mortgage, at half the interest rate the banks were charging. But the dire predictions of the bank officials have come true: our son is four months old, and I am on unpaid maternity leave. In spite of this blot on our financial profile, the mortgage gets paid every month, and there is enough left over for the rest of the bills.

Although the rejections of our mortgage applications worked to our advantage in the end, it is essential that banks be made to look at all credit applications objectively and leave worries about 'dangerous years' to the woman, her partner, and her gynecologist.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I announced my intention of offering an amendment to H.R. 16027, the Interior Department's appropriation bill, which would amend the land and water conservation fund appropriation from \$300 million to \$450 million. One of the major objections to raising the appropriation for the Land and Water Conservation Fund is that States still have substantial sums of money which they have not obligated. However, this is not necessarily the case. For the information of my colleagues, I am presenting a list of those States which have exhausted their fiscal 1973 funds or have negligible balances for that year. All moneys appropriated for the fund by the Congress in fiscal year 1972 have been spent.

The States have made tremendous strides in utilizing this fund. Unobligated funds are down from approximately \$70 million to only \$22 million. I might add, that \$4 million of this \$22 million belongs to the Federal Government's contingency fund.

The list of States with no or negligible funds remaining follows:

Falling into nothingness.

States with zero dollars left over:

California, Colorado, * Washington, D.C. Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.

States with less than \$1,000 left over:

Arizona (\$107), Maryland (\$343), Texas (\$178), Wisconsin (\$3).

* Washington D.C. is not a State.

THE DEFAMATION OF AMERICAN
POLES

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Henry C. Lajewski, of Arlington, Va., and under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by Mark M. Krug which appeared in the summer 1974 issue of the University of Chicago Magazine:

THE DEFAMATION OF AMERICAN POLES
(By Mark M. Krug)

Approximately ten million Polish-Americans have good cause to feel injured and often even defamed by their fellow Americans. In the face of this attempt to denigrate them, Polish-Americans have, in the main, remained a silent minority.

It ought to be made clear at the outset that our reference here is to Poles who came to America from Poland and not to Jews who also immigrated, in large numbers, to the United States from Poland. The bulk of these immigration waves came between the years 1880 and 1915.

The American public has so far shown little curiosity to learn the story of the immigration of Polish-Americans, their ways of life, their aspirations, hopes and frustrations. Fiction writers who have written, especially in recent years, dozens of books based on the life of Jewish professors, businessmen, and Jewish mothers, Italian "Godfathers" and Irish politicians, yet to write a novel based on the life, the customs, the predictions, and the dilemmas of Polish-Americans. Sociologists have produced many learned theories on American-Jews and American-Italians and other minority groups, but there is no scholarly sociological study of the Polonia, the Polish community in America. Broadway has producer Fiddler on the Roof, the Rose Tattoo, and many other plays with heroes and villains drawn from the white ethnic groups. All that the Poles got was Stanley Kowalski (or rather Kowalski as played by Marlon Brando) in Tennessee Williams' *Streetcar Named Desire*. There are no counterparts in the delineation of the Polish-American community (with the possible exception of Nelson Algren) of a Saul Bellow, Philip Roth, Mary McCarthy, Jimmy Breslin or Mario Puzo.

Television producers are very sensitive to new opportunities for successful shows. Recently, they have apparently become convinced that there is a demand for "ethnic shows." So after "All in the Family" and after "Bridget Loves Bernie," they decided to put on the air a "Polish" detective, naturally a kind of superman with criminals and women, but they revealed their ignorance and carelessness by giving the detective a typically Czech name of "Banacek."

But while American Poles are little heard from, they are not entirely forgotten. Americans don't want to know much about them, who they are, whence they came from and how they live, but they have been flooded by the abominable "Polish jokes," heard in night clubs and on television, which picture all Poles as simpletons, fools and obscurantists. The fad of the Polish jokes seems to be weakening lately and for that we ought to be thankful. But still, once a week, millions of Americans laugh uproariously when Archie Bunker calls his son-in-law a "dumb

Polack" or a "meathead." Sure enough, the son-in-law is an intelligent college student who is supposed to expose Bunker's bigotry, but survey after survey has shown that the heart of the listening public belongs to Archie. Americans have traditionally prided themselves in being ingenious, inventive and shrewd. For them to accept the image of millions of Polish-Americans as easily fooled, lacking imagination and incapable of accomplishing a fairly complicated task is a serious matter.

It is even more serious and more insulting, since it is so unjust and undeserved. Yet one must ask himself how did this phenomenon come to pass. The root cause of the present plight of the Polish-Americans must be sought in the history of their country of origin and in the story of their immigration to the United States.

The most significant fact to remember is that Poles who came to this country in large numbers between the years 1880 and 1910 did not come from a free sovereign homeland. In fact, since 1795 there had been no Poland on the map of Europe.

In 1795, after 800 years of existence as an independent state, Poland was a strong and distinct national entity. Poles, whose forebears accepted Christianity in the 9th century, considered themselves the defenders of the Roman Catholic faith and an outpost of western Christian civilization against the repeated onslaughts of the Russians, the Turks and other "heretic" invaders. Poles proudly claimed that Poland was a living "Christian wall" against the conquest of Europe by the Mongols, the Tartars and the Turks. Polish children were taught on their fathers' knees the story of the heroic contributions of King Jan Sobieski and his Polish army, who helped defeat the Turks in 1683 at the gates of Vienna. Poles also cherished the memory of their resistance to the repeated invasions by the Teutonic Knights, who came from East Prussia, and the victories attained in preserving Polish independence against the invading armies of Sweden and Russia.

For centuries, Poland's powerful neighbors were determined not to allow the Poles to live as an independent people. Finally, in 1795, Russia occupied eastern Poland, Prussia took the western and northern lands, and the southern part of Poland was incorporated into Austria. From that time on, for 125 years, Poles were ruled by three foreign powers. They regained their independence in 1918, when a free Poland was created by the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, based, in part, on the Wilsonian principle of self-determination of nations.

This long period of partition of Poland and the incessant struggle of Poles for independence—in particular two great uprisings, one in 1831 and the other in 1863—had a lasting and profound influence on the Polish people. They became one of the most nationalistic and patriotic peoples in Europe. To Poles, who had lost their independence to foreign invaders, and who were determined to regain their freedom, love of country became almost a national obsession. The Polish poet, Adam Mickiewicz, put it well in verse in one of his poems: "... my fatherland, you are like health, only those who have lost you, can know your value." It was indeed a desperate struggle that the Polish people waged against the might of czarist Russia, the military machine of Prussia and immense power of the Austro-Hungarian empire. The occupying powers attempted in varying degrees to suppress the spirit of Polish nationalism through forced Russification or Germanization and through bribery, political concessions and often by brutal force.

All these efforts failed. Poles had no independent political institutions. Their military

rebellions were suppressed. Their sons died on foreign battlefields, in a vain hope of enlisting the sympathy and the military aid in a fight for an independent Poland. But their dedication to the idea of a free Poland never faltered. If anything, during the period of foreign domination Poles became an even more united people—united by a will for independence and united in one language and culture and in one religious faith. Polish language became a precious and effective bond for Poles in all three sectors of occupation. To speak Polish, to write in Polish, to love the Polish language became almost a religious commandment for all Poles. The patriotic poetry of the great Polish poets, Adam Mickiewicz, Julius Slowacki, and the Messianic writings of Stanislaw Wyspianski became not only great literature for educated Poles, but their most sacred treasures and a source of constant inspiration.

CHURCH AND STATE

For the mass of poor and largely illiterate peasants who formed the overwhelming majority of the population, the spirit of Polish nationalism was kept alive by the Polish Catholic church. While the Catholic church in Poland was faithful and obedient to Rome, it was primarily a Polish Catholic church because it supported the fierce Polish nationalism and kept the devotion to the Polish language. Polish customs and Polish hopes and aspirations for independence. Priests delivered patriotic sermons in Polish and religious schools taught Polish language and literature. This was often done in the face of dire threats of the occupying authorities. As time went on, the lines of demarcation between Polish nationalism and Polish Catholicism became blurred and they have remained blurred until the present time.

Since several million Poles came to America during the period of the occupation of their country by foreign powers, they brought with them to this country both the spirit of fierce Polish nationalism and an unbounded devotion to the Polish Catholic church. In that, they differed from Italians who came from a free Italy, and especially from Sicilians, who had little comprehension or feeling for Italian nationalism and who, while devout Catholics viewed the Italian church and Italian priests with a great deal of suspicion, if not outright cynicism. Obviously, the contrast with Polish and Russian Jews, who felt little allegiance to the countries of their origin, was even greater. Both Polish nationalism and their special devotion to the Catholic church are still the most outstanding characteristics of those American Poles who have preserved their ethnic identity.

Polish patriotism stemming directly from the tragic history of Poland's partition is still a powerful force today. It is evident in the activities of the Polish-American organizations. American Poles are often exhorted by their leaders to maintain that spirit of Polish nationalism. For American Poles, Polish nationalism constitutes no conflict with their strong patriotic devotion to the United States.

The mass Polish immigration came, as we have said, in the last two decades of the 19th century and in the period before World War I. It was overwhelmingly peasant in character. During that period of time over three million Poles came to America, paralleling the massive Italian and Jewish immigration. While the special character of these immigration waves influenced the nature of the Italian-American and Jewish-American communities, the status, the image and the problems of the contemporary Polish community, or of Polonia as Poles call it, re-

flect the after-effect of the original immigration in bolder and clearer relief.

In comparison with the Italians, the Jews or the Irish, the Poles have made less economic and social progress in the American milieu. The reason for this phenomenon has, of course, nothing to do with the innate abilities of Poles, but is related to the point at which they started their journey to the New World.

Polish immigrants were overwhelmingly peasants who came from an occupied country and from a society which still practiced a variation of feudal economy. Professor Florian Znaniecki estimated that 60% of Polish immigrants were landless peasants who eked out a bare living as hired hands on large estates and that 27% were small landowners.

Polish immigration included few skilled workers or artisans. The mass of the Polish peasants who came to the United States had no skills to survive in the industrialized and strange country to which they came. They spoke rudimentary, peasants' Polish and were, to an overwhelming extent, illiterate, both in their own language and in English. Thus, unlike the Jewish immigrants and to some extent the Italian newcomers, most Poles were not able to benefit in their adjustment period from reading the few Polish newspapers in America. In addition, unlike the Jews who were experienced international wanderers, and unlike the Italians who benefited from the love and glamor that American society has always accorded Italy, Poles came from a country which was in chains and which was unknown to the Americans. The Italian immigrants, however, who came mostly from Sicily and southern Italy, did suffer from the "Mafia" image.

All that Poles had to offer America was their inordinate capacity and willingness to do hard physical labor. This contribution should have been accepted with gratitude by the booming American economy and industry, but in fact the Poles were shown little compassion and even less appreciation. The Poles, bewildered in the new society, were determined to adjust and to survive. To do this, they became unskilled laborers in the steel mills in Pittsburgh and Gary, in the Ford factories in Detroit and in the stockyards of Chicago. Some Poles who had experience in the coal mines in Poland, and many others who did not, went to work under hard and dangerous conditions in the coal fields of Pennsylvania.

No work was too hard, too menial, too coarse or too dangerous for the Poles. They had no choice and could not be choosy about jobs if their families were to survive in their new environment. This hard, demanding labor was a signal contribution of these millions of brawny and healthy immigrants who without complaining or rebelling helped to make America the industrial giant it is today.

There was virtually no crime among the Poles; their young people did not consider illegal activities as one possible avenue for advancement in the new, strange and often hostile environment. Crime was unthinkable in a Polish neighborhood where the authority of the parents, of the priests and of the police was highly respected and where the emphasis was on hard work, thrift and savings. Savings banks abounded and most Polish fraternal organizations were (and are) also insurance and savings institutions.

How did America repay the contribution and the exemplary behavior of these Polish immigrants? What they got in return was not a sense of welcome and appreciation. On the contrary, ridicule and scorn were heaped on the heads of these simple uneducated folk who worked sixteen hours a day in dangerously insecure mines, mills and stockyards, for pitiful wages.

The reasons for this ridicule and the cruel

and unfeeling image of the "dumb Polacks" must be explained because the problem of the image they present to America is still a serious dilemma facing Polonia today. First, there was great resentment that many Poles, like many Italians, have after a period of time returned to "the old country." This caused them to be branded as exploiters and sojourners in their new land. Feeling unwelcome in the new country, aliens in a cultural milieu which they did not understand, fearful that their children would be lost to them in an environment which violated many of their values, and doubtful of their prospects for economic advancement, many Polish immigrants were determined to save some money and return to their villages. In fact, between the years 1891 and 1910, 234,000 Poles returned to Poland.

Since many Polish immigrants intended to return, or were thinking of returning, "some day" to Poland, they felt consciously or subconsciously no compelling incentive, as did the Jewish and many of the Italian immigrants, to accept and bear the trials and tribulations of assimilation or to go through the educational steps necessary for naturalization.¹

Among other factors, this phenomenon may account for the fact that the economic, social and educational advancement of Poles was much slower than that of the Jews, the Irish and the Italians. The realization that they have been outpaced by other immigrant groups has created another dilemma for American Poles—their persistent, although now gradually disappearing, sense of inferiority which has grown in direct proportion with the appearance of the periodic epidemics of the senseless, unjust and heartless "Polish jokes."

It is virtually impossible to exaggerate the severity of the cultural shock suffered by the mass of Polish peasant immigrants. They came to this country, not from the advanced regions of Poland, around Warsaw, Pozan and Lodz, but from the least advanced regions—the highlands in southern and eastern Poland. They came from isolated primitive villages where they had no interest and no part in the management of their own affairs and no voice in the political affairs of the region and of the nation. Politics was the exclusive domain of the aristocratic landlords and of the country gentry. If they voted, they did so as the local priest or government official told them to vote. Even the rudiments of the democratic process were unknown to them.

The Irish immigrants spoke English and had considerable familiarity with Anglo-Saxon mores and institutions, while Poles were largely illiterate in their own language. Jewish immigrants were overwhelmingly literate and were becoming "Americanized" daily by the Yiddish newspapers which devoted many pages to instructing them how to survive and to prosper in the new land. In addition, the Jewish immigration, especially that which came from Russia and Poland, and to a lesser degree, the large wave of Italian immigrants, contained a pool of potential leaders and spokesmen. Poles had few of these advantages.

GENERATION CARRYOVER

The children of the Polish immigrants suffered in the public schools the usual tribulations of the other immigrant students, but they had to cope with another handicap—their unpronounceable names. Anglo-

¹ Professor Reverend M. J. Madaj suggests that this widely shared intention of an eventual return may provide at least a partial explanation for the slow process of assimilation or Americanization of the Polish communities. (M. J. Madaj, "The Polish Community—A Ghetto?" *Polish American Studies*, July-December, 1968, p. 69.)

Saxon and Irish teachers resented the effort it took to pronounce these names correctly and often suggested to a Stankiewicz or Wroblewski to tell his parents to change his name to "Stanley" or to "Warren." Polish children soon perceived, directly or by repeated innuendo, that to get along in school you had to forget or to hide your Polish ties and identity. When they told their Polish parents, who had struggled in occupied Poland to preserve their Polish identity, of their reluctance to speak Polish and of their desire to shorten their names, the reaction was often harsh and unyielding. No wonder then, that among many second generation Poles there developed a growing feeling of inferiority. They suffered from the hostility of their teachers to their cultural heritage and they were ashamed of their poor and illiterate parents who, as they soon discovered, did not even speak a "good" or literate Polish.

The generation gap was real and it was painful, and it had its effects on the psyche and the state of mind of the American Pole. The effects are still evident today. Professor Eugene Kusielewicz, president of the Kosciuszko Foundation, maintains that even the third generation of Poles "suffers from the same feeling of inferiority that is characteristic of the rest of Polonia." This feeling of inferiority, he believes, is reinforced by the largely negative image that Poles present to the rest of Americans.

Many Polish leaders dispute the views of Kusielewicz and cite evidence which indicates that many second and third generation Poles are interested in and are proud of the Polish identity and culture. The truth probably is that some young Polish-Americans are ashamed of their ethnic origin and others are proud of being Polish, while the attitude of the vast majority fluctuates somewhere in between these two extremes. There is no question, however, that many young American families of Polish origin, well established economically and sure of their place in the American society, are taking advantage of the greater acceptance of ethnicity and are much more comfortable with their ethnic identity and affiliation.

A POLISH PRESIDENT?

The question of image that they present to the rest of the Americans is one of the major dilemmas for the Polish-American community. When Senator Edmund Muskie was running for the Democratic Presidential nomination, I asked Aloysius Mazewski, president of the Polish National Alliance, a 300,000-member organization, whether he, a well-known Republican leader, and the Alliance, which includes many Republicans, would endorse Muskie were he to get the nomination. Without hesitation Mazewski said: "Yes, we will, because our most important concern is the image of Polonia and what better way is there to improve this image than by having a Polish-American in the White House."

The defense of the image of American Poles is the major preoccupation of the Polish-American Congress. The Congress is an umbrella organization of over forty Polish fraternities, clubs and associations. It was organized in May, 1944, to help in the establishment of a free and independent Poland at the conclusion of World War II, but now the Congress devotes a great deal of its efforts to the strengthening of the political positions and influence of American Poles and to the defense of the public standing of Polonia in the United States.

The image problem lies heavy on the hearts of the Polish community, and it ought to lie as heavy on the conscience of the American people. For some reason, the dominant American society has chosen to brand the American Poles as slow-witted, and television shows and night club comedians delight in

telling jokes, the butt of which is the stupid Pole who has difficulty in grasping a simple situation and who is easily outwitted. Such an image would be hard to bear for any group, but for American Poles, the descendants of a people which prides itself as having been the defenders of Christianity in Europe, which has produced writers like Sienkiewicz, Reymont (both Nobel Prize winners), Mickiewicz, Slowacki and Conrad, and scientists like Copernicus and Eva Sklodowska Curie, the painter Jan Matejko, and composers like Chopin and Paderewski, the burden is almost unbearable.

Nicholas von Hoffman wrote in his column in the *Washington Post* that "Poles have yet to make it as a respected group of people with feelings. . . . No other group in America has to put up with this sort of thing. Sure, there still are anti-Negro and anti-Semitic jokes going the rounds, and anti-other people jokes also, but nothing like the Polish jokes. Just about anybody who isn't Polish or at least Slavic thinks nothing of cracking one of these belittling, invariably unfunny, cruel jokes."

In recent years, American Poles have launched a long overdue counter-offensive. They have branded their image false and the "Polish jokes" as an unworthy and an un-American abomination.

The Polish-American Congress has established a special committee on education and cultural affairs, which has demanded from the communication media the elimination of "Polish jokes" and asked them to present the contributions and the positive life-styles of the Polish community in America. So far, this campaign has been only partly successful.

American Poles have only recently increased their efforts to support Polish cultural activities. There are two colleges, supported by Polish-Americans, where the Polish language and literature are taught extensively. But this effort is far from adequate.

In Polish-American communities throughout America, art clubs, academic group discussions, art shows, and poetry readings draw large and enthusiastic audiences.

In Poland, in spite of the restrictions of the communist regime, the Polish theater, one of the best in Europe, thrives. Playwrights like Stanislaw Witkiewicz, Tadeusz Rosewicz and Slawomir Mrozek have had their plays produced in France, Switzerland and England. Polish movie making is considered the most avant-garde in the world, and Hollywood has lured many Polish film directors and writers to work in America. The ancient Jagiellonian University in Crakow and Warsaw University rank among the finest in Europe, and on their faculties there are many world renowned scholars.

The record of the several generations of Poles in America provides no justification for the defamation and the mental anguish imposed on this group. But there is a growing spirit of self-confidence and pride in their cultural heritage among Americans of Polish descent.

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, last month, when the House considered the Federal Railroad Safety Act authorization, I brought to the attention of my

colleagues the fact that the Federal Railroad Administration had held rail safety hearings on the Connecticut-New York commuter lines last July 28, 1973, and that a year later we were still awaiting the report of the FRA investigation.

Last week the FRA issued its report and at this time I would like to share with my colleagues some of my thoughts on the first such report ever issued by the FRA.

Certainly this long-awaited Federal Railroad Administration report on safety conditions of the Connecticut-New York commuter lines is not the blast at the Penn Central that many of my commuter constituents desired and anticipated. However, I cannot help but think had the report been issued earlier, before the Penn Central corrected many of the inadequacies which the FRA conceded had led to justified complaints, we would have a much more forceful report. As it is, perhaps prompted by the FRA investigation, the Penn Central has corrected some of the conditions complained about, has programed other improvements for the near future, and has made commitments to the FRA to publicize certain aspects of train procedure.

For example, in my testimony at the FRA hearing in White Plains, N.Y., last July, I referred to the "deferred maintenance" practices of the Penn Central. The FRA report states their investigation revealed no such practices per se but it did disclose maintenance problems at Brewster—Putnam Junction—car shop. Hence, on June 1 the maintenance and repair work done at Brewster stop was assumed by the Madison Avenue car shop.

During the FRA hearings, I raised the issue that train crews and tower operators are improperly trained. Again, I do not know if it was the result of the investigation or what, but the FRA report states that such an allegation may have been warranted with respect to conditions which existed up to a relatively short time ago, but are not warranted now. Why are they not warranted now? Because the Penn Central "recently" improved its training programs. How recent is "recently"? Are these training programs the result of the hearings and subsequent investigation?

Again, in my testimony I complained that passengers and some trainmen do not know the location of fire extinguishers on the cosmopolitan and metropolitan cars. We now have assurances in the FRA report that the trainmen have now been made aware, in training classes, of locations of fire extinguishers and emergency tools on the new cars and the Penn Central has agreed to post adequate signs marking the location of fire extinguishers for the information of passengers. When did the Penn Central agree to this simple request to post signs designating the location of fire extinguishers? Was it again "recently" and, if so, is that the reason these signs have not yet been posted? When can we expect the signs to be posted?

Hence, in many respects the FRA report is anticlimactic. The report has been

issued after the Penn Central has agreed to certain remedies or has instituted remedies for the allegations and complaints made at the FRA hearings and in this sense I find the report very accommodating to the railroad.

I will not say the report is a whitewash, although to read the two pages of conclusions one could easily arrive at this sentiment. But again it is anticlimactic in that since the report was issued a year after the hearing the time span allowed plenty of opportunity for the Penn Central to take action on the complaints and improve operations and correct deficiencies. Perhaps we should be grateful to the FRA that these improvements have been accomplished and that we have assurances that further improvements are programed.

However, there is no reassurance anywhere in the report that followup will be forthcoming. I have written to Mr. John Ingram, Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration, with respect to this matter. What assurances do we have that the training programs will continue? Will the FRA spotcheck the Penn Central commitments to improved procedure and operation? Will the FRA issue periodic reports on Penn Central service?

While most of the allegations I raised in my testimony last year have been answered by the FRA, one issue was not mentioned, that being whether the number of accidents that have occurred have been reported and, if reported, if the correct cause of the accident had been filed. I raised this issue, because several railroad employees had advised me that a number of derailments—or their true cause—are hidden from the press, the public and the FRA. I was disappointed that the FRA did not address this complaint and I have asked Mr. Ingram for information as to what action his staff took on this allegation. In this respect, it seems to me essential that the rank and file railroad employees be interviewed to determine if there is any justification for this allegation.

That I consider it necessary to interview the rank and file railroad employees raises another aspect of the FRA report which disturbs me. The FRA investigated two parts of my testimony relating to rail employees—possible violations of the Hours of Service Act and the complaint that Penn Central officials are forcing employees to work under unsafe conditions, particularly with respect to equipment that is unsafe—and concluded that interviews with "appropriate local union officials" all indicate there is nothing to substantiate these allegations. I do not mean to impugn our union officials, but I regret that the FRA did not conduct interviews with the union rank and file. It seems to me that no investigation, whatever its kind, is complete unless the crewmen who operate the trains, the rank and file, are queried about existing conditions. I have also written Mr. Ingram in this regard.

In my statement before the FRA hearing examiner last July, I called for a definitive statement on exiting from the

new cars. Certainly the FRA statement is far from definitive on this point. The FRA "inclines to the opinion" that the Penn Central is correct is not publicizing the location of door-opening levers; that for the convenience and safety of passengers, they best not know the location of these levers lest they be used during nonemergency situations and run the risk of injury or death by contact with the electrified third rail or being struck by a passing train. The FRA concludes there is less likelihood of injury to passengers if they evacuate under proper controls. I had stated in my testimony that the Penn Central had a point in their contention but, like my commuter constituents, I wanted from the FRA a "definitive statement" on the issue of exiting. To "include" to an opinion is not the definitive statement we were looking for and I doubt if this report will lay to rest the concern of my commuter constituents on the question of egress from the new cars.

Moreover, in a sense their fears may be heightened by the reading of that section of the report dealing with the flammability of car interiors. While the FRA tests concluded that the materials are not highly flammable as alleged but are "quite fire resistant" and are considered to be among the "best state-of-the-art materials currently available for application in public transportation vehicles," the report goes on to note that should the plastic materials used in the cars catch fire, they may burn with sufficient intensity to produce toxic gases as alleged, but that such gases would require exposure of at least 10 minutes to produce harmful effects. I quote from the FRA report:

Within that time frame passengers should have ample opportunity under PC emergency procedures to evacuate the train.

I do not believe this 10-minute time frame will be of comfort to commuters who have grave reservations about the exiting procedure of the new cars. Rather than alleviate commuter fears, I think the FRA report in this respect, by not being conclusive and definitive, simply adds to the argument of those who want the location of the door-opening levers publicized.

We have the assurance from the FRA that that agency is researching development of minimum standards to be included in its forthcoming passenger car safety regulations, and that the FRA is researching matters related to fireproofing of interiors. But this is little comfort to commuters who are presently riding the cosmopolitans and who know that more of the same cars are on order.

The Penn Central has agreed to provide commuters with adequate information concerning procedure they should follow in emergency situations. We all await this "adequate information" and hope it will be forthcoming in the very near future.

We have the FRA report; we now know of improvements the Penn Central has made in its operating and maintenance procedures; we now know what is in the planning stages and what is expected to

be completed this year and in the near future. But the FRA must not simply sit back, now that their investigation has been completed, and simply trust that the Penn Central will live up to its promises and continue its improvements. In accordance with the provisions of the Rail Safety Act, the FRA must continue to spot check the Penn Central, issue periodic reports on the railroad's service, and insure that the Penn Central improvement program continues unabated.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN THE VOLUNTEER FORCE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest factors in promoting enlistments in the all-volunteer force is the opportunity for educational advancement. In a recent column in the Chicago Tribune, John Chamberlain described the outstanding program originally initiated by the 9th Infantry Division in the Pacific Northwest. Mr. Chamberlain also has some perceptive observations concerning conscription in American society. I insert this item in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 20, 1974]

VOLUNTEER ARMY GAINING ITS STRIDE

(By John Chamberlain)

When President Nixon made his still unappreciated gift to Young America by ending the draft, the cynics came out of the woodwork in full force. A volunteer army, they said, would never do. It would lure only the dregs; it would use up money that might better be spent on advanced weapons; it wouldn't represent a democratic cross-section of the nation; it would be 30 per cent black, etc., etc.

For a couple of months, when enlistments dropped by 30 per cent, it looked as tho the cynics were going to be right. But on the first anniversary of the draft's demise, the voluntary Army is already a resounding success. On July 1, Secretary of the Army Howard Callaway made the point statistically: The Army ended the fiscal year in excess of its authorized strength of 731,600. There had been enlistments of some 200,000 volunteers, and a high reenlistment of some 58,000 men and women.

An apparent paradox is involved here. All the polls tell us that patriotism is at a low ebb, particularly among the young. I myself doubt the ability of a pollster to get a true answer to questions about being motivated by patriotism—people feel sheepish about boasting of their love of country just as they feel sheepish about admitting their own virtue.

Leaving that matter aside, however, the U.S. Army Recruiting Command, which is under the direction of the astute Maj. Gen. William B. Fulton, has discovered that an inversion of the R. O. T. C. principle is just the thing to build up a voluntary Army. Under R. O. T. C., a college student devotes most of his time to ordinary civilian subjects, with his military training coming after math and chemistry and language requirements have been satisfied. The Army now works it the other way round.

In running the Ninth Infantry Division in the Pacific Northwest, Gen. Fulton had conducted something called "Old Reliable University"—he had worked with local colleges, vocational schools and high schools to enable his "old reliables" to get diplomas they had missed in civilian life. The principle, elaborated as the Educational Service Plan, is now luring high school graduates into the voluntary Army; almost 70 per cent of the June 1974 enlistments were high school graduates or the equivalent.

A recruit is now able to spend some 20 per cent of his training time on the ordinary civilians subjects he might have elected if he had gone to college. He can enroll in a local community college or a vocational school and, in three years of military service, get up to two years of credit toward an ordinary bachelor's degree.

This brings college training within the reach of hundreds who could not afford it, otherwise. It does not lead to any skimping in military preparedness; the improvement in morale and motivation means that the 80 per cent of time spent on military training is more intensively utilized.

The opportunity for continuing an education has brought highly motivated people into the Army. And the motivation extends to the blacks and other minorities, who now constitute some 21 per cent of the active Army, not an overbearing "ethnic" burden.

The skeptics are still at it, however—they show it when they ask such questions [quoting from the Washington Post] as "How well will an army of well-paid enlistees recruited in 'peacetime' perform in combat?" There can be no definitive answer to such a question short of war, but when Nixon called for his Middle East alert last fall, a telephoned notification at 12:15 a.m. brought an eager 100 per cent response of "Yes sir, where are we going?"

A voluntary Army does not make semantic mock of the 13th Amendment, which prohibits "involuntary servitude." The young, who make a fetish of integrity, appreciate that—and they are making the voluntary Army their own.

KNOCKING OUT NO-KNOCK

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to attach another editorial recommending the repeal of the "no knock" legislation. This editorial is from the Worcester, Mass., Telegram, a distinguished daily newspaper with a very highly regarded tradition of competence and excellence in its editorial positions.

I have the hope that the House of Representatives will follow the recommendation of this editorial and follow the Senate in repealing the "no knock" provisions of Federal criminal law.

The editorial follows:

KNOCKING OUT NO-KNOCK

In 1970, Congress granted "no-knock" authority to District of Columbia policemen, allowing them to enter dwellings, with a special warrant, without knocking and identifying themselves. Later that year, as part of the Drug Abuse Prevention Act, the same right was extended to federal narcotics agents across the country.

The legislation was intended to give additional impetus to law enforcement in an era of sky-rocketing crime. It brought the ele-

ment of surprise into the arrest process by giving suspects no chance to escape or destroy evidence.

At the time the proposal was debated, its opponents argued that Americans should be secure in their homes and that no-knock would open the door to abuses. An amendment by Sen. Sam Ervin to delete the provision from the anti-drug act was defeated by the Senate.

Four years have passed since, and the impact of no-knock has proven questionable at best. While some police authorities argue that the surprise entry helped arrest and conviction, the police chief of the District of Columbia said his department could live without no-knock. And the lawyer for the district police stated that no-knock investigation increased the possibilities of injury both for law enforcement officers and occupants of homes entered.

Moreover, several unfortunate incidents have occurred where teams of narcotics agents descended upon private homes by mistake, ransacked apartments and mistreated innocent people. The Gigotto case in Collinsville, Ill. was one outstanding example.

Because the risk to individual rights seems to outweigh the potential benefit law enforcement may gain from no-knock, the Senate reversed itself on the issue the other day, voting 63 to 31 to end it. If we still accept that old American idiom that "a man's home is his castle," the House should do likewise.

NUCLEAR FUEL COULD BECOME IN SHORT SUPPLY

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, set forth below is my statement on the effect possible on nuclear fuel supply from a failure to install adequate nuclear fuel reprocessing facilities, which circumstance could materialize.

The material follows:

HOSMER SAYS FUEL REPROCESSING FAILURE WILL BOOST DEMAND FOR ENRICHMENT BY 22 PERCENT AND FEED BY 40 PERCENT—SEES NEED TO REACTIVATE PUREX FACILITY

A serious new instability in the nuclear fuel supply picture is being introduced by the prospective dearth of fuel reprocessing facilities. It may further complicate the transition of its enrichment phase from public to private hands. I have asked the AEC to provide testimony regarding the problem during the final stages of Phase III hearings on the Future Structure of the Uranium Enrichment Industry.

If GE's Midwest Fuel Recovery plant at Morris, Illinois, is ever redesigned and completed, it will still be several years late in coming on line. The Nuclear Fuel Services Co. reprocessing plant in New York and the Allied Chemical/Gulf General Atomic plant at Barrwell, South Carolina, will be somewhat modest in size and may, themselves, come late on line. Exxon has nebulous plans for a reprocessing plant in Tennessee which may or may not materialize. In any case, these and future reprocessing schemes, public or private, buck up against massive environmental clearance problems.

Under the circumstances there now appears little alternative but for AEC to reopen its Purex facility at Hanford. I have asked that AEC furnish cost and time on line estimates concerning Purex. I want to furnish them to the Administration in ample

time for inclusion in its FY 1976 budget and earlier supplementals.

Purex will require widespread alterations in order to process civilian fuel elements and meet environmental standards. Reopening will be very expensive.

The difficulties of installing adequate reprocessing facilities and the need which seems to loom to inject the government into the picture calls for several high level policy decisions. The most fundamental of these decisions is whether or not to lump reprocessing in with waste disposal as a government function for the foreseeable future. If this appears desirable then both activities should be under some responsible, permanent subunit of the federal government which will survive reorganizations such as those contemplated by the ERDA legislation. Doing so could obviate some of the fears now being expressed over possible surreptitious diversion of plutonium from peaceful channels during the civilian fuel reprocessing. I do not, myself, regard this as a problem which cannot be handled quite adequately by IAEA and domestic safeguards. However, there is much confusion over it amongst the lay public.

The far more serious problems stemming from inability to reprocess spent fuel are three in number:

(1) The safe and secure storage for an indefinite period of spent elements for which space is now growing tight. Considerable investment will become mandatory to provide new storage and how it is to be financed will be troublesome.

(2) Even should plutonium recycle pass the AEC's licensing hurdle and offer the tantalizing prospect of reducing the demand for enriched uranium by 10% or so, this alternative will not practically be available so long as plutonium for recycling remains locked up in unprocessed fuel elements, and

(3) Even more significant amounts of nuclear fuel in the form of unburned U-235 would remain locked up in the same unprocessed elements. Utilities have depended upon the availability of this enriched uranium for recycling back into their reactors as soon as possible. More than 90% of the U-235 fabricated into a new fuel element still remains in a spent fuel element. Only a fraction of it is burned. The unavailability of such enormous stocks of U-235 as those which could be frozen in unprocessable spent fuel would place large new requirements for unforeseen enriching capacity and feed materials.

I have only gross and preliminary estimates of what these unanticipated requirements for separative work and feed material might be in the 1980's should reprocessing capacity prove to be in negative supply. Variables such as each individual utility's estimates regarding both plutonium and enriched uranium recycle are just not available at this time. It is hoped that AEC's testimony will bear on these matters.

Meanwhile, my tentative estimate is that the absence of reprocessing capacity in this time frame could mean something like a 28% increase in demand for separative work and possibly a 50% increase in demand for feed per year. The relationship between the two demands is not linear because uranium reclaimed from spent fuel rods is already substantially enriched and only some topping is needed to bring it back up to its desired U-235 content.

The prospect of such unanticipated demands as these would, of course, throw a heavy burden on the raw and feed materials industries. It would require almost immediate action and government financing to build up and sustain a preproduction stockpile adequate to satisfy the extra burdens during much of the decade of the 1980's. It

would require a massive infusion of capital into the mining and milling industries to make available the necessary additional feed material.

"THE SPIRIT OF '76"

HON. SAMUEL H. YOUNG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, recently, I called the attention of the House to the need for greater participation in the 200th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence of the United States.

In connection with my efforts to obtain increased citizen awareness of this event, I have sponsored an essay contest for high school students on the "Spirit of '76."

I would like my colleagues to read one of the two winning essays written by Shari D. Olenick, 819 Prairie Lawn Glenview, Ill., a sophomore at Glenbrook South High School. I am sure my colleagues will find it reassuring that we have such intelligent and thoughtful views so well expressed by the youth of this country.

The essay follows:

THE SPIRIT OF '76

"We the people, of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." So reads the preamble to the United States Constitution, and it is these words that define the continual search that not only constitutes our goal in the next 25 years, but for the rest of our existence as a nation.

"... in order to form a more perfect Union..." This realistic observation mirrors not only our forefathers' hopes, but their rationalizations as well. The phrase employed is not "to form a perfect Union," but rather "to form a more perfect Union." Too many Americans tend to criticize our government in terms of a perfect society; there has never been a perfect society. Such delusions can become obsessive, and in the throes of this obsession, we might miss the opportunity to criticize constructively, depriving our government of its backbone—the voice of the people.

"... establish justice..." Can we, the people, permit our laws to be upheld by an elite few? No—one needn't pass the American Bar examination in order to become involved in the many issues facing out justice system. It is not only our right to become involved, it is our responsibility as Americans. Must we be content with a welfare program that virtually sanctions the misery and impoverishment that characterizes poverty? No, but we, the people, must take the first step. Can we let ourselves be spoon-fed political information without once questioning its validity? Not unless we strive for a Communist Utopia.

"... insure domestic tranquility..." Who defines "domestic tranquility?" Is it defined by school officials, who, in their isolated idealism, decree that children be bussed into school districts that don't want them, school districts that they don't want themselves? Or perhaps it is defined in the explosion of a terrorist's bomb in California, a

bomb that decrees with a deep and vindictive hatred, "We, too, are the people. . . ." Domestic tranquility is not a dream, nor is it the idyllic state that people envision it as. Rather, it is the reality of a nation of people working together to better the lives of others, airing their differences and learning the fallacies of their prejudices.

" . . . provide for the common defense . . . " What constitutes "common defense?" Obviously Viet Nam did not, and we voiced our feelings with an adamant agony that finally led to our withdrawal. We didn't leave soon enough? Perhaps next time we'll be more decisive, more adamant about the value of human lives. Or perhaps there won't be a next time. If we finally take stock of our position in the turbulent world political scene, then perhaps, we the people, will be able to stop another Viet Nam from developing.

" . . . promote the general welfare. . . ." For all the government's talk of the welfare of the people, the greatest detriment to American society is the apathy that presently ravages it. The validity of this statement is found in the many examples of the work of one individual in our society. People like Ralph Nader have given the American people a taste of the social victories that can be theirs for the searching. Most people realize the value of personal well-being. What they don't realize is that they are a part of something bigger—a nation—and that this nation's well-being has a radical effect on their own well-being.

" . . . insure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. . . ." The only way that we, the people, can insure the ideals and principles on which our country was founded is to take a long hard look at them, and then relate them to our lives. We must shock the American public out of their blindly apathetic search for the American dream, and make them realize that our American dream is not theirs for the buying, but rather theirs for the doing. The American dream is a search; but unless we open our eyes and participate in it, the America we find may not be the America of our dreams, the America that our forefathers worked so diligently to insure. We the people, must lead that search.

WHAT'S RIGHT ABOUT AMERICA

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Karen Yolanda Bond of Hanover, was an entrant in the recent Miss National Teenager Pageant of Maryland. Part of the competition was a short essay on "What's Right About America." Karen's essay is as follows:

The American people—past, present, and future—that's what's right about America! In the past, many Americans lived and died to make and preserve our special freedoms.

Presently, those seeing beyond our weaknesses work faithfully to preserve such strengths as freedom of religion, freedom to be an individual, and freedom to succeed regardless of background. Among us are people inspiring us teenagers to make an even better future through this opportunity to be our best today. These American people—past, present, and future—that's what's right about America! That's why I am proud to be an American!

I am proud of Karen and, even though she tells me she did not win the pageant, I still think she is a winner.

GOLD ADVOCATES SAY INFLATION CAUSED BY "NEW ECONOMICS"

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the United States and the world face an unprecedented inflation at the present time. Much of our discussion about inflation tends to misunderstand its real cause and, if that is the case, we will fail in our attempts to reverse it.

Inflation has specific causes, the most important of which is an artificial increase in the supply of money with no backing for it. Deficit spending by Government, for example, is simply a form of taxation through the back door. Instead of raising taxes for Government expenditures, Government simply prints more money, thereby decreasing the value of all currency in the society. This is the situation we face today.

To those who argue that changes in the quantity of money do not really matter, Prof. Milton Friedman responds that:

There is massive historical evidence that they do. Every economic recession but one in the U.S. in the past century has been preceded by a decline in the rate of growth of the quantity of money . . . Acceleration of monetary growth in 1962 was followed by economic expansion. The monetary growth rate was too high—but it took until 1965 for its cumulative effects to produce higher prices . . . monetary expansion . . . has produced the widening signs of inflationary pressure.

The unfortunate state of the American and the world economy, many believe, can be traced to the period when the dollar ceased to be backed by gold.

In an article appearing in the July 18, 1974, issue of the *Journal of Commerce*, Charles A. Fuller, Jr., notes that:

The current runaway worldwide inflation and the breakdown of the international monetary system is a direct result of action taken by western nations, most notably the United States, in adopting the "New Economics" and failing to back their currencies in gold.

Mr. Fuller points out that the advocates of gold believe that:

Governments . . . have embarked upon a dangerous worldwide expansion of money supply and credit, a policy which led Jacques Rueff, a leading international monetary expert and former adviser to the late President Charles de Gaulle of France, and who called this period of history "The Age of Inflation," to sound his famous warning "I fear for western civilization."

One way to check the power of governments, Mr. Fuller writes, "is to tie money to gold." Economist Ludwig von Mises, in his volume, *Theory of Money and Credit*, stated that governments resist a gold standard because "it wrests from the hands of 'economic tsars' their most redoubtable instrument. It makes it impossible for them to inflate. That is why the gold standard is furiously attacked by all those who expect they will benefit by bounties from the seemingly inexhaustible government purse."

I wish to share with my colleagues the thoughtful article, "Gold Advocates Say Global Inflation Caused by Move to 'New Economics,'" by Charles A. Fuller, Jr., which appeared in the *Journal of Commerce* of July 18, 1974, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

GOLD ADVOCATES SAY GLOBAL INFLATION CAUSED BY MOVE TO "NEW ECONOMICS"

(By Charles A. Fuller, Jr.)

The current runaway worldwide inflation and the breakdown of the international monetary system is a direct result of action taken by western nations, most notably the United States, in adopting the "New Economics" and failing to back their currencies in gold.

This is the view of the gold advocates who see the adoption of monetarist and Keynesian economic theories as leading the western world to ultimate economic and political disaster.

FEARS EXPRESSED

Governments, the gold advocates point out, have embarked upon a dangerous worldwide expansion of money supply and credit, a policy which led Jacques Rueff, a leading international monetary expert and former adviser to the late President Charles de Gaulle of France, and who called this period of history "The Age of Inflation," to sound his famous warning: "I fear for western civilization."

To those Americans perplexed by the current high rate of inflation in the United States, the cause of inflation is clearly defined by Webster's Third International Dictionary.

Inflation, the dictionary reports, is "an increase in the volume of money and credit relative to available goods resulting in a substantial and continuing rise in the general price level."

In short, the United States and other countries have been increasing their supplies of money and credit at far too rapid a pace. With the resultant increase in paper money the nations of the world—their economies stimulated by the newly created money—are bidding against each other for the world's limited supplies of raw materials and goods and forcing prices upwards.

The result, in effect, has been a "beggar my neighbor" policy among nations in reverse. Instead of each nation devaluing its currency in order to allow its exports to better compete in world markets and increase home employment—a course of action taken during the 1930's—virtually every nation today is "begging" its neighbor by bidding supplies of raw materials away from each other in the world markets.

Much of the current inflation in the United States can be traced to this country's failure (by both the President and Congress) to increase taxes to pay for the Vietnam War or, better yet, in the opinion of many, not to have gotten us into that disastrous war in the first place.

President Johnson, in effect, told the American people that we could have "both guns and butter," a statement which flies in the face of all historical evidence. Similarly, President Nixon also refused to pay for the war which he waged for more than four years out of current tax revenues, and under his administration the United States is now running the largest peacetime deficits in history.

The post World War II arms race with the Soviet Union has also been inflationary, doubly so. Guns, tanks and aircraft, especially when produced on a planned obsolescence basis as some critics charge, add nothing to the standard of living and bid labor, capital and materials away from the private sector.

In many cases, the American taxpayer has really been given the business. A General Accounting Office (GAO) report, for example, showed that manufacturers of bombs and

rockets for the Vietnam War were making annual profits on invested capital of 300 to 1,000 per cent or even higher.

One basic reason why inflation in the United States has accelerated rapidly in the past few years has been devaluations of the dollar which, of course, have made imported products much more expensive and, at the same time, made U. S. exports cheaper and thereby creating shortages of commodities here with foreign purchasers bidding them away from Americans.

The gold advocates view the present world situation with alarm. In their view the present world is floating in an ocean of public and private debt of such massive proportions that sooner or later the world will be thrown into a depression of unprecedented magnitude, perhaps after a period of hyperinflation in some countries.

Herbert Stein, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, recently blamed the American people for the high rate of inflation, an escalation which hit an annual rate of 14.2 per cent in May. But Mr. Stein, it should be pointed out, has defended the administration's policy of not raising taxes and, further, his economic predictions in recent years have consistently proved to be wrong.

One steel importer asked last year what he thought the rate of inflation would be in 1974 in view of Mr. Stein's prediction that it might go as high as 8 per cent, concluded: "Well, if Stein says it will be 8 per cent, then I'd say it's got to be 18."

The Nixon Administration has blamed much of the inflation on high oil prices, but this is only one part of the inflationary spiral, a spiral deliberately set in motion by governments on the basis that "easy money" policies lead to high employment.

CONSIDERABLE DOUBT

There is considerable doubt in the minds of many observers whether governments can take the necessary—and painful—step to bring inflation under control: higher unemployment.

One Italian industrialist, when asked what he thought the world's current economic difficulties will lead to, replied that the necessary steps may be impossible in a democracy. He added that historically whenever an economy was out of control or foreign debts could not be paid, the outlet was war.

"But with nuclear weapons that possibility is unthinkable today," he said.

Referring to Italy, which today is bankrupt, he added that many people believe the situation will disintegrate into armed conflict between the left and right.

It is a historic fact that inflation leads to more inflation. The Federal Reserve, for example, is continuing to expand the nation's money supply at a rather rapid pace just to keep close to the treadmill sparked by earlier expansion of money and credit and thereby prevent a severe recession or economic collapse.

Each increase in prices leads businessmen to boost their loan demand since the cost of maintaining inventories of raw materials and other goods is now higher.

This process was carried to its extreme in the classic case of hyperinflation in Germany after World War I. As incredible as it might seem, people constantly complained that there was not enough money even when inflation had reached the point that workmen were paid every hour with bundles of banknotes. What they and their employers were complaining about, of course, was that the money would no longer buy what was needed.

The current high interest rates in the United States—the highest in this country's

history—in theory are supposed to cool the demand for money. But some observers see this as largely ineffective in dampening the demand for credit since the nation's banks have adopted a "floating" prime rate for business borrowers.

Under a "floating" price the interest rate on a loan is moved up or down through the life of the loan. Therefore, businessmen are not easily deterred from borrowing at today's high rates if they believe the rates will drop in the future.

The gold advocates feel the adoption of monetarist and Keynesian policies by governments have prevented periodic purges of the credit system which they view as necessary evils which must be endured if economic systems are not to get completely out of hand.

One way to check the power of governments is to tie money to gold, a situation which officials of the United States Government and other nations as well have refused to allow. In fact, in their criticism of gold, Treasury spokesmen were once quoted as saying that if the world's central banks stopped buying gold on the free market, the price of that metal would drop far below the then official price of \$35 an ounce.

Economist Ludwig Von Mises in his "Theory of Money and Credit," asserted that governments resist a gold standard because, "It wrests from the hands of the 'economic tsars' their most redoubtable instrument. It makes it impossible for them to inflate. That is why the gold standard is furiously attacked by all those who expect they will benefit by bounties from the seemingly inexhaustible government purpose."

ROSENBERGS CANNOT BE REDEEMED

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, liberals never stop trying to rewrite history. Their latest project is to redeem the reputation of the Rosenbergs, convicted of espionage in the early 1950's.

To speed this redemption, the Rosenberg apologists have taken to the communications media with a vengeance. As a result, the American people have been subjected to a barrage of television programs, news articles, and letters to the editor, all advancing the proposition that the Rosenbergs were really just innocent folk heroes.

I find this propaganda effort absolutely incredible. Despite President Nixon's current problems, it does not make history any different. Try as liberals may to convince us otherwise, the Rosenbergs were spies for the Soviet Government.

It was therefore refreshing to come across a letter in the New York Times that refutes this attempt to idealize the Rosenbergs. As the writer, Mr. Rifkind, contends—

They [the Rosenbergs] were not American heroes; they were spies in the service of the Stalinist tyranny.

I am glad that someone has taken the time to set the record straight on this matter.

The text of Mr. Rifkind's letter is as follows:

ROSENBERGS: THE "UNTAINTED VERDICT"

To the Editor:

In the past few months, TV plays and documentaries, mass meetings and letters to newspapers have promoted the myth that the Rosenbergs, convicted more than twenty years ago of espionage, were innocent folk heroes, killed by a corrupt judicial system. The record, however, does not yield to fiction. They were not American heroes; they were spies in the service of the Stalinist tyranny.

The facts are public but either not well known to the myth-makers or deliberately distorted:

The verdict of guilty was pronounced by a jury declared satisfactory by the accused before they had exhausted their thirty challenges; after the verdict, jury and judge were praised by the Rosenbergs' self-selected lawyer.

The presiding judge, Irving R. Kaufman, was of such quality that he was later recommended for appointment to the Court of Appeals—of which he is now the Chief Judge—by Learned Hand, universally regarded as a towering champion of human liberty.

The conviction was approved on appeal in an opinion written by Judge Jerome N. Frank, who is without a peer in his protection of the rights of those accused of crime.

The Supreme Court declared, "Each of the Justices has given the most painstaking consideration to the case"; it found no reason to review the verdict or sentence.

After sixteen petitions for reconsideration in the District Court, seven in the Court of Appeals, seven in the Supreme Court and two applications to President Eisenhower, the verdict of guilt remained untainted.

In 1967, Morton Sobell, of co-defendant, suggested that new evidence had been unearthed that would create a doubt about the verdict. That application was decided by Judge Edward Weinfeld, whose meticulous treatment of facts has won him nationwide renown. He found it utterly devoid of merit. Moreover, he laid to rest as false the claim, recently disinterred, that both judge and prosecutor had withheld from the defense helpful information. Another recent fabrication attributes to Judge Learned Hand a statement that the prosecutor was guilty of reprehensible conduct during trial. There is not a word in the record to support it.

The imposition of sentence is always a grave judicial responsibility. Some people were opposed to capital punishment in the fifties, and perhaps more of them are so opposed in the seventies. But a judge's duty is to obey the will of Congress, and not to be swayed by his own predilections. The Rosenbergs were sentenced under a statute which plainly contemplated the death penalty for serious acts of espionage. Life imprisonment was not authorized.

Many are under the impression that the sentence received no appellate scrutiny. That is not true. Judge Frank said: "Since two of the defendants must be put to death . . . we have scrutinized the record with extraordinary care. . . ." He pronounced the trial flawless, and he declared the sentence to be within the law; valid under the Constitution; supported by adequate evidence, and not at all offensive to the "common conscience."

Moreover, while a sentence is pronounced by a judge, its execution rests in the discretion of the President. In the case of the Rosenbergs, President Truman did nothing to obstruct execution. President Eisenhower twice denied clemency.

The current agitation has no contact with genuine efforts to improve the judicial process. History is being rewritten to manipulate political opinion in a direction which cannot be in the interest of the American people.

SIMON H. RIFKIND.

New York, July 5, 1974.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS OF THE 11TH DISTRICT OF INDIANA—1974

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to acquaint my colleagues in the Congress with the views of my constituents as they were set forth in their responses to the recent questionnaire we sent to everyone in the 11th Congressional District in the State of Indiana. Almost 17,000 persons answered my request that they share their opinions with me, and many not only made additional comments but also wrote me letters to amplify their views.

I was grateful for these responses. While obviously I must make up my own mind on how to vote on any given issue, remembering Edmund Burke's apt remark that one's constituency requires his industry, but even more, his judgment, nonetheless, the information I received through the questionnaire about what the constituency I represent is thinking supplies valuable input in the decisionmaking process. And beyond that, I believe that this type of communication between a Congressman and his constituents contributes immeasurably to the creation of an atmosphere of openness which is essential to the vitality and health of our democracy.

The only additional comment I would make is that in these strenuous times through which our Nation is passing with so many controversial issues facing us, we must never forget that as we formulate our opinions on these matters and speak our minds, reasonable men and women in all good conscience will differ. If we remember that, and respect each other's right to his or her own opinion without questioning the other person's motives or lampooning his point of view, we will be true to the ideals at the heart of American democracy by protecting the freedom of speech and thought that differentiates our way of life from a dictatorship.

Herewith are the questionnaire results:

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you associate the incidents surrounding Watergate primarily with:		
The Republican party.....	8.25	
The entire political system and politicians in general.....	58.25	
With a few isolated individuals.....	33.5	
2. Do you think the President should be compelled to spend all funds appropriated by Congress, even if he feels these expenditures are not in the best National interest?.....	16.91	83.09
3. Should Indianapolis continue to be on the same time on a year-round basis?.....	78.42	21.58
4. Do you favor the expansion of trade with the Soviet Union and China?.....	50.76	49.24
5. Do you feel that network television fairly presents both sides of most issues?.....	31.01	68.99
6. Do you think the Federal Government should completely finance all Federal election campaigns?.....	25.20	74.80
7. Impeachment is defined as bringing charges against a public official so that the official may be brought to trial. It does not mean removal from office. Under the Constitution, the House of		

	Percent	
	Yes	No
Representatives brings the charges (impeaches), and the Senate tries the case and makes final judgment. Do you favor the impeachment (bringing to trial) of President Nixon for what the Constitution specifies as treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors?.....	39.77	60.23
8. Would you favor some relaxation of clean air standards aimed at increasing gasoline mileage on cars and allowing a greater use of coal and high sulphur fuels in order to help solve the energy crisis?.....	72.42	27.58
9. Federal Judges are appointed for life. Do you think they should be elected—or subject to a periodic review—so that their terms will be limited?.....	87.03	12.97
10. Should the Federal Government require more information on consumer products and institute more stringent controls?.....	55.21	44.79
11. Should the death penalty be restored for such crimes as premeditated murder, wartime treason, skyjacking, or kidnapping which result in death?.....	86.99	13.01
12. Should all Federal office holders be required to make a complete financial disclosure?.....	76.67	23.33

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN NEW YORK

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, Federal efforts to enforce civil rights will only be truly effective when local governments commit themselves to defeating discrimination and surpass minimum Federal requirements. These minimum standards are important as a first step, but effective implementation is carried out at the local level.

New York City has recently taken those extra steps. Mayor Beame issued an executive order creating a comprehensive equal opportunity program in the city government. I commend Mayor Beame on his decisive action on behalf of equal opportunity, and I urge my colleagues to read the following article from the New York Voice of June 21 describing New York's prospective program:

FIRST COMPREHENSIVE EFFORT: EQUAL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM SET UP FOR CITY EMPLOYEES

(By Claire Paisner)

An executive order, considered of major importance in the city's history by human rights specialists, has been recently promulgated by Mayor Abraham Beame. Issued as Executive Order No. 14, it institutes a systematic equal employment program within city government, the first formalization of an internal program in the area of equal opportunity.

Prior to this move, there had been executive orders under the previous administration prohibiting discrimination and calling for an ethnic count of city employees, which was accomplished by the City Commission on Human Rights. There was a complaint procedure according to which individual employees could charge discrimination if they felt they had been subjected to it. But the Administration had not reached the point of setting up an overall affirmative plan, requiring positive initiative, as under Executive Order 14.

"This is a major civil rights step in government," Eleanor Holmes Norton, chairper-

son of the City Commission on Human Rights, told the Voice. "It mandates all agencies of city government to reform their practices to conform with modern notions of equal opportunity," she said, explaining that there have been a number of "forward-looking policies" that have come out of the courts recently and that need to be incorporated into a new program.

Asked if Executive Order 14 was in response to federal mandate, Commissioner Norton replied that it goes far beyond what is required by the U.S. government, operating through its principal human rights arm, the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (EEOC).

New York City and all other public employers came under the jurisdiction of the EEOC through legislation passed in July, 1972. Prior to that, only private employers were regulated with regard to employment discrimination.

"There is no obligation to have a comprehensive program," said Mrs. Norton, noting that the new plan avoids the piecemeal approach whereby changes are made in response to successive pressures. "We're not going to wait to be sued by minorities and women. This is no way to approach civil rights," she remarked.

CONTENTS OF PLAN

The executive order, covering both appointive and civil service positions, outlines a number of steps that are to be taken in setting up a program.

The first task is the preparation of guidelines by three agencies: the Department of Personnel, the City Commission on Human Rights, and the Law Department. These guidelines would include specific criteria to be used in such areas as "recruitment, hiring, selection, benefits, promotion, transfer, separation, compensation, and skills training." The three agencies are to work under the direction of the Office of the Mayor in preparing these guidelines. Mrs. Norton was unable to say precisely when they would be completed.

Immediately after the issuance of the guidelines, each city agency is instructed to analyze the composition of its work force and its personnel policies and then prepare an Equal Employment Opportunity Program following the guidelines. This program is to be submitted to both the Department of Personnel and the City Commission on Human Rights, who, in turn, report to the Mayor.

Each city agency, in addition to following an approved EEO plan, is required to appoint a senior staff member as an Equal Employment Opportunity Officer and report regularly to the Mayor concerning the implementation of its plan.

The Department of Personnel, in consultation with related agencies, is also required to submit a city-wide EEO program under the executive order.

Mrs. Norton says she expects that in the course of carrying out the order, a number of recommendations will be made for changes in personnel procedures, as well as alterations in existing law.

ETHNIC SURVEYS

Commissioner Norton, who also served in her present capacity under former Mayor John Lindsay, told the Voice that the need for a new program was perceived as a result of the ethnic census prepared by the Commission, published in September of 1973. The census itself was considered a milestone in city EEO policy and it contained a number of recommendations for personnel changes. The last previous census had been taken under Mayor Wagner in 1963.

After the ethnic census was begun during the Lindsay era, the new federal law covering local governments was passed, and it included the requirement that the states and

municipalities submit regular reports about the composition of their workforce to the EEOC. (A report, in fact, was prepared by the N.Y.C. Personnel Department some months ago, but has not yet been released to the public.)

Using data gathered in the 1973 survey by the City Commission on Human Rights (which based its findings on 1971 figures), Blacks made up 25% of the municipal workforce and Puerto Ricans 6%. Both groups had increased their number considerably since 1963, although the still low percentage of Puerto Ricans was highlighted. (In 1970 Blacks were 21% and Puerto Ricans 10% of the city's total population.)

Both groups were found to be concentrated in certain agencies, and both had earnings toward the lower end of the pay schedule. For instance, 48% of the Blacks and 59% of the Puerto Ricans were in the salary range of \$5,200-\$7,299, as opposed to only 10% of the Whites.

JERRY FORD

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, all of us in the House know JERRY FORD well. Having served on the floor with us for so many years, he gained the admiration and respect of everyone on both sides of the aisle. Now that he has moved up to the position of Vice President of our country it is interesting to see the impression and viewpoint of the people who are meeting him during his visits around the country.

The Vice President has visited Dallas on three different occasions during the past 3 months. Tom Johnson, who is executive editor of the Dallas Times Herald, wrote a very interesting article on JERRY FORD. Tom Johnson is a dynamic man on the move who represents the future leadership of Texas. I was interested in the complete writeup that he gave in the article of July 16. Here are Tom Johnson's observations in the Dallas Times Herald:

GETTING TO KNOW FORD

He insists on being called Jerry, not Mr. Vice President. He requires staff assistants to read George Reedy's "Twilight of the Presidency," a book which peels flesh off U.S. presidents for amassing luxuries in public office and for permitting their aides to isolate them in The White House.

He travels at a fast pace, exactly 200,919 miles since becoming vice president on December 6, 1973.

He delivers many speeches, more than 250 this year in 36 states.

He is not a brilliant, charismatic speaker, nor does he pretend to be. He does not have the magnetic charm that electrifies an audience in the fashion of John Connally.

He punctuates his private conversations with jabs on his left hand, while his right cradles a pipe filled with an aromatic blend. He seems to listen well.

Those who spent time with him in Dallas recently provide different personal descriptions, but highly positive reactions:

"... he's solid ..."

"... he's willing to listen."

"... he's honest in his answers."

"... he would be dependable ..."

"... he's not flashy."

And, perhaps, the one comment that echoed most frequently from his appearances here: "... he could be a good president."

Gerald R. Ford, age 61, the most important number two man in the world.

As Washington reels under the impact of its seemingly endless barrage of daily political explosions, and as 1976 approaches, the importance of knowing Mr. Ford becomes more critical.

In three trips to Dallas, he has provided considerable insight into the public and private man.

On May 11, at the Dallas-Fort Worth Airport Marina Hotel, he warned that Democrats are seeking a veto-proof Congress which he equated with a "legislative dictatorship."

He said then that Texas' Republican party is long on quality but short on quantity. He is working to strengthen the GOP in each state.

He defends President Nixon, but concedes that the tape transcripts "don't confer sainthood on anybody." He believes it would be wrong if the President resigned.

On June 13, addressing the Southern Baptist Convention in Dallas, Mr. Ford asked Americans to speak up "affirmatively about what's right about this country." He said, "We must get ourselves together to move forward to a higher state of moral responsibility and achievement."

On July 6, at the dedication of the World Trade Center, Mr. Ford stressed the vital importance of solid international relations. He reminded his audience of the President's great successes in foreign policy, from Southeast Asia through the Middle East, the Soviet Union, and the People's Republic of China.

A few other glimpses came through:

When a false report of a DPS escort vehicle being hit by gunfire was issued, Mr. Ford wasted no time after his speech at the Trade Center to make himself available to reporters in order to get the truth out. He did not try to cover anything up or to delegate the briefing to aides and law enforcement officials.

He has built solid friendships in Dallas. If that same impact is being felt in those 250 other speech sites across the country, he's far ahead on the route to the Oval Office, despite protestations that he really doesn't aspire to the Presidency.

IOWA REPUBLICANS SUPPORT AMNESTY

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that a greater appreciation for the need for a more complete national reconciliation is growing. This is evidenced by the adoption of a conditional amnesty plank in the platform adopted on July 20 by the Iowa Republican State Convention.

As adopted the amnesty portion of the platform reads:

In light of historical precedent and in order to remove lingering vestiges of the Vietnam War, we urge that amnesty for objectors to the war be considered depending on the merits of each individual case and further advocate that alternative service be required

as a condition of amnesty where granted. We oppose blanket amnesty.

The action by the Iowa Republican Party closely parallels the amnesty proposal I have made. Since a determined effort was made to take this plank from the platform and was defeated, I am hopeful that this action signals not only an awareness of the problems which amnesty can help overcome, but a commitment to taking steps which can truly "bind up the Nation's wounds."

U.S. SECRET SERVICE

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, I introduced H.R. 15505, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse State and local law enforcement agencies for assistance provided at the request of the U.S. Secret Service. Last week, I reintroduced this legislation with cosponsors.

As you know, Secret Service protection was some years ago extended by law to provide security for major political candidates and for foreign dignitaries. The Federal Government has acknowledged that the responsibility for protection of those individuals entitled to such protection by the Secret Service is at the Federal level. However, the Secret Service is not large enough itself and, therefore, must seek assistance from local law enforcement agencies to adequately provide this service.

There is currently no fund available to reimburse State and local agencies for the assistance that is requested of them by the Secret Service. Thus, the burden falls upon these agencies themselves to pay such expenses from their own budgets.

In Los Angeles alone, requests by the Secret Service for supplementary security personnel more than tripled with the passage of Public Law 90-331, which provides security for major Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates, and Public Law 91-651, allowing protection for dignitaries. During an 11-month period in 1972, the Los Angeles Police Department incurred direct expenses of \$168,959 in responding to 44 requests of the Secret Service. No doubt the local agencies in many other Member's districts have been affected similarly.

This increased burden on local communities was not foreseen when Congress enacted the legislation to expand Secret Service protection. It is time, however, that this inequity be corrected and that the Federal Government assume responsibility for paying Secret Service costs. My bill would accomplish this by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse State and local governments for expenditures made at the request of the Secret Service.

The response to this proposed legis-

tion has been very favorable and widespread. Typical of that response is a letter I received yesterday from Chief of Police Edward M. Davis of the Los Angeles Police Department.

I respectfully call to the attention of my colleagues Chief Davis' letter and the attached list of expenditures incurred by the LAPD, for assistance provided to

the Secret Service during 1972, the complete texts of which follows:

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 16, 1974.

HON. ALPHONZO BELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BELL: Bravo for your H.R. 15505. As you know we provide exten-

sive security for Federal officials visiting in this City, and other persons, at the request of the Secret Service. This is now done at a considerable sacrifice to the citizens through diluted police services to the balance of the city. This bill will rectify a long-term inequity.

Sincerely,

E. M. DAVIS,
Chief of Police.

EXPENDITURES BY THE LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR VIP SECURITY

Dignitary	Date	Man-hours	Cost	Dignitary	Date	Man-hours	Cost
Premier Sato (Japan)	Jan. 5/9, 1972	135.0	\$1,422.13	Senator Kennedy	Sept. 10/11, 1972	522.0	\$4,772.69
Moishe Dayan (Israel)	Feb. 8/9, 1972	192.0	1,560.63	Senator Kennedy/Sargent Shriver	Sept. 11, 1972	24.0	175.00
Vice President Agnew	Mar. 17/22, 1972	253.0	2,175.27	Mrs. Nixon	Sept. 18/22, 1972	881.0	7,628.66
Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm	May 17/22, 1972	248.0	2,054.55	Senator McGovern	Sept. 22/27, 1972	1,130.5	9,586.95
Senator McGovern	May 18/21, 1972	42.2	318.74	President Nixon/Senator McGovern	Sept. 22, 1972	10.0	105.38
Senator Humphrey	May 18/June 6, 1972	222.5	2,339.25	President Nixon	Sept. 22/28, 1972	3,526.0	30,398.13
Senators Humphrey/McGovern	May 22/June 6, 1972	178.0	1,819.62	Mrs. Tricia Nixon Cox	Oct. 5/6, 1972	31.0	382.04
Senator Humphrey	May 22/June 6, 1972	535.4	4,139.24	Sargent Shriver	Oct. 5/6, 1972	195.0	1,642.96
Senator McGovern	May 24/June 7, 1972	1,172.0	9,793.49	Prince Hassan (Jordan)	Oct. 9, 1972	3.0	27.93
Wives of Presidential nominees	May 31, 1972	15.0	104.94	Representative Schmitz	Oct. 12/16, 1972	1,356.1	11,327.45
Senators Humphrey/McGovern	June 5, 1972	410.5	3,179.89	Prince Hassan (Jordan)	Oct. 14, 1972	10.0	75.58
Vice President Agnew	June 8/10, 1972	29.0	277.07	Mrs. Julie Nixon Eisenhower	Oct. 18, 1972	5.0	45.52
Senator Muskie	June 16/21, 1972	1,069.0	9,277.09	Senator McGovern	Oct. 24/25, 1972	61.0	694.50
President Echeverria (Mexico)	June 16/21, 1972	168.0	1,997.75	Senators McGovern/McGovern	Oct. 24/27, 1972	836.0	9,166.14
President Arana (Guatemala)	June 24/25, 1972	22.0	292.00	Do.	Oct. 25, 1972	10.0	105.38
President Nixon	July 2/9, 1972	505.5	4,407.79	Senator Kennedy	Oct. 27, 1972	127.5	72.77
Vice President Agnew	Aug. 4/8, 1972	649.0	6,033.60	President Nixon	Oct. 27/28, 1972	4.0	4,913.14
Sargent Shriver	Aug. 14/15, 1972	12.0	129.72	Vice President Agnew	Oct. 27, 1972	124.0	1,079.88
Vice President Agnew	Aug. 25/27, 1972	1,107.0	9,190.44	Mrs. Nixon	Oct. 29/Nov. 2, 1972	2,224.0	18,710.83
Senator McGovern	Aug. 29/Sept. 6, 1972	10.0	105.38	Senators Kennedy/McGovern	Nov. 2/5, 1972	705.0	5,661.20
Senators McGovern/Kennedy	Sept. 1, 1972	18.0	166.94	Do.	Nov. 26/27, 1972	48.5	330.88
Senator Kennedy/Sargent Shriver	Sept. 8/9, 1972	139.0	1,149.64				
Sargent Shriver	Sept. 8/11, 1972			Total		19,348.7	168,959.49

WMCA CALLS FOR UNIVERSAL AMNESTY

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention a broadcast aired July 4, 1974, on WMCA, a radio station in New York, supporting total and unconditional amnesty. It has been more than 19 months since the signing of the Paris accords and we still have not shown enough courage to recognize those Americans who refused to participate in an immoral war. Amnesty should not be delivered piecemeal but should be given to all draft evaders, deserters, and antiwar demonstrators without any requirement of punitive service.

As you know I have introduced a bill, H.R. 236, which would grant universal and unconditional amnesty. I therefore commend station WMCA for its strong leadership in an area which should be of utmost concern to all Americans, and insert the following for the benefit of my colleagues:

AMNESTY

There's something pretty special about this Fourth of July. For it's the first "Independence Day" this country will celebrate with all of America's troops home from Vietnam. Which suggests to us at WMCA that this July Fourth is the perfect time for Americans to come out in support of total and unconditional amnesty—an amnesty which would bring those American men and women living in exile home also.

For while we believe that the veterans of the Vietnam war served this country with a courage and commitment symbolic of America's dedication to democracy throughout the world, we believe that the war resisters also stood up for American idealism—by refusing to participate in a war whose moral and constitutional bases were highly

questionable. Trying to punish them now serves no purpose at all; only creates more bitterness and divisiveness throughout the land; and prevents the citizens of this country from joining together in peace and understanding.

Yes. The time has come for unconditional amnesty. And we think that letters to you Washington representatives favoring that amnesty would carry an extra measure of strength, were they to be dated, "July 4th."

H.R. 6485—TOBACCO MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS AMENDMENT

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 6485, as amended, was passed by the House and sent to the Senate on Monday, July 22, 1974.

The purpose of this legislation is to preserve the effectiveness of the tobacco program by discouraging the production of types of tobacco, which are not under the price support and production control quota programs from being grown in areas where tobacco farmers have chosen to comply with these programs. This bill primarily affects the growing of Maryland type 32 in the burley, dark, and flue-cured areas.

This legislation was requested by the tobacco grower leadership from the burley, dark, and flue-cured areas of production. In 1972, approximately 850,000 pounds of tobacco reportedly produced from Maryland-type seed were produced in the burley areas of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia. In 1973, this production rose to an estimated level of approximately 5 million pounds primarily in those States.

The production and marketing of to-

bacco represented to be of Maryland type 32 in the burley production areas has caused great concern among burley producers, auction warehousemen, and others. Maryland tobacco is similar to burley tobacco, especially when grown on the same type soil under the same cultural practices. Both are light air-cured and are used primarily in the manufacture of cigarettes.

The Tobacco Subcommittee and the full House Committee on Agriculture recognized the concern of the burley producers and after considering the problem thoroughly recommended the enactment of this legislation. The U.S. Department of Agriculture also recommended the enactment of H.R. 6485, as amended.

H.R. 6485 was introduced by Congressman BRECKINRIDGE (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. SNYDER). Identical companion bills were sponsored by Mr. NATCHER and Mr. QUILLEN. On the Senate side an identical bill, S. 1533, has been introduced by Senator COOK and HUDDLESTON of Kentucky and Senators BAKER and BROCK of Tennessee.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues who joined in the passage of H.R. 6485. I hope that the Senate will pass this much-needed legislation at an early date so that final enactment may take place in time for the law to be effective with the 1975 crop.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1974

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has suffered a great tragedy and im-

July 23, 1974

measurable loss in the passing of former Senator Wayne Morse. It was my privilege to serve in the Senate with him for many years. He was a rare man—rare in ability, rare in the depth of his dedication to the public interest, rare in his integrity of mind and principle, rare in his persistence and pursuit of a worthy goal, rare in his understanding of public matters, rare in charm and graciousness. His public career is a record of a great warrior for the causes that he deemed right. It mattered not to him what the odds against him were, what forces opposed him or whether he stood alone. He fought unflinchingly, doggedly, persistently for what he thought was right. He had a deep feeling about public issues, because he saw the impact of such issues upon people for whom he had a very sensitive concern. He fought with only former Senator Gruening, his Senate colleague at his side, to prevent the enlargement of the war in Southeast Asia and to stop it once it achieved momentum. First because he thought it was wrong constitutionally for the President, without a declaration of war by the Congress, to conduct large-scale military activities in Southeast Asia and second, because he loved the men, women, and children who died in that war too much to see them killed. His strong and advanced position in trying to prevent and then later to stop the war in Southeast Asia undoubtedly contributed to his defeat in his effort to return to the Senate. But if he had known when he voted and fought as he did against that war that it would inevitably mean his defeat, such knowledge would not have changed his action or his attitude one iota. He put principle above politics, partisanship, or personal detriment. He fought for the working people of this country with singular tenacity and effectiveness. He fought for the farmers. He fought for the underprivileged—those discriminated against, those who needed help. He was like a knight of the round table as he ranged over the realm of public problems, jousting with every defender of wrong, gallantly fighting for every cause which he thought was right.

There was great variety in his genius. He was not only an eminent lawyer, a distinguished dean of the law school of his State, a great negotiator, an outstanding administrator, but a successful and imaginative farmer and breeder of horses and cattle, erudite writer, and a persuasive speaker all over the country.

He had been renominated for the Senate in his State and many thought he had a chance of winning back his Senate seat which would have warmed his heart for he loved the Senate and he loved the opportunity that it gave him to fight battles he felt needed to be fought.

Only a little while ago he and I were together at the memorial service of his late, great colleague, Senator Ernest Gruening, and we talked about his great career, his campaign, and his hopes of another opportunity of great public service. Then he seemed in good health. I congratulated him upon his Democratic victory and extended him warmest wishes for the future.

Now that great voice is stilled, that brilliant mind is no longer restless in his

mighty work, that body that vibrated with energy is active no more. But the memory of Wayne Morse, all that he was, all that he did, all that he fought for, all that he stood for, all that he meant to a loving family and innumerable friends and to people everywhere will never be forgotten. My wife joins me in extending deepest sympathies to his widow and to all the members of his family.

DISMAY OVER RUSH INVITATION

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at an earlier point in the Record today I expressed my willingness to raise questions supplied to me by other Members of the House when Kenneth Rush, counselor to the President for economic affairs, appears before the Joint Economic Committee next Monday.

In those remarks I referred to copies of letters of June 18 to the President and Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER, vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, expressing my dismay with events surrounding an earlier invitation to Mr. Rush to appear before the committee. The copies of the two letters are placed in the Record at this point:

JUNE 18, 1974.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am asking that this letter be transmitted to you as quickly as possible because of the urgency and importance of this matter.

In a letter dated June 13, Mr. Kenneth Rush wrote to Senator William Proxmire, vice chairman of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee, to advise him that he would not appear as previously scheduled before that committee Tuesday, June 18, for the committee's review of the President's mid-year economic report.

As the member of the committee who had originally suggested that Mr. Rush be invited to appear for the hearings, I wanted to provide him with an opportunity to share constructively with the Joint Economic Committee, the media and the public both the opportunities which the economy holds for the nation and the problems it presents.

I urge, as a member of the committee, that the domestic health of our country must move forward while you continue your important foreign missions to the mid-East and to Russia.

I want to emphasize that I made my proposal regarding Mr. Rush's appearance in the good faith that both the Executive and the Congress must act responsibly and in concert. The nation's economic conditions require full and candid discussion between the Administration and the Joint Economic Committee as a guide to both public and private actions that may affect the economy. Because the Joint Economic Committee is an advisory committee only and not a legislative committee, it seems to me that the separation of powers doctrine, which Mr. Rush cited in his refusal to appear before the committee, does not apply.

I strongly urge, therefore, that Mr. Rush advise the Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, Representative Wright Patman, that he has reconsidered his earlier refusal to appear before the committee and that Mr. Rush will schedule an appearance.

I will continue to work to try to reestablish a positive relationship between the Administration and the Joint Economic Committee. Such a relationship, I strongly feel, is of utmost importance to the economic well-being of the nation.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Member of Congress.

JUNE 18, 1974.

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIER,
Vice Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,
Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I join you in the indignation you expressed last week when informed by Mr. Kenneth Rush that he would not appear Tuesday, June 18, before the Joint Economic Committee for its review of the President's mid-year economic report. I feel that Mr. Rush should appear.

However, I feel that by cancelling the rest of the hearings, you have improperly denied the members of our committee the opportunity to read questions for Mr. Rush into the hearing record to be sent to the White House for response.

I urge that you try to work out a strategy with me to try to persuade Mr. Rush to appear before our committee at a future date. I shall make my own request to Mr. Rush to reconsider his refusal to appear when I meet with him for breakfast with other members of our committee on Wednesday morning. I certainly agree with you that the breakfast meeting is no substitute for discussing the Administration's economic proposals in a public committee session, but such an exchange is better than no meeting at all.

Also, I would suggest that a meeting of the full committee be convened at the earliest convenient date at which a House-Senate bi-partisan approach can be considered to arrange for the public appearance of Mr. Rush and others of the President's economic advisors. Hopefully, your cancellation without consultation with other members of the committee of the sessions at which we were to hear from Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur Burns and Council of Economic Advisors Chairman Herbert Stein has not precluded any opportunity for the appearance of these other public officials whose views and actions have an important impact on our economy.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Member of Congress.

ESTABLISHING A CEILING ON DOD SPENDING

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. ASPIN, Mr. Speaker, for several years now I have attempted to set an overall limit on the Department of Defense authorization bill by proposing a ceiling amendment. I feel that the ceiling approach, rather than individual weapons systems amendments, allows Congress to establish a firm limit on military spending without forcing the full House to judge the merits of every aspect of the military budget.

Congress frequently applies a ceiling to other spending programs. In fact, President Nixon recently signed the Budget Control Act which will mandate specific budget ceilings on the entire Federal budget at the beginning of each year; this legislation applies ceilings to

military as well as civilian aspects of the budget.

Despite this frequent use of the ceiling approach, there were some Members who criticized my amendment as being too arbitrary an approach to the defense budget.

In a recent interview, Defense Secretary James Schlesinger more or less endorsed the ceiling concept for the Pentagon's budget. Martin Schram, Newsday bureau chief, interviewed Dr. Schlesinger on May 28, 1974, for an article which appeared on June 28, 1974.

Schram and Schlesinger discussed the manner in which Congress deals with the Pentagon's budget each year. The article said that while the military usually wins its fights in Congress, it does often lose some "irritating skirmishes" due to what it calls "congressional nitpicking" over selected weapons systems.

In actual interview, Schram asked Schlesinger: "What if Congress were to exercise its oversight function differently and place a ceiling on DOD spending?"

Schlesinger replied that he would not object to Congress setting a flat ceiling on the military budget each year "if they give us flexibility to use our resources."

Schram asked further whether Schlesinger would "prefer that to the present piecemeal approach?"

"Sure," replied Schlesinger.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is highly significant that the Defense Secretary has endorsed the ceiling approach to the defense budget. I am also delighted that my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. ADDABBO) will be carrying the fight for a ceiling on the defense appropriation bill due on the House floor in about 2 weeks. I will most certainly support Mr. ADDABBO's amendment and urge that my colleagues do so too.

I am including the contents of the Newsday article of June 28, 1974, in which parts of the Schlesinger interview appear, in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Long Island Newsday, June 28, 1974]

BILLION-DOLLAR BUDGET

(By Martin Schram, Lynn Rosellini, and Bob Wyrick)

WASHINGTON.—Every year a game is played on Capitol Hill as hearings on the defense budget begin. But this year, many congressmen and defense officials, including Defense Secretary Schlesinger, are in favor of changing the rules.

The game as it now is played pits rooms full of military men, their desks piled high with documents, against a handful of congressmen whose job it is to approve or reject the multibillion-dollar defense budget. It is a lopsided game that the military usually wins. As one observer put it: "A David and Goliath confrontation without the slingshot."

But while the military wins the game, it often loses some irritating skirmishes with what it calls "congressional nitpicking" over selected weapons systems. This situation caused Schlesinger, in a recent interview, to concede that he would not object to Congress' setting a flat ceiling on the military budget each year, "if they give us flexibility to use our resources." Schlesinger said, in fact, that he would prefer this to the present piecemeal approach to budget cutting.

For the past two years more and more defense spending critics in Congress have been moving in this direction. One reason is that it is easier to let the Pentagon decide where cutbacks should be made than to con-

vince an individual congressman to vote against a military spending program in his district. The second reason is the sheer size of the defense budget. For 1975, the budget is \$92.6 billion.

Each year, Congress is faced with a mountain of paper on the Pentagon budget. It includes transcripts that go on for hundreds of pages, backed up by Pentagon documentation that runs into tens of thousands of detailed pages on everything from manpower needs to complex weapons systems. Rep. George H. Mahon (D-Texas), chairman of the House Appropriations defense subcommittee, says, "This government is so big no human being can keep up with it." Ralph Preston, chief counsel to the subcommittee, says, "If we were to take a job like the budget and farm it out to a place like Rand [Corp.], it would take them five years to do a good job. We get a lot of detail on a lot of programs, but even then we're only scratching the surface."

Arnold Smith, a former staff member of the Senate Appropriations defense subcommittee, has this description of what happens: "This big truckload of paper comes over and who in the hell is going to read it? These senators are running so hard already they don't have time to kiss their wives."

The Pentagon is well aware of congressional limits. One of the highest ranking officials in the Defense Department says, "We don't give Congress our five-year-plan. We give them one year and little hints of the next, and they authorize for us just a little piece at a time." At the same time, the official criticized Congress for "picking around at the edges" of the defense budget, and said it should spend its time deciding broader issues.

Basically, there are three entities outside the Pentagon which take an interest in minding military spending: (1) Congress, (2) the General Accounting Office and (3) independent organizations such as the Federation of American Scientists, the Brookings Institution and the Center for Defense Information.

Aligned against critics of military spending are the Pentagon itself; some powerful members of Congress, who occupy key positions (such as Louisiana Democrat F. Edward Hébert, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee); and the well-heeled military lobby, which one study indicates spends \$36,000,000 a year to promote Pentagon objectives. The study was prepared by Sen. William W. Proxmire (D-Wis.), who says, "The military lobby represents the unseen hand of pressure on Congress for increased defense spending."

While there are pressures on congressmen to increase military spending—because it "promotes national security" and "produces jobs"—there is very little pressure from individual voters to reduce it. Sen. Thomas J. McIntyre (D-New Hampshire), chairman of the Senate subcommittee on military research and development, believes this is because the Pentagon deals in figures so large that they "numb the mind." McIntyre says, "If you gave your wife a million dollars and told her to go out and spend \$1,000 a day and don't come back until she'd finished, you wouldn't see her again for three years. If you asked her to spend a billion, you wouldn't see her again for 3,000 years. They want \$9.3 billion approved [for research and development] this year. I sometimes can't understand how the bastards can spend it that fast."

Each year in late January or early February, the Armed Services Committees of both houses of Congress receive the defense budget. In the following three or four months the committees and their subcommittees hold hundreds of hearings, and most of their time is spent listening to military brass. This year, on the House side, for example, about 100 witnesses were called, most of them

Pentagon officials who testified in favor of the Defense Department's proposals.

Retired Army Lt. Col. Edward King describes what it is like to sit on both sides of the fence during defense hearings. As an Army official, King testified in favor of military budgets, and since his retirement, he has testified against certain aspects of military spending which he considers wasteful.

"Come over in uniform and you're one of the boys," he said. "But show up in your suit trying to save the taxpayers a buck and you're an enemy." As far as the Pentagon's approach is concerned, King says, "It's the same old game every year—tell them the part that scares the hell out of them and don't tell them anything else."

Before the budget hearings, for six to eight weeks, staff member of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committee on both sides of the house are invited several times a week to the Pentagon for budget "briefings" that last from two to four hours each. The briefings usually are followed by a cocktail party and dinner, during which congressional staff members are treated "obsequiously" by the military officers, according to Smith, the former Senate Appropriations subcommittee staffer.

Congressional staffers also are invited to go on cruises aboard aircraft carriers, attend openings of new military bases and view new weapons demonstrations, sometimes in delightful climates, Smith said. "I always felt that they [the Pentagon] were total masters of the information they had and were able to portray it for you in a totally convincing way," he said. "But even though every item in the budget might be totally justified, there is the feeling of helplessness before this avalanche of paper."

There are about 30,000 persons who have a hand in preparing the defense budget, while the combined staffs of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees comprise only 72 persons. By the time the budget reaches Congress for hearings, congressmen can only ask questions based upon the limited information their staff members have been able to assimilate. On the House side, for example, each member is given five minutes in which to ask those questions.

In addition to the regular budget this year, Congress was asked to approve a "supplemental" 1974 budget. This budget, with 526 pages of items costing \$6.2 billion, was considered in only two days of private hearings, during which 50 military officers in uniform were present and congressional members were not allowed to take copies of the budget out of the room. One freshman congresswoman, Rep. Patricia Schroeder (D-Colo.), said that there was not enough time for members to even begin to study the supplemental budget. "I was just furious," she said. "To think that anyone could okay \$6.2 billion just zap bam like that."

Rep. Charles E. Bennett (D-Fla.), a 22-year veteran of the Armed Services Committee, said that Congress is quite capable of dealing with the huge volumes of testimony. "The mind's like a computer," he said. "You retain this stuff . . . What better system could you have?"

Some Conservative congressmen and their staff members think it is unwise for Congress to try to oversee defense spending on an item-by-item basis. Their views are summed up by Michael Hemphill, defense expert in the office of Sen. John Tower (R-Texas), a member of the Armed Services Committee. Hemphill is impatient with congressmen like Proxmire, who recently exposed the large number of native Filipino servicemen utilized as personal servants for military brass. Hemphill called Proxmire's investigation "a waste of congressional time."

He said that generals and admirals are handling the biggest financial undertaking in America and that they are the equivalent

of corporate executives, although they don't earn as much. "How are we going to retain men of these [sic] caliber if we don't give them the comforts of life?" he asked. Hemphill said he feels that Congress, basically should give the Pentagon what it wants because the Pentagon is the expert on military matters and knows what America needs.

The Pentagon, however, controls the information that Congress receives. Much of it is classified and, as Mahon says, "Sometimes we don't hear the whole story."

In addition to this, the Pentagon is close to some congressmen. One example of the often remarkable similarity of views among the Pentagon's friends in Congress occurred in 1972 during debate on the Trident submarine program. Ohio Republican Rep. Donald D. Clancy stated on the House floor: "The Trident program is not a crash program. It is an urgent but orderly program for replacing our aging Polaris submarines with new submarines having greatly improved capabilities."

Shortly thereafter, Rep. Samuel S. Stratton, New York Democrat, began a speech which said: "The Trident program is not a crash program. It is an urgent but orderly program for replacing our aging Polaris submarines with new submarines having greatly improved capabilities." The speeches continued for 17 identical paragraphs, right down to the last sentence, "We must start building at once." The origin of the speech could not be determined.

Some of the most significant defense budget cutting occurs in committee. Once it happens, cuts are seldom completely restored on the floor of either the House or Senate. Last year, for example, the Senate Appropriations defense subcommittee, headed by Sen. John L. McClellan (D-Ark.), cut \$4.1 billion from the budget proposed. Although floor amendments restored a portion of this money, the final package that came out of the Senate-House conference amounted to a cut of \$3.5 billion. McClellan has set that goal again for this year, according to subcommittee staff member Guy McConnell.

Ironically, while some committees cut funds the Pentagon wants, others add money that the Pentagon has not even requested. This year, for example, the Texas delegation succeeded in persuading the House Armed Services Committee to add \$104,900,000 to the budget to build 24 new planes for the Air National Guard. These planes, which the Pentagon had not requested, are slated to be produced by the Texas-based LTV Corp. Similarly, it is almost axiomatic that congressmen will oppose the closing of military bases in their own districts, even though the Pentagon has proposed this as a way to cut costs.

On paper, Congress has a watchdog over Pentagon spending—the General Accounting Office (GAO), set up to be an independent agency responsible to Congress for overseeing government spending. Out of its 3,300 professional staff members, the GAO has assigned 524 people to watch the defense budget.

One Pentagon cost expert says, "The GAO is hell on widows and orphans. But the greatest problem anybody who is thrif-minded in Congress faces is the reluctance of the GAO to go after the big contractors. I guess GAO has its [good] reputation because people have got to believe in something in government." Richard F. Kaufman, an economist with the Joint Economic Committee, made similar observations in a magazine article, which called the GAO Congress's "one-eyed watchdog," and said it treads lightly where defense contractors are concerned.

Richard Gutmann, director of the GAO's procurement and systems acquisition division, denied these charges. The GAO, he said, attempts to "call the shots as we see them,

with due regard to fairness." Gutmann conceded, however, that "the most significant reports we've been issuing . . . by necessity, [are] classified." Since 1972, Gutmann's division has issued 193 staff studies of defense procurement and 138 of them are classified. Gutmann said that the GAO is "cognizant" of the public's right to know and makes every effort to get the reports declassified, but that the Pentagon has the final word. He said that "damned few" of the classified reports are complimentary to the Pentagon.

The remaining Pentagon critics are made up of outside groups, frequently headed by ex-servicemen, who take up the cudgels against the defense budget year after year—with zeal, but only occasional success. They have even less access than Congress to information which the Pentagon deems classified. But from the outside and with their past experience, they attempt to analyze the defense budget and propose ways of cutting it.

This year, the outsiders have concentrated their efforts on getting Congress to approve an overall cut in military manpower and to set a ceiling on the defense budget equal to last year's budget, plus a percentage increase for inflation. Many liberal congressmen and some budget-minded conservatives have joined forces for the effort, but so far, they have not been effective. An amendment to set a budget ceiling failed in the House this year by 24 votes (209 to 185), and prospects are dim for success in the Senate.

John Isaacs, anti-defense-spending lobbyist for Americans for Democratic Action, said, "Not many senators or congressmen want to go on the floor and challenge the Pentagon because they can always be made to look like a fool. Most people leave it to the Armed Services Committees and the Appropriations Committees, who leave it to the Pentagon, so they get what they want."

NORTH CAROLINA GOV. JAMES E. HOLSHOUSER ENDORSES LEGISLATION TO SAVE THE NEW RIVER BY INCLUDING IT IN NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of North Carolina James E. Holshouser is supporting the action of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation to save the New River.

As you are aware before this subcommittee reported a measure to study the New River for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System comprehensive hearings were held.

Governor Holshouser felt it of such importance that the New River be saved he dispatched his personal representative, Mr. Robert L. Buckner, to the hearing for the presentation of a statement on his behalf. I would like to have inserted in the RECORD a copy of Governor Holshouser's testimony:

STATEMENT

(Statement on behalf of Governor James E. Holshouser of North Carolina before the Parks and Recreation Sub-Committee of the House Interior Committee, June 3, 1974, regarding suitability of the New River in North Carolina for study as a unit of the National Wild and Scenic River System.)

I am pleased to offer this statement in support of House Bill 11120 to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 by designating a segment of the New River as a po-

tential component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. This is an important piece of legislation for northwestern North Carolina and I appreciate the opportunity to present the position of the State of North Carolina regarding it.

As this committee is undoubtedly aware, a segment of the New River included in this legislation has been proposed by Appalachian Power Company as the site for a pumped-storage hydroelectric project. This is the so-called Blue Ridge Project. Early last April, I expressed my opposition to this project. Despite the fact that our nation is faced with a serious energy problem, and despite the fact that I am willing to make reasonable compromises to alleviate this energy problem I am convinced that the detriments of the Blue Ridge Project far outweigh its benefits. I am simply opposed to incurring permanent social and environmental damages in order to obtain relatively short-term power benefits, particularly, when those benefits accrue almost wholly outside North Carolina. Thus, I am still opposed to the project.

It is clear that the proposed Blue Ridge Project will have certain benefits and a number of very clear disadvantages. Outside of the obvious benefit associated with the electric power to be derived from the project recreation is the other major project benefit. The major damage of the project will be its impact upon the social and personal lives of the citizens of Ashe and Alleghany Counties who will be disrupted so that it can be constructed.

In my opinion, this proposal to make the New River a potential unit of the National Wild and Scenic River System offers the citizens of Ashe and Alleghany Counties the opportunity to preserve their land and their way of life while at the time reaping benefits from increased development associated with stimulated recreational use of the New River.

Therefore, I strongly endorse this legislation and urge you to take favorable action upon it so that the needed studies can be made of the New River and an informed decision made upon its suitability as a component of the National Wild and Scenic River System.

During the recently concluded 1974 session of the North Carolina General Assembly, two bills were relative to the New River were passed. The first of these bills designated the New River, from the confluence of the South Fork New River and the North Fork New River to the Virginia border, as a component of the North Carolina Natural and Scenic Rivers System. The second bill called for a study of the feasibility of including in the State Natural and Scenic Rivers System those segments of the South Fork New River and the New River from U.S. Highway 421 near Boone down to the Virginia border. This study is to be completed and a report ready for the General Assembly by January 15, 1975. Our planning effort will begin shortly and will provide full opportunity for review and comment by affected citizens and local government. We will also take into full account the economic needs of the area in designing our strategy for preservation of the South Fork.

The State conducted detailed studies in 1971 of the South Fork of the New River in conjunction with its assessment of rivers in North Carolina as potential candidates for inclusion in a State system of natural and scenic rivers. The results of this assessment strongly supported inclusion of the South Fork New River in the State system.

The intent of the following remarks is to indicate the suitability of the South Fork New River for inclusion into the National Scenic Rivers System as a scenic river.

The South Fork New River heads in Watauga County, North Carolina, in the vicinity of Blowing Rock and flows generally northeastward through the Blue Ridge

Mountains across Ashe County, and joins the North Fork New River on the Ashe-Alleghany County boundary near the North Carolina-Virginia State line. The Blue Ridge Parkway follows the eastern edge of the drainage basin, whereas, the western edge of the drainage basin is located about midway between the North and South Forks. The elevation at the confluence with the North Fork is 700 feet below that of its headwaters. South Fork New River is the larger of the two headwater rivers of New River and has a gradient that falls approximately 8 feet per mile.

In terms of geology, the entire drainage area for the South Fork New River is in the Blue Ridge province. The bedrock geology of the Blue Ridge province is among the most complex in the United States. The area has a wide variety of metamorphic and igneous rocks. Bedrock more than 500 million years old is exposed along reaches of the channel of the South Fork New River.

Precipitation on the basin averages about 52 inches per year. Average annual snowfall is about 20 inches. The 52 inches of precipitation amounts to 294 billion gallons per year for the entire basin area of 325 square miles. Evaporation and use by plants amounts to 143 billion gallons per year and 151 billion gallons per year are discharged by the South Fork New River.

The following analysis is based upon certain criteria¹ developed jointly by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. Each individual criterion is summarized and following each is an evaluation of how well the South Fork New River meets the criterion.

The national criteria indicate that the "river and its immediate land area should be considered as a unit, with primary emphasis upon the quality of the experience and overall impressions of the recreationists using the river or the adjacent riverbank".

First, the river must be in a free-flowing natural condition. The South Fork New River meets the criterion.

Second, the river should be "accessible by roads which may occasionally bridge the river areas. Short stretches of conspicuous or longer stretches of inconspicuous and well screened roads or railroads paralleling (the) river area may be permitted". The South Fork New River has numerous road crossings and several stretches of the river are paralleled by roads.

Third, the "river or river unit must be long enough to provide a meaningful experience". Generally this would be at least 25 miles; however, shorter segments that possess outstanding qualifications may be included. The South Fork New River extends approximately 65 miles from its headwaters near Blowing Rock in Watauga County to its confluence with the North Fork New River in Ashe and Alleghany Counties.

Fourth, "there should be sufficient volume of water during normal years to permit, during the recreation season, full enjoyment of water-related outdoor recreation activities generally associated with comparable rivers". The South Fork New River, like many mountain streams, is characterized by rapid increases in flow in response to rainfall. Rates of rise of one foot per hour are common following periods of intense rainfall. The U.S. Geological Survey operates a gaging station 600 feet upstream from bridge on State Highways 16 and 88. Area of the drainage basin above the gage is 207 square miles. Lowest daily flow recorded at the gage during 45 years of record (1926-1969) is 65 cubic feet per second. The maximum peak discharge was 52,800 cubic feet per second during the 1940 flood.

¹ Guidelines for Evaluating Wild, Scenic and Recreational River Areas Proposed for Inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System Under Section 2, Public Law 90-542.

A statistical analysis of the data for the 1926-1969 period shows that average flow is 408 cubic feet per second, the 50-year flood (peak discharge expected to be equaled or exceeded once every 50 years on the average) is about 31,000 cubic feet per second, and the minimum one-day flow having a recurrence interval of 20 years is 86 cubic feet per second.

Winter and early spring are the months with the highest flows while the summer and fall months are considerably lower. The difference between the flows during the wet and dry months is due to seasonal distribution of rainfall.

Fifth, "the river and its environment should be outstandingly remarkable and, although they may reflect substantial evidence of man's activity, should be generally pleasing to the eye." Furthermore, "agricultural practices which do not adversely affect river area may be permitted." South Fork New River from its origin to the backwaters of the proposed impoundment meanders lazily through scenic pasture, meadow, and farm land. The entire area is under private ownership with very few landowners having deed to both river banks. Landowners bordering the river number in the hundreds.

Sixth, "the river should be of high quality water or susceptible to restoration to that condition." Furthermore, "water quality should meet minimum criteria for desired types of recreation except where such criteria would be exceeded by natural background conditions and esthetics and capable of supporting propagation of aquatic life normally adapted to habitat of the stream, or is capable of and is being restored to that quality." The reach from the confluence of Middle Fork South Fork New River and East Fork South Fork New River to the New River is presently classified as Class C. The headwaters of South Fork New River are influenced slightly by the discharge of treated waste from Blowing Rock and Boone. The bacteriological quality of the waters from Howards Creek downstream to the confluence with North Fork are of such quality to allow excellent recreation classification.

The preceding data convinced me that the South Fork New River meets the criteria for inclusion in the National System as a Scenic River. I am aware that H.R. 11120 includes the North Fork New River and, as I have indicated, this segment is not included in the State study. Although the focus of State planning will be on the South Fork, we pledge close cooperation with the Federal government in the study effort that will take place following passage of H.R. 11120. I understand that the Senate version of this bill, S. 2439, includes a two year limit on the study. North Carolina will support this limitation should the House choose to include it in H.R. 11120.

I urge favorable action on H.R. 11120. Thank you very much for this opportunity to express the State of North Carolina's views on the matter.

SUPPORT FOR FREE CHINA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, proposals for full diplomatic recognition of Communist China are being heard again. In remarks before this body I have opposed such proposals.

Recently, there have appeared a number of excellent analyses of what diplomatic recognition of Communist China would do. In a letter to the New York

Times, C. Martin Wilbur, professor of Chinese history at Columbia University has written:

I see no compelling reason why we should deliver a blow to the Chinese on Taiwan . . . Senator Jackson has simply fallen in with Peking's strategy to isolate Taiwan diplomatically before attempting to subdue it.

At this point I include in the RECORD the text of Professor Wilbur's letter and the text of an editorial from the San Diego Union:

[From the New York Times, July 18, 1974]

JACKSON'S CHINA PLAN

To the Editor:

Senator Henry M. Jackson returns from his trip to the People's Republic of China with the proposal that the United States raise its diplomatic liaison office in Peking to an embassy and at the same time reduce its embassy in Taipei to a diplomatic liaison office. This is a very misguided suggestion.

One can have no quarrel with the Senator's desire to improve relations with mainland China in the interests of world peace, but why should this be done at the cost of serious damage to our friend and ally, the Republic of China on Taiwan?

Our Government has recognized the Government of the Republic of China continuously since 1928. For the past two decades, our official relations have been intimate, while cultural and economic relations between Americans and Chinese on Taiwan are lively and constantly expanding. Insofar as nations can be friends, our two nations have achieved that position.

Germany is divided and ruled by two separate governments, both of which are represented in the United Nations and both of which enjoy diplomatic relations with major governments. This simple realism took years to achieve. We should apply the same principle to divided China, which is ruled by two separate governments, each of which is fully effective in its area of control. We should strive for impartially equal relations with both.

We may offer to raise our diplomatic liaison office in Peking to the status of an embassy but should make it clear that we will not reduce the status of our embassy in Taipei. The leaders in Peking might refuse—they probably have turned down that proposal before—but if they do, that is their decision. I see no compelling reason why we should deliver a blow to the Chinese on Taiwan, particularly when their Government is struggling to maintain its position in the world. Senator Jackson has simply fallen in with Peking's strategy to isolate Taiwan diplomatically before attempting to subdue it.

C. MARTIN WILBUR.

[From the San Diego Union, July 12, 1974]

SENATOR "FEVERISH"—CHINA IDEA UNREALISTIC

While President Nixon was visiting Moscow with a case of phlebitis, Sen. Henry Jackson was visiting Peking with a case of presidential fever. Apparently trying to fashion a China plank for a potential campaign platform, the senator has come away from a meeting with Chinese Communist leaders urging that we close the U.S. embassy in the Nationalist Chinese capital on Taiwan and open one in Peking instead.

The most we can say for the Jackson trip is that it has reminded us that Communist China is still there, posing all its puzzles and dangers, while the world has been preoccupied with the possibilities of an arms agreement and other fruits of detente between the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Otherwise we doubt if the senator's trip will move America any closer to full diplomatic recognition of the Peking government, or move himself any closer to the Democratic presidential nomination in 1976.

China has moved to the back burner in U.S. foreign policy, and for good reason. It is now fully evident that a fierce power struggle is taking place within the ruling circle of mainland China. The anti-Confucius campaign that began last year has flowered into an open attempt by hard-line Maoists to clip the wings of Premier Chou En-lai, who met Sen. Jackson in a hospital. The age and failing health of Both Chou and Mao Tse-tung are threatening the stability of the Peking government. Chou's moderate policies toward the West are by no means assured of continuation. The U.S. liaison office in Peking, which Sen. Jackson would elevate to the status of an embassy, has been notably without major assignments except to nurse the flickering flame of U.S.-Chinese trade.

The senator's proposal is unrealistic in the context of the political ferment in Peking and also inconsistent with the position he has taken toward detente with the Soviet Union. He has been an outspoken critic of the President's Moscow summitry, arguing that the United States should demand a softening of Kremlin attitudes toward dissenting intellectuals and would-be emigrants. His insistence on this point has been the main obstacle to passage of a trade bill which the Administration has been seeking for nearly two years.

Now, Sen. Jackson would take a major step of conciliation with a Communist regime in Peking which has a record of suppression of intellectual freedom, regimentation of its populace and suppression of emigration in a degree even more outrageous than the Stalinist days of the Soviet Union. If there are no Solzhenitsyns in China for whom the senator can go to bat it is only because dissenters of that stripe were weeded out with bullets long ago.

Sen. Jackson has embarked on a course typical of presidential hopefuls—traveling abroad to develop an image in foreign affairs. Fortunately for him, he still has two years to clear up where he really stands on the issue of trade and diplomacy with Communist governments—any of them.

THE GREAT PAYCHECK RAID

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last week I inserted in the RECORD an article by Bill Duncliff, which explored the tax burden of two fairly typical middle-income workers. Today I would like to followup with another part of Mr. Duncliff's series from the July 8 Boston Herald-American which itemizes the taxes which take approximately 38 percent from an average worker's gross income.

The text follows:

THE GREAT PAYCHECK RAID

Each week your livelihood—and that of every other person in Massachusetts—is being picked apart by a multitude of national, State and local taxes.

But while everyone is aware of how much is taken in withholding and Social Security taxes, few realize how large a slice of their income is being consumed by the many other levies to which they are subjected.

Two typical wage earners opened up their financial records and family budgets to the Herald American in order to explore just how these indirect and hidden taxes hurt them.

What was found—and what it all means, to you as well as to them—is told in this series, "The Great Paycheck Raid."

TAXES ARE TAKING 38 PERCENT OF YOUR ANNUAL INCOME (By Bill Duncliff)

The "stars" of this series are two demoralized wage earners, who every week of their working lives, are seeing their salaries pilaged in The Great Paycheck Raid.

But they are "stars" in the same unfortunate sense as the victims of a hungry and plundering horde, for while they are angered by what is happening to them they feel helpless to do anything about it.

And they are very much like the rest of us.

One is a blue-collar worker who, at 40, heads a family that includes his wife as well as five children ranging in age from ten through their teens. They live in the rented half of a duplex in one of Boston's residential neighborhoods, and their only "luxury" is a small car bought two years ago.

His factory job pays \$201 a week—and that is not enough to keep his children in socks, shoes and staple foods. His wife cannot give him a lift by taking a paying job because her more important responsibilities at home demand all the hours and energy she has.

His salary falls so far short of what his family needs for simple survival that he is forced to scratch for whatever handyman chores he can find on evenings and weekends just to provide them with the bare necessities.

He is essentially a family man and the fact that he is compelled to work other jobs disgusts him greatly—but he really has no other choice if he is to feed and clothe his children.

The second man is a white-collar worker in his mid-thirties with a college degree, a wife, and son still in the Romper Room stage of education. Every business day he drives from his new and possibly over-priced home in one of Boston's bedroom communities to his desk in the downtown office district.

His job, which entails some traveling and a good deal of responsibility, pay \$278 a week—and that is not enough either, because in order to meet their bills and live in moderate comfort, his wife must work too.

Taken together, their income last year came to \$19,000, and he is the first to say they are by no means starving. But they are not living in splendid luxury either, and what they do have was bought at the cost of extra hours of separation from each other—because they sometimes work different shifts—less time than they would like to spend with their son, and social life limited to infrequent dinner dates on weekends.

The white-collar worker is a privately happy but publicly disgruntled man—happy at what years of struggling, saving, and planning have enabled him and his wife to achieve but nagged by the growing belief that they're being hurt and held back by the never-ending avarice of those who assault their paychecks each week.

Both men are real—and may even be numbered among your neighbors—but for reasons that will soon be obvious they asked that their identities be withheld. Neither one is a rabble rouser or malcontent. Instead they are everyday people like most of us, and like most of us are responsible enough to recognize that taxes are a necessary price to pay for the rights and opportunities they enjoy.

But—again, like most of us—they cannot help but be aware when they examine their check stub each week that there is a vast disparity between what they earn and what they take home. They are beginning to grumble, to ask whether too many hands are reaching out for too much of their money—and are squandering it rather than spending it wisely.

That, briefly, is what The Great Paycheck Raid is all about, for most of us are being dunned for much more than we realize by a multitude of Federal and State taxes and by the few but immensely onerous levies that are available to local government.

A few of these taxes—Income, Social Security, the auto excise, and the everpresent property tax—are direct, in that all that's needed to see what they're costing is a glance at a check stub or bill.

But the majority are imposed more subtly. There are no less than 25 different taxes which the State inflicts on its citizens, businesses, and activities, and Washington has a long lineup of levies it relies on to keep the mills of government grinding.

And just about all are felt—eventually—by people like the blue-collar worker, the white-collar worker—and you and I.

Organizations such as the Tax Foundation, Inc., run numbers through their computers and come up with figures to show that every one of us works two hours and 38 minutes a day—just to pay taxes. And the Mass. Taxpayers Foundation comes up with other statistics to indicate that more than \$11 billion—or 38 percent of the \$30.3 billion of personal income in this State last year—was consumed by Federal, State, and local taxes.

But numbers of that magnitude are so large as to be meaningless in terms of the effect they have on the average wage earner's paycheck. To measure that, the Herald American talked at length with the factory hand and the office worker, and was allowed to examine their financial records.

From their tax returns and candid conversations, a picture of how The Great Paycheck Raid is jeopardizing the future of two men and their families was drawn—and this is what it showed. First, the factory worker and his \$201.

When he gets his check each week, the Feds take \$6.90 and the State takes \$2.90 right off the top, for income taxes.

Then the government, without any allowance at all for the fact that he has five young mouths to feed, takes another \$10.07 for Social Security payments.

That reduces his pay to \$181.63—and the Raid is only just beginning.

This year's excise tax on his car was \$104—and that breaks down to \$2 a week.

He tries to limit gas for it to ten gallons a week—but the 11½ cents he may pay in State and Federal taxes per gallon chips another \$1.15 from his earnings.

Between them, he and his wife smoke three packs of cigarettes a day. It is one of the few enjoyments—if that's the proper word—they have, but the State hits them with a tax of 16 cents a pack and the Federal government demands another eight cents—and so it costs them 72 cents a day or \$5.04 a week for that.

He stays away from "hard" liquor; he can't afford it. But three nights a week he stops on his way home from work for a glass of beer—and every glass costs him four cents in taxes.

According to tables supplied by the government, the factory worker and his wife pay \$42 a year in the State sales tax. According to his budget the figure is closer to \$78—or \$1.50 a week.

All of those combine to cut another \$9.81 from his income—and that brings it down to \$171.82. But there's more.

He has—and needs—all three household utilities, gas, electricity and a telephone, and the bills for each one of them average about \$20 a month, or \$5 a week.

All three are subject to Federal, state and local taxes—but all three pass them on in toto to their customers. In his case that means 63 cents of his cost for gas service per week goes to pay the company's tax bill, while the electric company gets him for 55 cents and N.E. Tel. & Tel. nicks him for \$1.10. That's another \$2.28 nibbled away from his income, which cuts it down to \$169.54.

And that's not all either.

Each month the factory worker must pay \$210 for his flat, and according to David Taylor of the Rental Housing Ass'n. the rule-of-thumb in Boston is that about 30 percent of any rent goes for property taxes.

On that basis he's paying \$63 a month—or \$15.75 a week—toward his landlord's real

estate bill—and that shrivels his income down to \$153.79.

And believe it or not, there's more.

Government hits industry, farmers, cattle ranchers, and every other business with corporation, real estate, transportation, excise, and other taxes—and another rule-of-thumb some experts like to quote is that half of these taxes are absorbed by shareholders and the public is saddled with the rest.

There is no totally accurate method of measuring exactly how hard a wallop that delivers to the blue-collar man's rapidly shrinking budget, but one official with a well-earned reputation for knowing what he's talking about told this reporter that taxes account for at least 20 percent of the cost of any given item, from A-frames to zoom lenses.

If that's an accurate yardstick it clips another \$30.41 from his budget—and leaves it at \$123.38.

And really, that's not all either, because he has to have Blue Cross coverage for his family at \$8.18 a week, he's dunned for \$1.50 in union dues, and another \$12 in payments on a loan he had to get in order to buy some badly-needed furniture. While those are not levies imposed by law, they could be considered "taxes" on his need for medical coverage and job protection, and on his inability to make ends meet.

That leaves him with just \$101.70 to put food on the table and clothing on his children's backs, to pay utility and heating oil bills and meet all the other demands on his paycheck—and it's just not enough.

His wife scrimps every way she can; she delays shopping for groceries until Saturday night, because after 5 o'clock her neighborhood supermarket cuts prices on many perishables rather than risk having them spoil over the weekend. She buys boy's sneakers for her girls because the soles are thicker and, hopefully, will last longer. And the factory worker spends every spare moment either looking for or doing odd jobs—because right now they are all that is between him and utter destitution.

Despite his desperate condition he holds no grudge against Boston's city administration; he thinks he and Mayor White are faced with the same essential problem of too much unavoidable outgo and not enough unencumbered income, and he is sure that, like him, White is doing the best he can with what he has.

But he's just as sure that the Federal and state governments don't give a damn about him, that they're spending high while he's forced to live low through no fault of his own. And what really drives him up the wall is the cavalier way many better-fed politicians and experts judge his situation.

In the past several weeks many of them told this reporter that while a 38 percent level of taxation in this state may be a lot, it is not oppressively so. They said that Sweden, Great Britain, Italy and—closer to home North Carolina—either tax their people more or give them a lot less in services.

"What the hell do I care about how tough they're having it in Europe?" he explodes, "and what does it matter to me if they're not getting as much for their tax money down south?"

"I'm not living in any of those places! I'm living here, in Massachusetts—and it's here where I'm being killed!"

LAW ENFORCEMENT CONFERENCE

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my pleasure to sponsor a law en-

forcement conference in the Sixth District of Maryland. The purpose of the conference was to bring local, county, State, and Federal law enforcement officers and elected officials together to discuss State and Federal law enforcement programs.

Mr. George Bohlinger III, represented the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration giving the Federal view of law enforcement programs. Richard Wertz, executive director of the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice presented the latest information on State programs. This was followed by a panel consisting of Chief Judge Robert Sweeney of the Maryland district courts, Mr. Bohlinger, Mr. Wertz, Sheriff Charles E. Price of Washington County, and Chief Charles V. Main of the Frederick City Police.

This type of forum provides an excellent setting for the exchange of ideas and the presentation of information on trends in law enforcement programs. This conference included for the first time a discussion of the role of corrections in the overall law enforcement picture. I would like to express my gratitude to the participants and to Frederick Community College for the use of their facilities.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK 1974

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, in my view Captive Nations Week, the third week in July of each year, is a very serious and important matter. All the more serious and important this year, because the newspapers of America are filled with talk of détente and East-West trade. A great deal has happened in the world since 1959 when the first Presidential proclamation on this topic was issued. Little of what has taken place has been of much benefit to the Free World, in my view. Therefore, I am taking the liberty of including the text of a speech I gave at Cobo Hall in Detroit, Mich., on July 14, 1974, on the subject, which spells out my view in a little more detail:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK COMMEMORATION, JULY 14, 1974

Governor Milliken, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the opportunity to join you in observing Captive Nations Week.

The plight of the Captive Nations is not a subject you hear mentioned by television news commentators, or read about on the editorial pages of your newspaper. Dr. Gallup does not publish the opinion of the American public on the subject of the Captive Nations.

There are some, including government leaders, who say that Captive Nations issue is not important anymore—that it is a relic of the Cold War. The official attitude of our government is much different today than it was in 1959 when President Eisenhower signed the original Captive Nations Resolution, which is printed in your program today.

The original resolution was a ringing declaration of the commitment of the people of the United States to freedom for all peoples.

Proclamations since that time have become bland and meaningless to the true cause of freedom.

What has changed since 1959? Has the Soviet Union changed? Soviet citizens still do not have freedom of emigration, the forced labor camps are still there, and intellectual dissent is stifled. Soviet actions in Southeast Asia, Czechoslovakia, and the Middle East provide dramatic testimony that the Soviets have not become more peaceful.

Today, our government is engaged in a quest for "peace" with the Soviet Union. The instruments chosen for building this peace are trade and arms limitations.

What does history teach about such tactics? Does trade bring peace? History shows that the United States has had nearly all its wars with its principal trading partners—England, Germany and Japan. What about arms limitations? Did the treaties prior to World War II save us from going to war? Did the pact renouncing war as an instrument of policy prevent Hitler from marching? History provides the answer, and it is a lesson we ignore at our own peril.

Since our Executive Branch now speaks only of trade and detente, it is up to the Congress of the United States to speak of freedom, human rights, and self-determination of peoples. If no one appears to be listening, the Congress can and should write laws to forbid the President from making trade concessions to the Soviet Union until such time as we see real concessions, such as freedom of emigration.

"Peaceful coexistence", as defined by the Communists, means continuation of the struggle to achieve world communism by means other than open warfare. In the long run, the hopes and aspirations of the Captive Nations could be more significant than the megatonnage of our respective nuclear weapons. How these captive peoples view the United States as opposed to their Communist masters could decide the future of the world.

The Soviet dictators still believe there will never be a peaceful world until all the world is communist. The only effective counter I know to that view is that there will never be a truly peaceful world until all men are free everywhere. To view the world otherwise, just in terms of trade or cultural exchange, would be to sell ourselves, our heritage, and our future generations for thirty pieces of silver.

I am also including, as a second item, extracts from a speech given by the Honorable Yaroslav Stetsko at the seventh World Anti-Communist League Conference, held in Washington, D.C., from April 11-14, 1974. Mr. Stetsko's remarks were delivered on April 9. Extracts from his speech follow as I feel they are worthy of the attention of my colleagues:

EXTRACTS OF SPEECH BY HON. YAROSLAV STETSKO

Common to all of us are fear, hope and the endeavour to find some way out of the critical situation in which not only subjugated nations in the Russian empire have found themselves.

I am speaking not only about problems concerning one part of the world but equally free and subjugated people, and more, concerning nations subjugated and free! It is said: "Humanity is confronted with the possibility of being destroyed by thermo-nuclear war". Does such a danger really exist? Is there really no other way out than the capitulation before the tyrants or appeasement and detente at the cost of hundreds of millions of the subjugated people and dozens of the subjugated nations recognizing their slavery and the ruling of the Russian tyrants over them.

Do we not really have another superpower—the existence of which has gone unnoticed, not so much in terms of material

and technological as in spiritual, ideological and political values—which plays a decisive role in the developments that are irrevocably coming upon us?

Shall it be detente with tyrannies and balance of power on a worldwide scale, i.e. capitulation before tyrants, or the reliance on the eternal spiritual values of man and nations as the solution to the world crisis?

Besides the technological elements of superpowers, in particular the thermo-nuclear elements, there is an element which is more important—namely, the spiritual element.

The spiritual superpower is that of the subjugated people and nations in the Russian empire and under the communist yoke, who are desiring freedom and justice and are ready to sacrifice everything material, for that, even their own lives.

Why should the natural process of disintegration of empires in the whole world stop at the frontiers of the Russian prison of nations?

The more that this Russian empire imposes on the subjugated people and nations its own way of life, starting from the metaphysical doctrine down to the Kolkhoz system, something unprecedented in all kinds of empires in history up till now.

Why should this empire not finally become bankrupt instead of being preserved as a "new world system of ideas and values"?

The spiritual and political superpower of our epoch—is hundreds of millions of human beings and dozens of subjugated nations in the Russian empire and under the communist yoke. It is this reality, this real factor of world politics which will decide upon the future of mankind.

Is there besides USA, a second superpower in the world? The Russian prison of nations so-called superpower is a 'colossus on feet of clay'.

It is not sufficient to have the most modern type of weaponry and warfare technology, it is also necessary to possess the sympathy of the souls of people and of nations.

Does Russia or communism possess on her side the souls of Ukrainians, Turkestani, Georgians, Azerbaijani, Byelorussians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Bulgarians, Hungarians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, North Caucasians, Jews, Tartars, Rumanians, Croats, Albanians, Don Cossacks, Germans? Even Professor Sakharov (Russian) has to acknowledge the mighty (disruptive) power of liberation national idea although he is fighting for human rights only but not for the rights of nations.

We raise as the central problem the right of nation, liberation nationalism, because never until now the human rights of a subjugated nation have been realised unless the precondition was realised: National independence, democratic, but above all sovereign own state. We support the movement for human rights but the ideas of this movement will not be realised in the nationally subjugated countries in the empire.

In order to realise human rights George Washington had to gain national independence for America. There does not exist any other individual in the world without a concrete national imprint and there are no human rights realised without realisation of rights of the nation to which it belongs. And what of the democratic empires? Did they guarantee human rights in the countries they subjugated in the past?

In the "International Herald Tribune" of March 3d, we read: "Alexander Solzhenitsyn, the Russian dissident writer, has addressed a long letter to the Soviet leaders asking them to abandon communism as an alien, unworkable political philosophy, dismantle the Soviet Union and focus on developing Russia proper as a separate state."

In addition to abandoning Soviet sway over the countries of Eastern Europe, the Kremlin would also be expected by the author to drop its control over the Soviet Union's 14 non-Russian republics.

They are Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in the Baltic; Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia in Transcaucasia; Kazakhstan, Kirghizia, Tadzhikistan, Turkmenia and Uzbekistan in Central Asia; Ukraine, and two smaller republics not mentioned by Mr. Solzhenitsyn—Byelorussia and Moldavia. All have strong nationalist sentiments.

"Nationalism"—writes Solzhenitsyn in the well known letter to the Soviet leaders—"was declared by your ideology already dead in 1848. But is it possible to find today a greater power in the world than nationalism?"

And Brezhnev in a speech on the 50th anniversary of the USSR said that "nationalist superstition is an unusually vital phenomenon which has a firm grip on people's psychology . . ." He also stated "it must not be forgotten that nationalist prejudices are a very vital phenomenon rooted in people's psychology. One must also take into consideration that manifestations of nationalist tendencies are often interwoven with local patriotism that in turn is associated with nationalism."

Liberation nationalism—opposed to imperialism—has become the symbol and banner of our age. "Without nationalism"—write the fighters in our native lands—"there is no progress; without nationalism there is no nation." Under the banner of nationalism, the national liberation movement in the whole world is taking place. More than half of humanity considers it its own banner.

And the greatest achievement of our liberation struggle, a guarantee of our victory is the fact that the struggle for the soul of the subjugated nations was taken up by the young generation, which at times was born of parents already grown up under the Bolshevik occupation, a generation which has never seen the free world, but to the contrary, was reared in an atmosphere hostile to its own nation, in the spirit of the occupant.

The banner of traditionalism of a millennium, the primacy of the spirit, the immortality of the soul, the banner of the nation, of the eternity of a nation was raised by the generation of the sixties and the seventies, was carried by sons and daughters not only of inmates of prisons and concentration camps, but also of average workers, collective farmers and even technocrats.

This is the greatest blow suffered by the Communist ideology and system of life, the Russian system of occupation, in recent decades.

For this reason, it will be impossible to crush the national aspirations. As a rule the revolution of soldiers was preceded by the revolution of poets and creators of spiritual values.

The ideological, spiritual, moral and political revolution, is a precondition of armed revolution. The creativity of the young generation has a clear national political aim: The national state.

SUPPORT FOR AMNESTY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as this Nation endeavors to recover from the wounds of the Vietnam era, an issue that must soon be legally and spiritually confronted is that of amnesty for those who chose not to participate in the Indochina war.

In a recent meeting, the Parish Council of St. Gregory the Great in New York issued a resolution stating their support for amnesty. The statement, which I

deeply support, is now submitted for the thoughtful attention of my colleagues.

Let us not consider this issue in the light of petty partisan politics but rather in the clear light of reason, compassion, and decency.

The resolution follows:

PARISH OF ST. GREGORY THE GREAT,
New York, N.Y., June 24, 1974.

HON. CHARLES RANGEL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANGEL: In the month of May, after long and complicated debate, the Parish Council of St. Gregory the Great, representing the people of the parish, passed the following resolution on the question of Amnesty. We forward this resolution to you for your consideration and, hopefully, for your support in your work in the halls of Congress. The resolution read as follows:

Be it resolved that the Parish of St. Gregory the Great urge its political representatives in Congress to work for an immediate and general amnesty for those who have left the country or who have been imprisoned because of their opposition to compulsory military service in the Indo-China War, and that amnesty be granted on an individual basis to those who have deserted the Armed Forces for reasons of Conscience.

We thank you for your efforts on our behalf, and we strongly urge you to support the spirit of our resolution. With best wishes and prayers for your work, I remain

Respectfully yours,

Rev. JOHN J. MANNING,
Secretary, Parish Council.

A LONG LOOK AT THE SSS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the July 15, 1974, Wall Street Journal, points out that the Social Security System is in poor financial condition. The paper quotes from a recent cover story in the U.S. News & World Report.

I found the figures about the Social Security System most disturbing and I believe my fellow Members of Congress will also find them disturbing. I trust this body has not been derelict in watching over the Social Security System. I believe it is time for us to do something about this most distressing problem.

The article follows:

A LONG LOOK AT THE SSS

We read with interest last week's cover story in U.S. News and World Report on the Social Security System, which concludes that the system is in desperately poor financial condition. "The failure to reform Social Security, almost everyone agrees, could lead in the long run to disaster."

It is worse than that. USN&WR says that by 1990, even though a worker pays a maximum Social Security tax of \$2,070.45, which has to be matched by his employer, the system will be paying out \$20 billion more in benefits than it takes in that year. Unhappily, the assumptions cranked into these numbers are those of the Social Security Administration, numbers that are obsolete and ridiculously optimistic. Unless taxes are increased substantially, deficits on the order of \$20 billion could arrive by 1980, growing by leaps and bounds from there.

The most disheartening number, an official one, is provided by the Treasury Department. As of June 30, 1973, the unfunded

liability of the system was \$2.1 trillion. Another way of putting it is this: in a very real economic sense, the national debt is at least \$2.1 trillion larger than the politicians say it is. If, as of June 30, 1973, the system had refused to accept new workers, saying it would only collect taxes and pay benefits to those already covered, its outlays over the next 75 years would exceed receipts by \$2.1 trillion, plus market rates of interest compounded annually. In the last year, the number has grown by about \$300 billion.

So far, Congress has blinked away this enormous pool of debt by passing a law that defines "actuarial soundness." Its reasoning is that the SSS would never close off to new work force entrants, hence there would always be new workers to pay the benefits to the new recipients. By the congressional "dynamic assumptions" definition of actuarial soundness, the system is only in deficit by \$62 billion, spread over the next 75 years.

As it happens, for the dynamic assumptions method to hold up the assumptions have to be as dynamic in reality as they were on the planning boards. They have not been. Working on the 1960 Census figures, the Social Security bureaucrats projected a 1964-1975 birth rate gradually declining from 21 per 1,000 to 20 per 1,000, then climbing again. Instead, the birth rate dropped like a stone throughout the period and now stands at around 15 per 1,000. The bureaucrats projected a growth in real wages over the period of 2.1% a year; between 1965 and 1973 the real wage growth averaged 1.7%.

The errors imply much higher taxes are required to sustain benefit levels, and of course imply economic insanity if Congress continues to hike benefit levels. How much higher taxes? In their "Actuarial Audit of the Social Security System," Robert Kaplan of Carnegie-Mellon University and Roman Weil of the University of Chicago assert that realistic assumptions "imply taxes 50% to 75% higher than current levels." The SSS actuaries will not be able to avoid admitting some of this when they put out their new assumptions based on the 1970 Census. The Kaplan-Weil argument is that the dynamics have worsened since 1970 and should be faced up to now.

What's to be done? The first thing is that the public has to be told, by the politicians, that it is not possible to maintain the current rate schedule and benefit level. One or both have to be adjusted. It is of vital importance that the public be told that most of the work force is now counting on the purchasing power the current benefit levels yield for their retirement years.

Congress may cringe at the idea of trimming these benefit levels, but sharp tax boosts won't be popular either. Liberals will want to dip into the general fund to keep the system going a little longer, but within two or three years this method will be cleaning out the Treasury. All other "worthwhile" government programs will have to be chopped out to sustain Social Security. That, too, appears to be politically impossible. Indeed, there are no politically appealing ways to straighten out this mess. But the longer the nation waits to do it, the more it will hurt.

METRO-GOLDWYN-MAYER

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, one of our most important motion picture companies, celebrates its 50th anniversary this year. The MGM Studios in Culver City, Calif., have enjoyed a worldwide fame for the

hundreds of motion pictures which have delighted and thrilled generations of moviegoers. The films have brought honor not only to the State of California, but also to the American people, whose aspirations and high standards of entertainment these films reflect.

For many years Hollywood was the acknowledged motion picture capital of the world, and for most of that period Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer was the preeminent motion picture company.

For this we have to thank the creative and talented people who worked at MGM. In one area, particularly, these filmmakers and players made the full-maned MGM lion a world-famous trademark. This was the motion picture musical, of which MGM produced more than 100.

Fortunately for all of us who remember these movies with affection, MGM has seen fit to celebrate its 50th anniversary with a marvelous musical film, "That's Entertainment!" which is a compilation of unforgettable magical moments from many of these pictures.

Special recognition should go to Jack Haley, Jr., who wrote, produced and directed the movie, to executive producer Daniel Melnick and to the many other dedicated people at MGM who helped bring this film to the screen. It obviously is a labor of love as well as a work of exceptional merit. And it must have had special meaning for Mr. Haley, whose father, Jack Haley, was starred in one of the great MGM musical classics, "The Wizard of Oz," which is represented in "That's Entertainment!"

The film is narrated by Fred Astaire, Bing Crosby, Gene Kelly, Peter Lawford, Liza Minnelli, Donald O'Connor, Debbie Reynolds, Mickey Rooney, Frank Sinatra, James Stewart, and Elizabeth Taylor. All of these great stars appear in the film. The one exception is Liza Minnelli, who talks with great love and admiration of her mother, Judy Garland, one of the motion picture industry's outstanding stars.

It is encouraging to learn that today's new generation of filmgoers, many of whom were weaned on cinematic violence, are seeing and enjoying "That's Entertainment!," and now have a new and deep respect for the stars and filmmakers of yesterday.

TOBACCO FARMERS

HON. BO GINN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, the tobacco farmers in Georgia and other States are caught in the grip of a potentially disastrous price squeeze. Even though production costs have increased drastically in the past year, the price farmers are receiving for their crop this year is the same or less than a year ago.

To try to provide emergency relief in this crisis period, I have personally contacted Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz to urge him to take administrative action to assist our tobacco farmers. I have

also joined as a sponsor of legislation to increase the tobacco support price by 10 percent. What we need now is action.

I testified this afternoon before the Subcommittee on Tobacco of the House Committee on Agriculture in regard to this problem. I would like to have the text of my statement to the subcommittee appear in the RECORD at this point along with the text of a statement I issued on July 16:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN BO GINN BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TOBACCO

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I welcome this opportunity to present my statement as part of your examination of the crisis that faces our tobacco farmers.

The facts are simple. In my own First Congressional District, opening market prices were down two to three cents below the prices received last year. The cost of production is up 28 to 35 percent or more in our area. If we do not have higher prices, then many farmers face the prospect of bankruptcy. Others, who are better able to withstand a bad year, are likely to abandon or severely reduce tobacco production next year.

I am not going to try to fix the blame in this situation simply to produce a scapegoat. But I believe we must understand the cause in order to produce a cure. Prior to the current growing season the major tobacco companies assaulted the Department of Agriculture with pleas for increased production. They said that increased production was essential to meet increasing domestic and foreign demand and that they would be prepared to pay the price for this increased production. A 10 percent allotment increase was granted, and now we see the cruel effect of that shortsighted action.

The tobacco companies have pulled off the greatest agricultural hoax of the year. Their maneuver is the slickest trick I have seen since we virtually gave away grain supplies to the Soviets in the Russian wheat deal.

What we have now is the fact that the farmer answered the call of the Department of Agriculture to increase tobacco production during a period of extraordinarily high inflation. Now that the crop is ready and must be sold, the tobacco companies are black-mailing the farmers into selling at below cost. Mr. Chairman, I believe this tactic is going to backfire when farmers pull out of tobacco production to avoid future problems such as this. Then the tobacco companies will be running back to Washington pleading for help.

The Department of Agriculture is responding to the crisis by saying that prices will go up when primings and lugs are sold and we go into sales for the upper stalk leaves. Certainly the price will go up. The price always goes up when we get into the upper stalk leaves. But the point is that as things stand now, this higher grade of tobacco will still be selling at about the same price that was received last year despite the fact that inflation has raised costs dramatically.

Labor costs, of course, are higher this year. And I know that I am not telling the Members of this Subcommittee any news when I point out that fertilizer and insecticide prices have gone through the roof.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is essential that the Congress take a hard look at the root causes of this crisis. There is a very serious question about possible restraint of trade agreements. There is a very serious question about the pressures brought to bear regarding the increase in allotments. We should have a thorough probe of the tobacco companies entire policy on marketing. We should have a thorough probe of the Department of Agriculture's role in this affair.

I am grateful for the opportunity to present this statement to you, and I am confi-

dent that this outstanding Subcommittee and Committee will move aggressively into a full review of the problem.

Thank you.

NEWS RELEASE

WASHINGTON.—Congressman Bo Ginn said Tuesday that the opening day of tobacco sales indicates that Georgia farmers were lured into increased production this year by false promises from the major tobacco companies that increased demand would justify increased planting.

Instead, Ginn noted, the opening day of sales showed that prices are at about the same level as last year even though the costs of growing tobacco have gone up 25 percent or more.

"The tobacco companies persuaded the Department of Agriculture to increase production by saying they would need a big crop this year to meet increasing domestic and foreign demands," Ginn said, "but it appears now that they simply wanted to keep their own prices down by getting farmers to grow a bumper crop."

"The result has been that the companies and the federal government have lured farmers into major investments in this year's crop that now will be lost if market prices do not increase," he said.

Ginn said he would compile statistics on the Georgia prices and personally bring them to the attention of Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz.

The First District Congressman said he is hopeful that the companies will increase prices when they realize "they are about to force many farmers to the brink of financial ruin."

LOUISIANA LEGISLATURE GOES ON RECORD URGING REPEAL OF PSRO

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Louisiana Legislature has recently approved House Concurrent Resolution No. 111 "urging Congress to repeal the Professional Standards Review Organization Law."

The Louisiana Legislature very correctly pointed out in enacting this legislation that—

Operation of Professional Standard Review Organizations will cause great harm and financial hardship to the elderly and poor people of our country because of . . . unrealistic requirements on physicians to practice their profession based on standards and norms approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The bill approved by both the house and senate of the Louisiana Legislature goes on further to point out that—

These segments of our population will suffer greatly if denied medical care and hospitalization deemed necessary by their physician but not in conformance with HEW standards based on averages and medians rather than human needs.

Mr. Speaker, to this date over 125 Members of the House have joined in sponsoring PSRO repeal legislation. The action by the Louisiana Legislature only further emphasizes the need for Congress to act now to repeal the PSRO law.

I insert a copy of the resolution adopted by the Louisiana Legislature in the RECORD at this point:

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION URGING CONGRESS TO REPEAL THE PROFESSIONAL STANDARD REVIEW ORGANIZATION LAW; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

(Regular session, 1974, House Concurrent Resolution No. 111, by Messrs. Landry, Leblanc, Jenkins, Scogin, O'Neal, Humphries, Stephenson and Marullo)

Whereas, Section 249-F of Public Law 92-603, Professional Standard Review Organization (PSRO), was enacted by the Congress of the United States in 1972 without due consideration and careful deliberation by both its bodies; and

Whereas, operation of Professional Standard Review Organization will cause great harm and financial hardship to the elderly and poor people of our country because of its unrealistic requirements on physicians to practice their profession based on standards and norms approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

Whereas, these segments of our population will suffer greatly if denied medical care and hospitalization deemed necessary by their physician but not in conformance with HEW standards based on averages and medians rather than human needs; and

Whereas, this law may well inhibit the great advancement seen in American medicine during this century of progress in conquering many of man's dread diseases.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Louisiana Legislature, the Senate thereof concurring herein, that this body notify the Congress of the United States that the Professional Standard Review Organization Law is ill-conceived legislation, harmful to the public and pernicious in its effect on the practice of medicine.

Be it further resolved that the Congress be urged to repeal the Professional Standard Review Organization Law as quickly as possible to prevent the damage it will cause to the public and the American health care system.

Be it further resolved, that this Legislature encourage Louisiana physicians to continue the ethical practice of their profession, to maintain the privacy and confidentiality of their patients' records, to retain their right to make medical decisions based on their own professional judgement, and to support the existing system of peer and utilization review available in hospitals and nursing homes, medical societies and associations.

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to transmit an appropriate copy of the Resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Louisiana Congressional Delegation.

CONGRESSMAN DOMINICK V. DANIELS HAILS GENE FARRELL ON LATTER'S RETIREMENT—"A GREAT NEWSPAPERMAN" CALLS IT QUITS AT THE JERSEY JOURNAL

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 1974, one of the best of the old breed of newspapermen is calling it quits at the Jersey Journal after 46 years in the newspaper game. Eugene Farrell has announced his retirement as executive editor of the Jersey

Journal, the Jersey City, N.J., based organ of the Newhouse chain.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no one in the newspaper business who exemplifies the ideals of the profession more than Gene Farrell. Careful and precise, he always valued accuracy in his work. In this he was the very model of the old breed of newsmen.

Long before the term "advocacy journalism" came into vogue, Gene was crusading for a better Jersey City. His contributions to our city and county are so many that space and time preclude me from listing them all here in the House Chamber. Following my remarks, I shall insert an account of his career from the July 18, 1974, edition of the Jersey Journal which tells the story of his remarkable career.

Jersey City has lost a tireless zealot for better government. I hope that Gene stays in Jersey City where he can give encouragement to his successors and to those who hold public office. Certainly we will miss his pen, but his advice will be valuable and I hope he favors us with it in the future as he did in the past.

Mr. Speaker, as Gene Farrell goes into retirement, I extend to him and his lovely and talented wife, Lois, my very best wishes. Jersey City is the better for Gene Farrell's contributions.

The article follows:

FARRELL RETIRES AFTER 46 YEARS

Eugene G. Farrell, executive editor of The Jersey Journal, announced today he will retire Aug. 1 after 46 years in the newspaper business.

He spent 36 of them as an editor of Newhouse newspapers in five cities and had been the editor or the executive editor of this newspaper since 1951. Prior to that he served in Jamaica, Long Island City, Newark, and Harrisburg, Pa.

Today he recalled that it was in the summer of 1928, a few weeks after his graduation from Notre Dame, that he walked into a newspaper office and wrote his first story, a three-paragraph piece on a parochial school play.

"In between," he said, "there have been years of wonderfully interesting work and many fine people."

In between, too, he built a record of civic enterprise achievement with his editorial campaigns in each of his cities. He had the pleasure of seeing one come to fruition a week ago when the Charter Study Commission recommended a new form of government for Hudson, something for which he had long argued.

He was in such civic enterprises from his earlier career when, as a reporter in Jamaica, he worked on stories which led to the creation of the Long Island parkway system during the administration of Governor Franklin Roosevelt in New York.

In Long Island City his editorials helped bring about the founding of Queens College.

In Newark, another series of editorials convinced the city commission to let the Port Authority run the airport and the seaport, a management which changed those facilities from rundown liabilities to flourishing assets.

A firm believer in P.A. efficiency, he campaigned later in this newspaper for takeover of the Hoboken piers and for Port Authority operation of the Hudson Tubes—now PATH.

In Harrisburg he carried on a campaign against the slums near the capitol where a cluster of state buildings since has been erected.

What does he rate as his greatest civic success with editorials?

"Undoubtedly the change of government in

Jersey City because that did two things the city needed: It put the worm in the apple of boss rule, making possible the election of officials like Mayor Jordan. And it opened the way for minority groups to elect members of the council through district representation."

The Jersey Journal editorial campaign which he directed 15 years ago included hundreds of stories and dozens of editorials. It succeeded by rallying the housewives of the city against the politicians and they prevailed even against the opposition of John V. Kenny's political machine.

Since 1970, as executive editor, Farrell oversaw the paper's political coverage. His interest in politics goes back to his days of covering New York's city hall when Jimmy Walker was the mayor.

Only this year he won a New Jersey Press Association state first prize for interpretive writing with a series analyzing the mechanics of Paul Jordan's 1973 campaign.

Farrell also gave his time freely to public service. During the 1950s Gov. Robert B. Meyner appointed him to the original New Jersey State Market Commission on which he served four years, first as vice chairman and later as chairman. The commission studied the feasibility of a food distribution center in Hudson County, an idea rejected by the county at the time but generating new interest now. He resigned from that post when he felt he had completed his work.

In 1966 he was named chairman of the original board of managers of the Jersey City Medical Center, which pulled the hospital complex out of serious financial difficulties and began the reorganization and rebuilding which continues today. He stepped down from the board of managers in 1970 when he became 65 years old.

Born in Brooklyn, Feb. 12, 1905, Farrell was the son of a career Navy man who had fought in a gun crew of the USS Iowa in the Spanish-American War. As a boy, because of his father's assignment there, he lived for nearly four years at the Olongapo, Philippine Islands naval station in Subic Bay. The sleepy little Navy installation became one of the major bases of World War II in the Pacific.

Returning to Brooklyn he was graduated from St. Brigid's School as valedictorian, was in the first June class graduated at Brooklyn Technical High School, worked for a year, and then entered Notre Dame where he won an A.B. degree with honors. His plan to teach school and study law was frustrated by preliminaries to the Depression; school teachers were not being appointed. Deciding that journalism was a kind of teaching, he got a job on the Long Island Daily Press in Jamaica. Within a few years the paper was purchased and Farrell became one of the young executives who grew up with the Newhouse newspaper group.

Jim Bishop, the columnist, in his book "Reporter," listed Farrell among the outstanding city editors he had known.

Farrell has three sons from his first marriage to the late Margaret F. Reidy of Brooklyn. He and Lois Fegan, woman's editor of this newspaper, were married in 1952. After several years in a riverfront apartment in West New York, they purchased a home in Downtown Jersey City where they still live.

How does he feel about leaving daily newspaper work after all that time? "I'm looking forward to change," was the answer.

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 988

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when the House considers House Resolu-

tion 988, I along with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ) will offer an amendment to establish a permanent Select Committee on Aging.

This new committee will not have legislative jurisdiction, but will have oversight functions along the same lines as the Special Committee on Aging in the Senate. More than 115 Members of the House have sponsored legislation to establish a committee concerned with the problems of aging and older Americans. One-fifth of our citizens are over 55 years of age, and the proportion is increasing. Yet the House has no focused means of examining their special needs and problems, and making recommendations to the appropriate legislative committees. Members who serve on a Select Committee on Aging can gain valuable insights which they can then bring to their regular legislative duties on exclusive committees.

Mr. Speaker, following is the text of the proposed amendment which we will offer to both House Resolution 988 and the Hansen substitute, plus a list of those Members who have sponsored similar legislation in the House:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 988

Page 40, immediately after line 10, insert the following new paragraph:

"(f) There shall be in the House the permanent Select Committee on Aging which shall not have legislative jurisdiction but which shall have jurisdiction as follows:

"(1) Conducting a continuing comprehensive study and review of the problems of the older American, including, but not limited to, income maintenance, housing, health (including medical research), welfare, employment, education, recreation, and participation in family and community life as self-respecting citizens.

"(2) Studying methods of using all practicable means and methods of encouraging the development of public and private programs and policies which will assist the older American in taking a full part in national life and which will encourage the utilization of the knowledge, skills, and special aptitudes and abilities of older Americans to contribute to a better quality of life for all Americans.

"(3) Developing policies that would encourage the coordination of both governmental and private programs designed to deal with problems of aging.

"(4) Reviewing any recommendations made by the President or by the White House Conference on Aging relating to programs or policies affecting older Americans."

Page 40, line 10, strike out the quotation marks.

SPONSORS OF LEGISLATION IN THE 93D CONGRESS TO ESTABLISH A PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING

Abdnor, Abzug, Andrews, Ashley, Badillo, Bell, Benitez, Boggs, Brasco, Broomfield, Buchanan, Burgener, Burke (Fla.), Carney (Ohio), Carter, Chisholm, Cohen, Collins, C., Corman, Conte, Daniel, Danielson, Davis, Dent, Drinan, Edwards (Cal.), Edwards (Ala.), Eilberg, Forsythe, Fraser, Frey, Froehlich, Fulton, Fuqua, Grasso, Green (Ore.), Green (Penn.), Gude, Gunter, Hanley, and Hanna.

Harrington, Heckler (Mass.), Heinz, Helstoski, Hillis, Hinshaw, Howard, Hungate, Jarman, Johnson (Penn.), Kemp, Ketchum, Koch, Kyros, Lagomarsino, Lent, Long, Luken, McCormack, McDade, McFall, McKinney, Mathis (Ga.), Mayne, Moakley, Mosher, Moss, Murphy (Ill.), Murtha, Owens, Peyser, Pike, Podell, Preyer, Price (Ill.),

Pritchard, Randall, Rangel, Rees, Regula, Riegle.

Robison (N.Y.), Rodino, Roe, Roncallo (Wyo.), Roncallo (N.Y.), Rosenthal, Roy, Roybal, Ruppe, Sarasin, Sarbanes, Satterfield, Schroeder, Sebelius, Selberling, Skubitz, Stark, Steele, Steelman, Studds, Talcott, Teague (Calif.), Thone, Tiernan, Veysey, Walsh, Wilson, Bob (Calif.), Wilson, Charles H. (Calif.), Winn, Won Pat, Yatron, Young (Ill.), and Young (Ga.).

U.S. JAYCEES HONOR PITTSBURGH SELF-HELP GROUPS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Jaycees have just published a book, "Uplift: What People Themselves Can Do," which analyzes the scope and success of small scale self-help projects, operating in low-income communities throughout the country.

I am pleased and proud to report that the Jaycees chose four such operations in my congressional district.

These four projects, along with 96 others, were picked from some 1,000 similar activities isolated by the Jaycee research project.

I wish to include in the RECORD at this time a brief description of the neighborhood programs singled out by the Jaycees, and offer my sincere congratulations for jobs well done to Pittsburghers: Mr. Leon Hickman, director of the homemaker skills program; Mr. Richard Barber, director of urban talent development; Mr. Bernard Jones, director of urban youth action; and Mr. James Givner, director of Operation Better Block.

The material follows:

URBAN YOUTH ACTION

PITTSBURGH, Pa.—Down the street from the Duquesne Club, where Pittsburgh's corporate leaders meet, young black people are striving to get their cut of the free enterprise system's employment pie.

They are participants in Urban Youth Action (UYA), a program established in 1967 and overseen by a group of mostly young black businessmen. UYA is primarily in the business of teaching the young people of Pittsburgh about the business world and developing their employment potential.

Much of UYA's work involves finding jobs and providing training for young people in the low-income Hill and Homewood-Brushston districts of the city. Bernard H. Jones, the man behind the idea and now the chairman of the UYA board, sees the program as having a far more profound influence on young lives than simply an economic one. "Coming out of UYA," he says, "are a cadre of revolutionaries. They will revolt against the dismal futures their brothers and sisters have faced in the black ghettos. They are building self-esteem."

More than 4,000 youngsters have participated in the program since its inception. The current "class" numbers 450—nearly all elementary and high school students. There is also an active "alumni" group that promotes UYA projects in its dealings with local business and the community.

UYA adheres to the principle of "learning by doing," and that includes the staff, which is composed for the most part of high school volunteers. There is a full-time director, C. Richard Gilcrease, who began with UYA when he was 19 years old and it was just beginning. He has three full-time adult assistants, a

secretary, and a controller, all of whom were in the program as students.

UYA headquarters is a busy place, as can be seen by a glance at the various department activities. It has departments for employment, and also for education, community service, and economic development.

Employment. Urban Youth Action is an organization run much like a business. Gillcresce says the older youths who work there in managerial positions are constantly grooming younger workers to assume their jobs when they graduate from school.

There is an incentive system for trainees. When a student first applies to join the program, he must fill out an application form, be interviewed, and discuss his salary and hours of work, as if he were applying for a job.

"We do this so they will know what they will be facing when they try to get a job after they leave high school," the director says.

The staff of the Urban Youth Action employment relations department stays in touch with major companies in the area to learn of employment opportunities. They also work with placement agencies and try to guide UYA members into particular jobs that are available.

A key part of this placement program is a summer job program that has found employment for more than 500 youngsters over the past seven years or so. Many of the youths have stayed on as permanent employees after graduating from school.

Education. Several volunteers are engaged in educational projects. Part of the young staff is keeping abreast of opportunities offered by colleges and technical and vocational schools. Information is gathered from these institutions on a regular basis and made available to UYA members and other students interested in continuing their education.

The UYA staff members of the organization's board of directors also provide counseling as to what institutions UYA members should apply to and how to go about it.

One of the UYA's most successful education programs—for elementary school students—is also its oldest. Bernard Jones relates how it got started:

"We went to a school and told the principal we would like to hire the entire fifth- and sixth-grade classes for three weeks and pay them a dollar an hour for three hours of work." The students worked in the school office and with teachers and custodians, and also did a variety of odd jobs.

"In that three-week period," says Jones, recounting the experience, "it helped youngsters get interested in English. It helped the math teacher get some new courses up."

"For example the students got some catalogues from the stores. They figured out what presents they wanted to buy for their parents. They had to read the catalogues, so the English teacher got them involved in reading. They figured how much money they were going to make, how much their gifts came to. So that got them involved in math."

"One parent said she had always had trouble getting her son to go to school but during that three weeks, he was getting her up in the morning! There were kids waiting outside of school for the teachers to arrive to get in there so they could go to work."

"This project was so successful that after the three-week period the parents and teachers and all met with us and said, 'You've got to continue it.'"

Jones says that UYA, which exists primarily on donations, has managed to come up with enough money to pay about twenty-five of the school's students 75 cents an hour for three hours a week. UYA has also extended the program to other elementary schools.

"One of the best letters I ever received," Jones says, "was from a girl who had returned to school from pregnancy. She was

able to work [in the junior high school program], and she thanked me because she was able to buy clothes and things for her daughter.

"By working she relieved the pressure she had of supporting her kid at home. Although her kid lives at home with her parents like she does, she still wanted to do something to support her."

Community Services. Work aspects of the community services program are also administered by the employment relations office. Service workers must be high school students and must attend a weekly UYA training session conducted by a business professional. These young workers perform a number of tasks designed to help needy individuals or the entire community. They may do housework for the handicapped, shop for the elderly, paint houses, and weed lots.

Sometimes workers are employed on jobs that have been contracted for with UYA by a major company or a government agency. The entire program is intended to provide the youths with valuable work experience, as well as money.

Economic Development. Director Gillcresce administers the organization's economic development program for new ventures. This program is financed partly by contributions deducted from the paychecks of the UYA staff and student workers. Donations from businesses, foundations, and other sources also go into a fund to support the program, which includes assistance for students who are going on to college and other schools. Another source of revenue consists of the UYA alumni members, each of whom contributes \$6 a year.

Bernard Jones got the idea for starting UYA when he was a community worker for the city's urban redevelopment authority. He saw the need for assisting young people to make the transition from school to the world of work and, at the same time, to imbue them with pride in themselves.

Over the years, UYA has launched hundreds of youngsters on successful careers. How many are carrying on the revolutionary spirit isn't known. But Robert B. Pease, the former executive director of the urban redevelopment agency, thinks they will create a different city in the future.

"If I were asked to name the most significant urban redevelopment contribution to the Pittsburgh community over the past twenty years," he says, "my vote without hesitancy would go to the Urban Youth Action program in the Hill district. For this is urban renewal, as I view it, in its purest and most direct role."

OPERATION BETTER BLOCK

PITTSBURGH, PA.—Pittsburgh's Homewood-Brushton section is a neighborhood in transition.

On block after block the people are out repairing and painting their houses. Lots have been cleaned up, grass seed planted, and new lawns kept neatly mowed. Hedges and bushes are trimmed. Sidewalks have been repaired, holes in the street filled in, and the trash is gone.

This transformation of a once-decaying neighborhood is the doing of Operation Better Block—an idea that never caught on in the place it originated, New York City, but has flourished since being transplanted to Pittsburgh. Carrie Washington, assistant director of Better Block, feels the project failed in New York's slum neighborhood because it was sponsored by the city.

"Here, the people themselves are doing it—they are doing it because they want to take more pride in their community," she says. "And they are making more than just physical improvements—they are bringing about change in their lives."

Better Block was put together in 1970 by a coalition of Homewood-Brushton community organizations known as Forever Action

Together (FAT). The housing committee of FAT spent eighteen months designing the project, then went from block to block trying to organize the residents. These efforts eventually resulted in the creation of some thirty block associations or clubs involving a total of about 6,500 people.

The effect of these associations has been widespread. The city has been pressured into fixing sewers and streets, improving street lighting, and removing trash. Absentee landlords have been forced to repair and maintain their buildings. And the people of Homewood-Brushton, as well as of other areas of the city, have become much more concerned about their physical environment than they used to be.

But Better Block emphasizes much more than just cleaning, fixing, and repairing. It is concerned about the entire community and all of its problems. Consequently any list of Better Block's accomplishments must be extended to include the fostering of community pride and neighborliness, persuading families not to leave the area, providing part-time work for neighborhood youngsters, organizing sports and other recreational activities, and giving local people a chance to find out what they all have in common.

"What people have discovered in the clubs is that they can sit down and discuss common problems and help one another," says Carrie Washington. "They are generating a whole different spirit than was here before, when nobody cared about anything."

What Better Block itself has learned is the importance of caring for and dealing with the people. As Carrie Washington says pointedly, "You can give all the grass seed in the world, all the paint, all the peat moss, but if you don't work with the people inside the houses, you have wasted your time."

Organizing a new block association begins with Better Block's five staff members undertaking a study of the problems and characteristics of the prospective new member block. Is it, for example, primarily a block of elderly people? Are there a lot of children? How many people are home owners? Is there a high percentage of absentee landlords?

One of Better Block's two field representatives then assists the group during its first shaky days as it sets up priorities and begins organizing a block association.

Better Block initially provides \$25 to the new association, and it will subsequently contribute additional seed money of up to \$500 as the association requires it. Better Block staff members maintain a close watch over expenditures to see that policy is carried out.

Residents are given grass seed, shrubbery, and other items, along with donated clippers and mowers. Project leaders buy paint, gas lamps, and fencing materials at cost and sell them to the residents at the same price. Better Block keeps on file a list of contractors who will do reliable work at reasonable cost for those who can afford it.

From the beginning the project has maintained close contacts with the city, although its financing has come from the Allegheny Conference on Community Development United Fund and several large Pittsburgh companies.

"Consequently," says Carrie Washington, "people have been amazed at the fast action we get. It runs all the way from sewer clean-ups to better street lighting—whatever you can think of. The city fixed a hole in the middle of Monticello Street that could have swallowed a compact car. They sent in the Neighborhood Youth Corps to help in the cleanup."

The project has ways of dealing with absentee landlords. It first makes residents fulfill their obligations as tenants. Then, if necessary, they bring legal action against obstinate landlords.

The Better Block clubs serve as a forum where a person can take a complaint against

his neighbor without generating personal friction.

"When we tell Mrs. Smith her garbage is attracting rats, she gets made at us, not her neighbor, Mrs. Jones, who wants it cleaned up," says Carrie Washington.

Representatives of different blocks meet once a month to discuss their programs and exchange ideas. Most of the ideas concern how to keep the club going after the funds from Better Block have been used.

FAT's president, James Givner, the owner of a beauty-products store, has been fostering the participation of youth in Better Block. Individual clubs are urged to include young people in their meetings and solicit their ideas for improvements. High school students have been paid to make and install new house numbers and to build trash receptacles, with some local companies providing the necessary money.

Efforts are also made to provide recreational facilities and activities for the neighborhood youngsters, partly to involve them in Better Block, partly to provide them with leisure-time activities, and partly to expand their horizons.

In 1973, for example, Operation Better Block sent a team of Little League all-stars to play in Madison, Ohio. The excitement of the game was compounded by the fact that most of the Pittsburgh youngsters had never been out of their home city before.

"The coaches selected those kids who were able to get along with other players, those with a positive attitude, and those who showed evidences of leadership," Carrie Washington explains. "All we heard from the others when the all-stars came back was, 'Boy, next year I'm going to be like one of them so I can make the team!'"

Carrie Washington says that numerous donors have attempted to influence the direction of the project. "We have had more spin-offs suggested than you can imagine, and we have had to say our goal is here.

"We went to a donor who suggested certain changes . . . and made this a condition of his donation. He was told, 'No, we will not accept any funds from anyone on the basis of change of this program. It has already been designed and we will not let anyone build in failures.' Now this was a \$10,000 grant, and we didn't have a penny. It jolted him."

Nevertheless the organization received the grant that year—and each year thereafter. "Obviously if there were more money, more blocks could be helped," Givner says. "But the response from the residents has been tremendous."

And that's the real name of the game.

EXPENDITURES ON U.S. EDUCATION

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the United States has made great advances in the field of education. Unfortunately, many individuals and groups believe the answer to better education is more Federal money. It is easy to forget that the United States as a national priority spends a tremendous amount of money on its educational system at all levels, both public and private. I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some relevant facts about our country's expenditures on education:

EXPENDITURES ON U.S. EDUCATION

I. The U.S. spends far more on education than is generally realized when all education expenditures are added up: federal, state, local and private (often overlooked).

Education is the largest single American industry.

The profession is the largest single occupational group.

More is spent on education than is spent on national defense.

II. Comparatively speaking, the U.S. spends a greater proportion of its GNP on education than does any other major country in the world.

The U.S. spends more, in real terms, on education than does the rest of the non-Communist world put together.

The U.S. spends 8% of its GNP on education.

1. Total expenditure on education in the U.S. in 1973-74, elementary, secondary, and higher, public and private was \$96.3 billion. This is higher than the amount spent for national defense, \$81 billion in 1974.

2. Total public expenditure was \$79 billion but an additional \$17.3 billion was spent by nonpublic sources. About 17% of education costs came from private funds, a higher figure than in any other major nation.

3. \$61.6 billion was spent on elementary and secondary schools; of this amount, \$56 billion was public and \$5.6 billion was nonpublic.

4. \$34.7 billion was spent on higher education; of this amount, \$23 billion was public and \$11.7 billion was nonpublic.

5. Of the public funds for education, \$7.7 billion are appropriated at the federal level, \$32.1 billion at the state level, \$29.8 billion at the local level and \$9.4 at all other levels. The remaining amount, \$17.3 billion, comes from non-public sources.

6. In 1971-72, the total American expenditure on education was 7.9% of the Gross National Product. (Above statistics from Department of HEW, *Digest of Educational Statistics*, 1973, pp. 22-23.)

7. In 1970, the U.S. spent an average of \$264 per capita on public education. This figure does not include the amount from private sources, which would be approximately \$44 (17%). Thus the U.S. total per capita would be about \$308.

8. The world average per capita spent on education in 1970 was \$46. Thus the U.S. spent well over 6 times the world per capita expense on education. The per capita expense for the developed world (a fairer comparison) for 1970 was \$150. However, this figure includes the U.S. itself and also includes the U.S.S.R.; the figure for the Soviet Union, \$159 per capita, is based on the official exchange rate of approximately one ruble to the dollar which experts in the Soviet economy regard as totally unrealistic. A "real" equivalent would be much lower than the official \$159, per capita.

9. Probably a more realistic comparison would be with the NATO nations of Western Europe which have a comparable economic development and "hard" currencies combined with reliable statistics. The figure for European NATO countries is \$93 per capita. Few countries outside of the U.S. spend any significant amount on private education. Thus, Americans spend a good three times as much on education as do the people most like ourselves, Western Europeans.

10. In 1970, the U.S. was spending about \$65 billion a year on all education, public and private. The rest of the non-Communist world (Western Europe, Latin America, Africa, Australasia and the free countries of Asia, including India and Japan) all together was spending about \$60 billion a year. The U.S. thus spends a little more on education than does the entire remaining Free World. (Above statistics from U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, *World Military Expenditures*, 1971, pp. 14-17, 38-41).

11. There has been a steady, in fact, a steep growth in the real sums spent at all levels in the U.S. on education in the past 30 years. In 1944 the percentage of the GNP spent on education was 1.8; by 1974 it had risen to over 8% . . . this represents more than a four-fold increase in 30 years.

12. Although education costs are only a relatively small part of the federal budget (education was meant to be a state function, after all) it accounts for over 40% of state and local expenditures. This is more than three times the outlay for highways, the second largest item in their budgets. (Above statistics from Department of HEW, *Digest of Educational Statistics*, 1973, pp. 24-27).

13. It is thus fair to say that Americans are not short-changing education but are in fact devoting far more of their resources to this activity than is any other country in the world, with the possible exception of Canada, no matter whether you count in dollar terms, in "real" purchasing power, or in percentages of the GNP.

14. When critics claim that the Nixon Administration is "short-changing" education, it should be noted that the Administration has more than tripled the amount of federal funds devoted to education in its years of office. In 1967-68, federal aid to education was \$5.1 billion (HEW, *op. cit.*, p. 22). For Fiscal Year 1975, a total of \$16 billion is budgeted for education at the federal level. (OMB, *Special Analysis, Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Yr 1975*, p. 109).

15. Unfortunately, however, not all federal money spent on education goes for better schooling for children; the U.S. Office of Education, which administers these programs, estimates that roughly 30% of the funds are spent on administrative costs . . . absorbed by the federal bureaucracy.

RADIATION IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Roger E. Linneman, president of Radiation Management Corp., and assistant professor of clinical radiology at the University of Pennsylvania, has authored an excellent article entitled, "Accentuate the Positive," which appeared in the July/August issue of *Trial* magazine.

In the article Dr. Linneman poses a series of questions typical of those currently being asked not only by Members of this body but of the general public as well. He then in very lucid fashion provides comprehensive scientifically based responses to these questions and presents them in a manner understandable to the lay public. In large part the questions relate to fears that people may hold to concerning the biological effects of radiation from a variety of sources. These include radiation exposure as a consequence of diagnostic examination by physicians, radiation due to low-level emissions from nuclear power plants, radiation from natural background causes and that received as a consequence of jet aircraft travel.

Dr. Linneman points out that no discussion of radiobiological effects can be meaningful without a presentation of the levels of exposure involved. In each

case the average levels of exposure from the various sources are cited and the risk, if any, is clearly enunciated. I shall not attempt to summarize this very fine presentation of a subject of current interest to all of us. Instead, I insert the article by Dr. Linneman in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks:

ACCENTUATE THE POSITIVE

(By Dr. Roger E. Linneman)

"Doctor, will the radiation hurt me?"

This increasingly common question is asked of many doctors in a modern world where patients get x-rayed, children watch TV, and people live near nuclear power plants.

Recognizing there is no absolute safety in any human endeavor and considering for the moment that a certain level of electrical energy is beneficial to the health and welfare of society, the proper questions for society to ask are:

Do we need or desire more electrical energy?

What are the feasible methods to produce this energy?

What are the medical hazards from each of these methods of production?

We are told that for the near future the two most practical and economical methods of producing electricity are the nuclear fission process and the combustion of fossil fuels. Though there are many factors to consider when selecting a source of electrical energy, one of the most important is the impact on the public's health. To the degree the society has already accepted the use of fossil fuel to produce electricity, an impact evaluation is *ipso facto* retrospective. A decision to now employ a nuclear technology is prospective, and therefore a proper impact evaluation should seek answers to the following questions:

How and to what extent may the population be exposed to radiation?

What do we know about the human effects of radiation?

To what can we compare the exposure dose from nuclear reactors?

What are the estimates of risk to the population from this exposure?

What are the estimates of risk to the population from continued use of fossil fuels?

POPULATION EXPOSURE

Under normal operations, nuclear power reactors discharge radioactive isotopes to the atmosphere. These discharges occur primarily as gases via the stack, and liquids via the discharge canal into an adjacent water source (river, lake, bay, etc.). The exposure to the population from gases is primarily external, i.e. the radioactive isotopes remain outside of the body (in the air and on the ground) where they emit radiations that may penetrate the body. To a lesser degree, there is an internal exposure from breathing the radioactivity in the air and from consuming food products contaminated with radioactivity (e.g. milk and iodine). Under controlled conditions, these gases are released periodically. Over the course of time, dispersion by wind dilutes the radioactivity in all directions. Consequently, the exposure to the population decreases as the distance from the plant increases.

Upon discharge into a stream or river, the radioactive isotopes are rapidly diluted and mixed with radioactive isotopes already present in the water. These radioactive isotopes expose man through consumption of food and water. Hence, the primary exposure to man from the liquid discharges is an internal exposure, i.e., the source of radiation, after ingestion, is located within the body.

Radiation causes cancer! Radiation causes genetic mutations! Both are true statements. However, an important characteristic of all biological systems is their ability to react to physical or chemical insults with a graded re-

sponse to increasing doses. Consequently, any discussion of radiation effects is meaningless without first specifying the dose.

REACTOR EXPOSURES

Presently, there are about 30 nuclear power reactors operating in this country. The estimated average dose to the entire U.S. population from these reactors is 0.01-0.001 millirad per year. To the people living within the vicinity of a reactor, the doses may average a few millirad for close-by residents to 0.01 millirad out to 50 miles.

HUMAN EFFECTS—CANCER

In medicine, we have been using radiation for over 70 years. In any year, approximately 137,000,000 people (over 1/2 the population) in this country receive at least one X-ray.

It is estimated that X-rays play a major role in 1/2 to 2/3 of all serious diagnoses. During this time, we have accumulated a considerable body of knowledge regarding the effects of radiation on the human. It is safe to say that there has never been a potentially hazardous agent so carefully and exhaustively studied by so large a group of internationally recognized scientists as has been radiation. We have learned that in sufficiently high doses, radiation can be dangerous—can induce cancer. We have learned that radiation is an effective agent with which to cure cancer. This apparent enigma is a result of the fact that the body's response to radiation depends on many factors including the sensitivity of the tissue, the total dose and time over which the dose is delivered. The longer the time over which the dose is delivered, the smaller the effect. In other words, cells, tissues, and organs can and do repair and recover from radiation damage.

The two most important long term effects that are associated with radiation are cancer and genetic mutations. In order to detect these effects, relatively large populations exposed to relatively large doses of radiation must be examined. These studies include people treated with x-rays, atomic bombs casualties, and radiation workers.

The evidence that radiation bears a cause and effect relationship to cancer lies above a level of exposure of about 30,000 millirad. The most convincing evidence is above exposures of 100,000 millirad. Doctors who pioneered in the use of x-rays were its first cancer victims. Other groups affected were radium dial painters, populations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and patients treated with x-rays for rheumatoid spondylitis and tinea capitis.

Do radiation doses below levels of 30,000 to 100,000 millirad cause cancer? Many studies have been done and others are continuing in search of an answer to this question. These studies include a variety of exposure situations such as I-131 treatment of hyperthyroidism (7,000-15,000 millirad), occupational exposures of radiologists and their technicians (thousands of millirads), occupational exposure of AEC employees (thousands of millirads), diagnostic fetal exposures (few hundred to a few thousand millirads), and environmental exposures of populations living downstream from nuclear reactors.

With the exception of fetal irradiation, all of these epidemiological studies have failed to demonstrate a positive effect. The absence of a positive result combined with information on dose-cancer relationships at high doses indicates that any increased incidence of cancer following low dose exposures would have to be exceedingly small. It has been estimated that to see a statistically significant increase in the incidence of cancer at low doses, at least 5 million people would have to somehow be exposed to about 5,000 millirad (over and above background). No such exposure, except perhaps in a nuclear war, can be envisioned. To attempt to unequivocally find a dose-effect relationship at the few millirad level either experimentally or epidemiologically is virtually impossible.

GENETIC EFFECTS

Genetic studies in the human are among the most difficult and illusive studies in medical science from which to try to gather meaningful data. The problem is threefold: (1) a relatively high incidence of normal genetic defects (2-4% of live and stillborn children show visible congenital defects and about 15% of all pregnancies end in miscarriage); (2) the requirement for extremely large irradiated populations in order to make any small increase in the mutation rate statistically apparent and (3) understanding and controlling all other causes that produce similar genetic mutations.

Studies concerning abnormal characteristics in children of one or both parents exposed to varying amounts of radiation exposure include the children of radiologists, radiation workers, and women exposed to therapeutic amounts of radiation. These studies have been generally negative. However, they must be regarded as inconclusive since in most instances there were too few cases to be statistically significant and the variables were not well controlled.

An important human study was that of the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission (ABCC) on children born of Japanese parents irradiated in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Some 75,000 children born of these parents were examined and followed. There was no increased frequency of congenital malformations, stillbirths, neo-natal deaths, or growth and development abnormalities in the first generation off-spring.

That radiation can produce genetic mutations was first demonstrated by Mueller in the 1920's on experiments with the fruit fly. Using relatively large doses of radiation (above approximately 25,000 millirad), he was able to show genetic defects in the subsequent offspring of these flies. Twenty-three years ago, Dr. William Russell of Oak Ridge, Tennessee, began his genetic experiments with mice. He used the mouse because it is a mammal, and large numbers of mice are relatively easy to produce. Today, he is probably the world's foremost authority on many aspects of mammalian radiation genetics. Like Mueller, he was able to demonstrate genetic mutations with relatively high doses of radiation. But, as with the fly, attempts to demonstrate an increased incidence of genetic mutations with doses below about 37,000 millirad are very laborious. As the dose is lowered, the increased incidence of mutation is so small that extremely large numbers of experimental animals are required to show a statistically significant difference. Consequently, the experiments become unwieldy and very costly.

Russell also studies the effect of dose rate on genetic mutations. He delivered a total dose of 400,000 millirad to both female and male mice using dose rates of 100,000 millirad per minute to 1 millirad per minute. In the female mouse at a dose rate of 9 millirad per minute, he found no significant increase in genetic mutations. He also found that female mice irradiated and bred before six weeks showed an increase in genetic mutations. However, if the breeding was delayed for six weeks or more following irradiation, he found no increase in genetic mutations. His interpretation is that the female mouse has a recovery or repair mechanism for genetic damage. In both the male and female mouse, the lower dose rates were associated with less genetic damage than would be anticipated from linear extrapolation of high dose rate effects.

In view of this recent work, Russell concluded that the genetic hazard is about six times less than it was considered to be when the present standards were set in 1956.

FETAL IRRADIATION

In 1906, Bergonie and Tribondeau formulated the hypothesis that the radiosensitivity of tissues and cells in the body varies. Cells which turn over and divide rapidly and

cells which are undifferentiated are more radiosensitive than cells and tissues such as the brain or muscle, which divide slowly or not at all and are well differentiated. Subsequently, it was postulated that the embryo and fetus (rapidly growing organs) should be more radiosensitive than the born child or adult. Experimental work has confirmed this. Death of the embryo or fetus or congenital abnormalities have been produced in animals with doses as low as 10,000 millirads delivered in a matter of seconds on the first day of gestation. It was also found that the fetus is most sensitive in the early stages of pregnancy (first three months). As the pregnancy develops, larger doses of radiation are required to produce abnormalities.

Laboratory and clinical studies, by and large, support the contention that doses of radiation below 10,000 millirad do not contribute to intra-uterine or extra-uterine growth retardation or to gross congenital malformations.

Some epidemiological studies indicate that abnormal x-ray exposure of mothers during pregnancy may be associated with an increased incidence of cancer in children before the age of ten years. The frequency of such malignancies in unirradiated children is about 1 in 1200 births. The studies referred to provide evidence that a dose of about 1,000 millirad, delivered in a very short time, may result in a doubling of the "natural" incidence of cancers in children.

Assuming that a fetus could receive a dose of about 0.01 millirem in 9 months, and that the effect of this long term exposure would be the same as that of exposures of short duration, the additional risk of developing cancer as a result of 0.01 millirem is about 1 in 120 million.

In the past few years, much has been written concerning infant mortality and the emission of radioactive materials from nuclear reactors (Sternglass Hypothesis). Because an increase in infant mortality as a result of an extremely small radiation exposure would be an unexpected radiobiological effect and because, if true, it would have serious public health consequences, the question was extensively studied by federal and state health authorities as well as medical scientists all over the world. Scientists knowledgeable in infant mortality, epidemiology, and radiobiology have overwhelmingly rejected the Sternglass Hypothesis and his data as completely unfounded and unsupported. Most recently, the National Academy of Science reviewed the status of our knowledge of radiation effects and concluded that:

"It is clear that the correlations presented in support of the hypothesis depend on arbitrary selection of data supporting the hypothesis and the ignoring of those that do not. In several regards, the data used by Sternglass appear to be in error.

"In short, there is at the present time no convincing evidence that the low levels of radiation in question are associated with increased risk of mortality in infancy. Hence, for the purposes of this report, no estimate of risks are considered to be applicable."

OTHER SOURCES OF RADIATION

From time immemorial, the human race has been bathed in an envelope of radiation emanating from the sky, from the ground, from the food we eat, and within our bodies. On the East Coast, this amounts to approximately 110 millirem per year. Annually, the radiation from the sky contributes about 35 millirem; the buildings we live in add another 34 millirem; the air we breathe, 5 millirem; and the food we eat, about 25 millirem. The latter is chiefly from radioactive potassium which is in both water and food. This background radiation varies considerably around the world. For example, in Denver due to higher elevation the population is exposed to approximately 175 millirem per year. In some areas of France, the annual exposure is 350 millirem; India, 1,500 milli-

rem; Egypt, 400 millirem; and in some areas of Brazil, 13,000 millirem.

This variation is not only due to the cosmic radiation but also due to the radiation emanating from the ground, where the earth contains more thorium and radium and uranium.

With the increasing use of radiation in medicine, research and industry, man has added radiation to his environment. By far, the largest contribution is from the use of radiation in medicine. The bone marrow and the gonads are the tissues of concern in the use of diagnostic x-rays. The exposures vary from a fraction of a millirad to a few thousand millirads. Other sources to which the population is exposed include fallout, approximately 2-3 millirad annually; television sets, watches, etc., about 1 millirad annually; and nuclear reactors, approximately 0.01 millirad per year. A round-trip cross-country jet ride exposes a person to about 4 millirem.

RADIATION RISKS

In the absence of any observed effects at very low doses and in the interests of assisting the lay community in weighing the risks and benefits of a technology, it is customary to extrapolate from observed effects at high doses to possible effects at low doses. Consequently, to guard the public's health to the maximum, the most conservative assumptions are incorporated into derivations of mathematical formulas for estimating low dose effects.

To maximize any effect, it is assumed that radiation is cumulative, that there is no repair of radiation damage, and that prolonged exposures are equally as effective as instantaneous exposures. These formulas do not, in themselves, prove that any dose of radiation is harmful. In the course of public discussions about radiation, the word "assumed" is often dropped and the statement "all radiation is harmful" made rather than "all radiation is assumed to be harmful." In reality, the effect at very low doses could also be zero.

Depending on the assumptions used and the interpretations of the hard data at high dose levels, scientists have made various estimations of effects at low doses. Perhaps the most severe estimations of low dose effects that have received wide public attention are those of Gofman and Tamplin for cancer, and Linus Pauling for genetic effects. In making the following risks estimations, I have used their figures. Though they do not represent a consensus of scientific opinion, they are certainly the most conservative. Pauling's genetic risk, which he attributes to mutations resulting from irradiation of parents, includes gross physical and mental defects, and embryonic, fetal, and neonatal deaths.

According to estimates made by these scientists, if 3 million people living within 50 miles of a reactor receive an exposure of 0.01 millirad per year, there would be an extra 0.03 cancer death per year and a 0.1 extra genetic problem. Normally, this group of three million people can expect to have 4,800 cancer deaths per year and about 7,200 genetic problems per year.

For the population of the United States as a whole, the dose from presently operating nuclear reactors is about 0.001 millirad. The extra cancer death risk would be 0.2 cases per year. Normally, there are about 320,000 cancer deaths in this country per year. The extra genetic risk is about 0.4, whereas normally there are about 500,000 genetic problems as defined by Pauling. In other words, if radiation is harmful at these very low doses, it appears that the worst we could expect is less than one extra cancer death and less than one genetic problem each year as a result of normal nuclear power reactor operations.

Another way of looking at the problem is in terms of the individual risk—"what is my

chance of cancer death or having a genetic problem as a result of this exposure?" This too, can be calculated. Normally, one out of every 10 pregnancies in this country evidences a genetic defect—a conception disintegrating shortly after implantation, a miscarriage or an abortion, a still birth, some mental or physical defect. There is one chance in 60 that an individual would have an automobile injury in any one year, and one chance in 4,000 that he would experience an automobile death in any one year. Estimates on the consequences of air pollution suggest that there is one chance in 10,000 that any individual would die in any one year as a result of air pollution. For women who are on "the pill," there is one chance in 25,000 that a fatal complication would occur as a result. On the whole, there is one chance in 500,000 that any individual in the U.S. would die in an earthquake. Finally, the chances of getting cancer as a result of reactor radiation is about one in one billion.

Psychologists say that each individual has a "chance-o-meter" built into his thinking and that in general, people tend to write off as an act of God or an act of Nature any chance greater than one in 100,000. Some people are more conservative than others and, consequently, demand better odds in any activity in which they engage. Others will engage in the same activity at worse odds.

Having considered the maximum risks to people from the generation of electricity with nuclear energy, and having compared these risks to which individuals are normally subjected today, the final step in this decision-making process is to compare these to the risks of continued use of fossil fuel to generate electricity. Unfortunately, information concerning the effects of air pollution on the human body are sparse compared to the great wealth of knowledge we have on the effects of radiation. Consequently, it is impossible to even estimate individual risks from air pollution. According to some authors, the present day mortality caused by air pollution in this country is 20,000 deaths per year. Others have gone as high as a million deaths per year. The former is from a report prepared for a congressional committee on Air Pollution in the United States in 1963. Fossil fuel power plants are responsible for about one-seventh of all the atmospheric pollutants. It appears that the sulfur oxides and nitrous oxides are the most damaging agents.

In an article entitled, "Air Pollution and Human Health," which was published in *Science* in August 1970, the authors reviewed more than 200 studies dealing with air pollution and human health. They concluded that a 50% reduction in air pollution would lead to, among other things, a 25% reduction of mortality due to lung cancer and a 20% reduction in cardiovascular (heart disease) mortality, the number one killer in the United States today. In numbers, this means we would save 15,000 people from lung cancer each year and one-quarter of a million from heart disease by reducing fossil fuel air pollution. The National Research Council's Committee on Air Pollution calculated that the total cost due to air pollutants is 13 billion dollars per year or \$65 for each man, woman, and child in this country.

SUMMARY

In summary, it can be seen that the radiation emissions of nuclear power plants are small indeed compared to natural background radiation and radiation emissions from other man-made sources of radiation. For example, the population is exposed to 100 times more radiation from television sets than from nuclear power reactors. The assumed risks to the people in this country from nuclear power reactors are also small compared to the normal risks which are tolerated in this society and significantly

less than those from continued use of fossil fuels to produce electricity.

The complete elimination of all hazards is a most difficult if not impossible task. If we need and desire a certain level of electrical energy, if we must choose between alternative sources of the energy, the health hazards of radiation discharges from the normal operation of nuclear power plants are indeed small, non-existent, compared to those from the continued use of fossil fuel plants.

THE PERSISTENT ILLEGAL ALIEN CONTROVERSY

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks attention has once again been focused on those aliens who have entered the United States by other than legal means and who are attempting to eke out an existence while fearing apprehension by the authorities. Most of the stories focus on the Government's efforts to apprehend and deport these hapless men, women, and children and on the allegations that they are taking jobs which could be performed by American citizens or that they are swelling the welfare rolls. Tragically, these accounts fail to report the fact that the vast majority of so-called illegal aliens perform jobs which most citizens would not even consider doing and that they perform this work at substandard wages and often under hazardous or undesirable conditions. Seldom is any consideration given to the constant misery and fear which these people are forced to endure, the conditions in their native lands which have precipitated their departure, or their victimization by unscrupulous employers, landlords, and creditors. One does not often read that, in the course of dragnets conducted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and other Federal agencies, the illegals are frequently degraded and are subjected to demeaning procedures, many of which violate those basic rights which we in this body have sworn to protect and defend.

Frequently these operations to apprehend illegal aliens result in any person who may speak with an accent or who may present a "foreign" appearance being confronted by a Federal agent and forced to prove their citizenship. Basic civil liberties and simple human dignity are many times ignored in the course of these investigations. Particularly distasteful is the fact that the term "illegal alien" has become a code word for the Spanish speaking and all too often Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, Cubans, and other Spanish-speaking citizens are needlessly embarrassed, inconvenienced, and intimidated, either directly or indirectly. Surely no one in good conscience can defend or condone such ill-conceived and misdirected policies and practices.

Unfortunately, this whole situation was seriously exacerbated last year when the House passed H.R. 982, known as the

Rodino bill. While the ostensible purpose of this legislation was to protect the American labor force against job encroachment by illegal aliens, this measure represents a most serious assault against civil liberties and clearly discriminates against the foreign-born and foreign-language speaking Americans. For example, because of problems in locating or furnishing vital statistics, many minority groups would have considerable difficulty in furnishing documentary proof of their birth and citizenship. In addition, an overly cautious employer may refuse to hire an alien legally permitted to work or a minority group citizen for fear that the person may be an illegal alien. It was for these reasons that the Governor of New York recently refused to approve State legislation similar to the Rodino bill.

I believe that the American labor force must be provided with all reasonable protection. However, while protecting the rights of American workers we cannot deny rights to others and the problems of unemployment and economic dislocation will not be solved by pitting American-born workers against the foreign born, as does H.R. 982. Also, this repressive and discriminatory legislation simply perpetuates unfounded myths and irresponsible charges about illegals. I am fearful that it will serve only to fan the flames of prejudice and misunderstanding and needlessly aggravate community tensions.

I remain adamant in my opposition to the Rodino bill and am gratified that the Senate has the wisdom not to proceed with this measure. I am hopeful this bill will not be acted upon in these waning months of the 93d Congress and trust that a more rational, humanitarian, and compassionate attitude will prevail should the issue again arise in the 94th Congress.

The question of illegal aliens is one which we cannot avoid and is one which warrants full and careful consideration. Last September, for example, during consideration of amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, I offered an amendment authorizing a special study of the flow of migrants from the Dominican Republic to the United States as some had estimated that there are approximately 200,000 illegal Dominicans in New York City alone and claims were made that there was an influx in the number of illegal Dominicans. Surely we must take into consideration those factors which are at the root of the flow of illegal immigrants as well as secure accurate data on the precise number of nonlegal aliens.

Another proposal worthy of attention and support is amnesty for certain illegal aliens, such as those who are close blood relatives of lawfully admitted permanent resident aliens or U.S. citizens, those who might be entitled to a special preference status regardless of their country of origin and those who have resided in this country for a certain number of years. Many illegal aliens have lived and worked in the United States for many years, have married, raised their families, and have become a part of the communities in which they reside. How-

ever, their lives are a nightmare as they live in constant fear of detection and deportation. Certainly these men and women warrant special and sympathetic consideration and an amnesty provision I believe would be an equitable and humane device. As long as an illegal alien does not have a criminal record and could not be classified as undesirable, some form of amnesty—within a set period of time—should be provided.

Finally, attention must be focused on one of the primary causes for the illegal alien problem—the highly discriminatory annual ceiling of 120,000 persons imposed on the Western Hemisphere. The Western Hemisphere quota recalls the regressive era of the national origins quota system and the Asia-Pacific Triangle quota. The question as to "where were you born" has yet to be eliminated from questions to be answered in establishing one's eligibility for immigration. While the establishment of a preference system, as provided for in H.R. 981, may establish some order in the issuance of visas to applicants from Western Hemisphere nations, the continuation of the 120,000 annual limitation on this region remains as a standing affront to our sister republics and certainly exacerbates the whole illegal alien question. I urge that the Senate take affirmative steps to place the Eastern and Western Hemispheres on an equal footing and remove the discriminatory limitation on the number of persons who may immigrate from Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that our colleagues will carefully and seriously reflect on what I have discussed this afternoon and that they will take into account the humanitarian aspects of the illegal alien situation. This is simply not a black or white issue but one which warrants close consideration of various important factors such as the causes of migration, the actual impact of illegal aliens on the economy, the human misery and suffering endured by illegals, the violation of basic rights and human dignity of both aliens and citizens, the cruel and needless separation of families, and the possibility of granting some form of amnesty.

TURKISH OPIUM BAN

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point, statements that were delivered at hearings I sponsored in New York dealing with the effects of the lifting of the Turkish opium ban. These statements clearly substantiate the worst fears of Americans that we will see a resurgence of opium traffic, and the concurrent growth in heroin addiction in our country. The statements follow:

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR RANDALL, CHIEF, NARCOTICS BUREAU FOR WILLIAM CAHN, DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF NASSAU COUNTY

I am pleased to appear before you this morning in support of your efforts to con-

tinue the ban on opium poppy production in Turkey.

In the past decade, we have witnessed the havoc wrought by the heroin epidemic and the vibrations are still being felt in our spiraling crime statistics. Painfully, we have learned that the containment of this problem is not solely within the grasp of local law enforcement. The broad scope of the heroin problem extends beyond the borders of this country.

Experience has taught us that on the domestic front effective law enforcement, coupled with the certainty of punishment, allied with sound rehabilitation and preventive programs, are key-blocks in building a bastion against the cancer of heroin abuse within the confines of our country. Standing alone, this bastion cannot contain the assault of heroin abuse unless a priority effort is made to stem the infiltration of heroin into our country. Unless we can stop the infiltration of heroin, the cancer of heroin abuse will keep spreading.

The facts adduced, since the initiation of the Turkish ban on opium poppy production, has been startling in my community and throughout the country. Our own intelligence reports reflect that there is very little heroin present in our Country, and arrests for heroin sales and possession have dropped off dramatically since the initiation and enforcement of the ban. The elimination of illicit poppy production in Turkey and greater priority by the Federal government to interdict and destroy the smuggling operations in our opinion has done much to contain the heroin epidemic.

I find disturbing, but understandable, the recent announcement by the Turkish government lifting the ban on the cultivation of the opium poppy. Prior to the ban, it was estimated that 80% of America's heroin consumption could be traced to the poppy fields of Turkey. Can we, therefore, remain indifferent to this lifting of the ban? Shall we, as a nation which has triumphed over the most pervasive and brutal challenges to the vitality of our institutions in time of war and depression, surrender its social health to a drug epidemic spawned on the poppy fields of Turkey?

Reports are persistent that Turkey is confident it will remain immune to any cessation in the flow of our aid. This notion by the Turkish government, or any other nation involved in poppy production, must be dramatically dissipated. To do otherwise, would be surrendering our youth to the ravages of heroin abuse. We must make it known in no uncertain terms that we intend to stop giving economic assistance to those nations which fail to exercise firm controls over illegal drug production.

We must also recognize realistically that the Turkish farmer must be compensated for his loss of income. Without such aid, Turkey will be beset with explosive economic and political problems. Therefore, we must grant additional economic aid to Turkey to compensate the workers who are economically dependent upon poppy production. We cannot, in good conscience, create economic disaster for the estimated ninety thousand farmers engaged in poppy production. There are those who blindly and ignorantly raise the hue and cry of the financial burden of such an undertaking to our nation. Unfortunately, however, in the past, we have learned that there is no bargain basement where we can deal with American security and well-being. We know that the health of our young people represents the strength of our future. We are in a war against drug abuse and as in every war, we must prepare to expend our full resources in containing and defeating the enemy. Therefore, we should be just as prepared to grant additional compensation to those nations who assist us in this war against drug abuse. There are those who argue that the ban on opium poppy produc-

tion and the resulting scarcity of heroin has led to the abuse of other drugs. We find little or no evidence to support this position. In the event that it does arise, we shall then meet this challenge.

President Kennedy stated, "It should be our earnest intention to insure that drugs should not be employed to debase mankind." To serve in this fight against heroin abuse, it is mandate that the total resources and energies of our free society must be continually mobilized. The drug abuse problem is one of the great challenges of our times and it calls for aggressive action to contain and liquidate this dangerous, malignant cancer. It would be ironic if the American experiment, so bright with promise at its inception, should be stricken into sterility and doom by our inability to have the will and resolution to meet the challenge of heroin abuse.

Gentlemen, in my 25 years as a Prosecutor, I have witnessed time and time again man's inhumanity to his fellowman. Each and every day, we, in law enforcement, observe the injustices and cruelty one man can inflict upon another, yet nothing is of more concern to me than the growing toll of tragedy among our youth which stems from their involvement in drug experimentation and abuse. Like a wave, it engulfs not only the abuser but his family and community around him.

As a parent, as a citizen and as a Prosecutor, I commend you and support you fully in your efforts to stem the flow of heroin into our country and contain this scourge of our youth.

STATEMENT BY JAMES HENDERSON, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL NARCOTIC ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION

I come before you today wearing two hats. I have been designated by my Commissioner of Police Louis Frank to represent the Nassau County Police Department and in addition I will speak as the President of the International Narcotic Enforcement Officers' Association.

I would like to read into the record a resolution passed by the INEOA at its April 25, 1974, Board of Directors Meeting held in Washington, D.C., which I believe expresses the view of over 5,000 Narcotic Enforcement Officers.

RESOLUTIONS OPPOSING LIFTING OF BAN ON OPIUM PRODUCTION BY TURKEY ADOPTED APRIL 25, 1974, WASHINGTON, D.C., BY THE INTERNATIONAL NARCOTIC ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Noting that on June 30, 1971, the Government of Turkey took commendable action in deciding that the most suitable method of preventing diversion of opium into the illicit traffic was to prohibit all production of opium in Turkey;

Appreciating that this action was taken for international humanitarian reasons in spite of certain economic and social considerations;

Believing that the Government of Turkey's ban on opium production has caused a significant shortage in the flow of opium to clandestine heroin laboratories thereby disrupting the supply of illicit heroin to victim countries;

Regarding the disruption of illicit traffic in Turkish opium as a major factor contributing to the reduction of heroin addiction in the United States;

Being deeply concerned by reports that the Government of Turkey is considering a resumption of opium production; and

Convinced that a resumption of production would make available sizeable quantities of diverted opium thereby stimulating the illicit manufacture and distribution of heroin;

Recommends and strongly urges:

(1) That the Government of Turkey continue its humanitarian resolve in recogni-

tion of the serious consequences that the world community would suffer if the Government of Turkey were to abandon its present policy; and

(2) That the Government of Turkey continue its ban on the production of opium.

Be it further resolved that this resolution accompanied by evidence of its approval be forwarded to the Turkish Ambassador to the United States with a recommendation that it be respectfully transmitted to the Prime Minister of the Government of Turkey.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Directors of the International Narcotics Enforcement Officers Association held in Washington, D.C. on the 25th day of April, 1974.

Attested to: John J. Bellizzi, Executive Director, INEOA.

This resolution is the strong feeling of our group who represent Narcotic Enforcement not only in our fifty states and Canada but also over 50 countries of the world. We strongly feel the resumption of the growing of the opium poppy in Turkey would be a backward step which would result in an increase in addiction to heroin and certainly an increase in crimes perpetrated to enable the addict to purchase his supply of the living death.

We have all seen the ban work—Heroin of the Turkish type is in short supply and the arrest statistics concerned with its related crimes have leveled off and even lowered. Now is the time in history to avoid such a backward step.

I hope what we are doing here today is not a lesson in futility. According to a recent news release it is my understanding the Turkish Government has already lifted the ban as far as six of its provinces are concerned.

Gentlemen, please do whatever you can to see that heroin does not again become readily available.

STATEMENT OF B. A. RITTERPORN, JR., PRESIDENT, NEW YORK COUNTY REPUBLICAN VOLUNTEERS

These Hearings—tragically enough—can no longer serve to warn the Turkish government of U.S. indignation over the possibility of renewed Turkish cultivation of opium.

Nine days ago, the Turks carried through on what had for months been their threat. It is confirmed; full-scale opium production will be resumed by Turkish peasants this fall. The United States—and New York City in particular—can expect the renewed onslaught of the "heroin epidemic" within a relatively few months thereafter.

New York County Republican Volunteers took to the streets on this issue as early as April 20th. We demonstrated before the Turkish Consulate General in Rockefeller Centre in order to rouse popular protest of Turkey's abrogation of its 1971 agreement with our country banning opium growth. We were pleased to have had the Harlem-based Citizens Coalition Against Crime join in our protest demonstration and to have won widespread media coverage—then and subsequently—of our outcry.

Republicans demonstrating? A preponderantly white, middle-class group shouting slogans and waving placards?

The overwhelming danger certainly warranted what we did.

In the late 1960's, 80 percent of the heroin flooding the East Coast originated as Turkish opium. At the height of the epidemic, according to John R. Bartels, Jr., U.S. Drug Enforcement Administrator, there were as many as 600,000 heroin addicts in America. In New York City, there were as many as 150,000. To "boost" habits costing up to \$150-a-day, these addicts literally looted the City. *Newsweek* in 1971 estimated that the annual cost of New York City's crime-to-pay-for-heroin was at least \$2 billion—and perhaps far higher.

Addicts accounted for 80 percent of the shoplifting in the City, with comparable figures for mugging, burglary, robbery, et al. I personally know a black businessman who was ruined by having been robbed and burglarized more than a dozen times. Fear was so pervasive that three years after the worst of the epidemic, any number of midtown shops still operate behind locked doors.

Turkish supplies, Mafia trafficking and peer group proselytism (remember The Rolling Stones on the thrills of shooting dope) combined to devastate our country during the late 1960's and early 1970's. Heroin became the leading cause of death among New York City males in the 15 to 35 age bracket. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs figures showed a 420 percent increase in the rate of New Heroin Addicts Reported between 1965 and 1971. Over the same five year period, Bureau of the Census data indicate the overall American crime rate soared 490 percent. The similarity of these curves cannot be viewed as coincidental to anyone who has seen addicts in schools, on street corners and in clinics, as I have.

Or been mugged—as I have.

The U.S.-Turkish Agreement of 1971 was literally a godsend. Its benefits have been widely noted. Administrator Bartels tells us the addiction rate is cut by at least half. Incidence of crime has also been reduced. Aggregate narcotics fatalities have fallen in New York City from 1,205 in 1969 to an estimated 1973 level of 658—and heroin is no longer the first among the killer narcotics.

A Department of State briefing paper states: "While improved law enforcement efforts in Turkey, Europe and the United States and expanded addict rehabilitation programs contributed to these trends, there is no question that the ban on Turkish poppy cultivation was the major factor."

There is very little rational justification for Turkey's reversion to opium cultivation. Only about 100,000 peasants have actually made their living by opium. Legal opium operations contributed a mere one percent to the Turkish GNP.

On the other hand, Turkey has great apparent reason to want to maintain American good will. From 1946 through 1972, Turkey received more than \$2.5 billion in U.S. foreign grants and credits. That represented fully one-third of the U.S. outpouring to the Mid-East as a whole. Notably, it was 41 percent greater than the credits and grants extended by the U.S. to Israel.

Nor should Turkey be insensible to the value of its exports to the United States. These grew from \$60 million in 1960 to \$106 million in 1972.

Without in any way apologizing for the Turks or rationalizing the heinous move that they have made, it is apparent to me that we must look further than logical self-interest to explain the Turkish decision to restore opium cultivation.

Opium cultivation has for 400 years been an integral of Turkish life. One province—as you know—is actually named "Afyon," the Turkish word meaning "opium." Although there are obviously large numbers of Turkish officials and landowners that again want in on the huge profits offered by heroin trafficking, the fact remains that for nearly all Turks opium is not thought of as a narcotic. The poppy is food. And it is invested with great meaning as part of Turkish tradition.

That tradition has great, renewed importance. The modern social system wrought by Kemal Ataturk is under attack. Inevitably, this reaction is strongly xenophobic. No less than the Deputy Premier slashes at tourism and foreign investment as "polluting" the country.

Unfortunately, backcountry traditionalism frequently is linked and supported by extreme left wing guerrilla action. You will recall some of the frightful acts of terrorism

that have befallen Americans in Turkey recently.

In fact, the temper of the country has become so aberrant that we could revise the 19th century epithet and hold Turkey now to be the Mentally Sick Man of Europe.

It was in this atmosphere that all the political parties of the country last year called for resumption of opium cultivation. In one move, both the satisfactions of tradition and of baiting the United States could be indulged.

But how many New York City kids must die of heroin because Turkish demagogues want to stir up the worst elements of the Turkish national character?

There is no rationalizing the tragedy that Premier Ecevit has begun.

Shock treatment is required for the badly disturbed Turkish nation.

But first, we must joggle our own State Department. It has too much deferred to the Turks. State has relied on "quiet diplomacy" to hold the Turks to their word—and failed!

Chairman Wolf: your own subcommittee should immediately require Secy. Kissinger to appear before you in order to present a strategy that can still compel the Turkish government to relent from again growing opium. Your responsibility, Mr. Chairman, is to make the Secretary and the entire Department understand that more heroin means calamity for the people of our cities—blacks and whites both.

Secretary Kissinger need not mince words with Premier Ecevit. Power equations have changed in the Mid-East, thanks in part to the brilliant successes won by the Secretary. If Turkish irrationality is speeding the country back into heroin trafficking, the U.S. can with cold reason lay down the law.

Per House Concurrent Resolution 507, which you have introduced, all U.S. governmental assistance for Turkey should end. Similarly, again following your lead, the new Trade Bill should deny Most Favored Nation status to Turkish exports. Some of those—e.g., tobacco—would quickly lose their place in American markets without equal footing with competitive products of other countries.

And as they set about re-infecting us with heroin, we should proceed to quarantine the Turks. One appropriate measure would be to cut U.S. air service to Istanbul and Ankara.

In fact, the gravity of the Turkish action against us is so great that we should not hesitate to break diplomatic relations with the country.

In pragmatic terms, we do not now need Turkey as an ally. Accordingly, we certainly should not do anything to perpetuate an alliance—or any form of relationship—when our so-called ally is unleashing heroin upon us. Nor would it in any way be improper or unwise to take steps to seek the ouster of Turkey from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

In short, we should not refrain from any step—no matter how drastic—to exorcise the spirit now possessing Turkey. The danger that its actions are about to wreak on all of us justify any action that we may take to jar Turkey back to its senses.

THE CASE FOR H.R. 14392—PART II "ARE CANCELED LOANS TAXABLE?"

HON. IKE F. ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in an article in the July 8, 1974 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education, Ms. Karen J. Winkler has summarized very well the status of the

Internal Revenue Service's effort to enforce Revenue Ruling 73-256.

With permission from the Chronicle of Higher Education, I am inserting this article in the hope that my esteemed colleagues will read it carefully and will join me and 137 other Members in cosponsoring H.R. 14392.

The article reads as follows:

ARE CANCELED LOANS TAXABLE?

(By Karen J. Winkler)

WASHINGTON.—Hundreds of thousands of persons may be liable for up to three years of back taxes on education loans that were canceled in return for their service as teachers or health personnel in understaffed areas, according to a ruling that the Internal Revenue Service has recently begun to enforce.

In 1973, the I.R.S. ruled that such "forgiven" loans should be considered income and that taxes must be paid in the year they are canceled. Because the loans are made "primarily for the benefit of the grantor," the I.R.S. said, they cannot be considered tax-exempt scholarships.

YEARLY PAYMENTS DROPPED

Many state and federal programs, as well as privately sponsored medical programs, provide for the cancellation of all or part of loans to prospective teachers, doctors, dentists, nurses, pharmacists, medical technicians, physical therapists, optometrists, osteopaths, podiatrists, and veterinarians in return for a promise to serve in low-income or poorly staffed areas, or to instruct the handicapped.

Each yearly loan payment is usually dropped, partially or totally, for each year of service.

Under the I.R.S. ruling, taxes can be collected retroactively, for the three years preceding notification of liability. A single taxpayer earning \$10,000 a year with a canceled debt of \$2,000 a year for three years, for example, would thus have to pay an additional \$540 a year in taxes, a total of \$1,620.

The Internal Revenue Service did not begin to enforce the ruling until early April, when it notified roughly 1,000 teachers and health practitioners in North Carolina that they had 15 days to sign an agreement that they would pay taxes on canceled loans. Students in other states have not yet been contacted.

An I.R.S. official told *The Chronicle* that North Carolina was a test case, and that the service would analyze the effect of the ruling there before using it nationwide.

Eighteen states currently finance such forgiven loans. At least two more are debating doing so.

Revenue service officials said the ruling would also apply to federal loans, although sources within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare said they had not received official confirmation of the status of their various programs. They hope some will be exempt.

Combined, the programs canceled the loans of almost 300,000 teachers and health professionals last year, all of whom may now be hit with bills for back taxes.

Under the National Direct Student Loan program (formerly the National Defense Student Loan program), approximately 285,000 teachers were absolved of approximately \$45-million of debts for one year of service in 1973.

Under the Nurse Training Act of 1971, some 12,330 nurses were absolved of \$2.39-million in 1972.

Under the Comprehensive Health Manpower Act of 1971—part of the Public Health Service Act—40 borrowers were absolved of \$40,000, and 480 have applied for another repayment provision since becoming eligible last September.

Many of the roughly 700 teachers and 1,500 health practitioners liable for back taxes on their North Carolina state loans have already

received payment-due notices, with 15 days to agree or appeal. The pressure is against appealing: if they lose, the taxpayers will be charged interest for each extra day until they sign a statement accepting liability.

The bills have ranged from about \$50 for low-paid teachers to around \$1,000 for doctors earning \$30,000 a year, a local I.R.S. official in North Carolina said.

Both students and state officials complained that there should be no taxation without notification at the time the loan was made. "We weren't told we were subject to the ruling until November," Janet Proctor, administrator of state medical loans, said. "If you head people into the program, ask them to serve in given areas, without advising them they will be taxed, they feel misled. It's not fair," she said.

WE'RE GETTING THE BLAME

It is also not fair to the people administering the program, said James Spate, director of the state's prospective teachers program. "We were not aware it was coming, and we're getting the blame for something that isn't our fault."

Colleges and universities may find themselves in a similar position if canceled National Direct Student Loans are taxed. Since the government does not have on file the names of the students absolved at each institution, colleges and universities would presumably have to supply their records to the I.R.S.

This past year, 2,639 institutions of higher education participated in the federal program.

"We also feel it's defeating the purpose of an incentive" to serve in understaffed areas, Mr. Spate said. While he reported that students applying for loans to become teachers in North Carolina so far had not been deterred by news of the ruling, Ms. Proctor said there had been "a groundswell of discouragement and concern" among prospective health professionals.

AGENTS AT THE OFFICE

Moreover, she said, "Some students who have already been involved in the program are paying back the loans rather than practicing because they don't want to get involved" with tax problems.

Nurses and physical therapists, she reported, have received tax notices at home, while some doctors and dentists have been confronted by revenue agents at their offices.

Rep. Ike F. Andrews (D-N.C.), is enlisting support for a bill to bar retroactive taxation, so that students will know their responsibilities before they apply for loans or go into service in special areas. Other Congressmen are being asked to introduce legislation banning all tax on canceled student loans.

ECONOMIC REALITIES AND RHODESIAN CHROME

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, in approaching the question of our continued trade with Rhodesia and our violation of United Nations sanctions against such trade, one of the factors we must consider is our economic relationship, now and in the future, with Rhodesia as well as all the other African states.

Currently, U.S. interests have over \$3 billion worth of investments in Africa. One-third of this is in Nigeria while private interests in Rhodesia total only

about \$60 million. It is projected that our investments in Nigeria are likely to double over the next few years, mainly as a result of our need for petroleum. Recent figures supplied by the Federal Energy Office show that Nigeria is now emerging as one of our largest sources of petroleum—especially crude oil—supplying almost 15 percent of our imports. In fact, in some recent reporting periods, Nigeria has been our largest single foreign supplier.

Traditionally, we have experienced a generally favorable overall balance of trade with African nations, and our positive position here has helped to offset unfavorable balances elsewhere. As a result of our increased reliance on oil from African sources, the dollar figure for our total imports from Africa in 1973 exceeded exports to Africa, \$2.35 billion to \$2.30 billion—a substantially balanced trade picture, nevertheless. For the first quarter of 1974, however, we did show a net positive balance of \$126 million.

Trade with Rhodesia is a minuscule percentage of our overall trade with all African nations. Commerce Department figures thus far this year indicate that Nigeria and South Africa, together, comprise over 50 percent of the monetary value of all imports from Africa and almost 40 percent of all exports. Rhodesia represents much less than 1 percent of the African total in either category.

Africa possesses overwhelming reserves of critical mineral resources and produces much of the current world supply of manganese, 28 percent of world production; cobalt, 80 percent; bauxite, 68 percent; copper, 17 percent, and petroleum, 11 percent. Substantial outputs of cocoa, coffee, groundnuts, and roundwood also come from African nations. To a great extent, the United States relies on African nations for these resources. Almost 60 percent of our manganese and 80 percent of our cobalt, for example, come from the African continent.

It is in our national interest to observe the sanctions now and support those who would see majority rule in Rhodesia. With a minority of 200,000 whites imposing its rule on nearly 5 million blacks, I believe both our current economic and political relations with African nations and our long term trading and business interests with Rhodesia, itself—for chrome or whatever—rest clearly with majority rule in Rhodesia. In my estimation, based on personal conversations with a number of African leaders, we are deluding ourselves if we assume that those in power in Africa are indifferent to our stance with regard to sanctions. On the contrary, our violation of sanctions is invariably the first topic of conversation raised by African diplomats in discussions with Americans.

As we consider our resource needs for the future and where our trading markets can lie, I believe we must carefully assess the wisdom of our current relationship with Rhodesia. Whatever gain we can possibly see in our present course and I see none is decisively refuted by the economic and political realities by the situation, both present and certainly in the future.

GROWTH AND PROGRESS

HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend the people of Bridgeport, Mich. took part in a 3-day celebration of progress and pride, the annual Sauerkraut Festival. Each year at this time, the community marks its continued growth and prosperity with this fine festival. I ask my colleagues to join in a salute to this fine American community, its proud heritage, and its friendly hard-working people.

No words are more appropriate for Bridgeport than the words: growth and progress. Over the years, the people of the area have watched their town grow with new industries, schools, and shops. And yet, a visitor to Bridgeport cannot help but feel the friendly flavor of the rural community that it was.

Early settlers of the area named it "Cass Bend," after the river that courses gently through it. Historians have left us precious few facts on Cass Bend, although we do know that its first election was held in 1848. Early in 1874, a bridge was ordered to be built and paid for from State land improvement funds set aside by Michigan's famous boy governor, Stevens Mason. Shortly afterward, money to build a turnpike connecting nearby Saginaw and the bridge was appropriated. In 1884, the name of the area which is now the center of town was officially designated the township seat, with its new name of Bridgeport.

Industry is not new to the area. In fact, one of its founders, M. C. Lull, built a sawmill there in 1849. According to newspaper accounts of the time:

Some of the finest lumber ever manufactured in Michigan—the famous Cass River cork pine—came out of the first saw mill.

A year after the construction of the sawmill, Hull undertook another venture. He bored a salt well and historians believe that this well provided the "Finest flow of brine ever struck in the Saginaw Valley."

Shortly after the sawmill operation began, other mills were constructed. Shingle mills, and flour mills were some of the first businesses built.

Bridgeport Lumber and Saw Co., established in 1862, was one of the first important businesses in the area. Another footnote of days gone by was the prosperous business of a man named Foster, who manufactured a cure-all called Hinkley's Bone Liniment. The product caught on, and for some years afterward Bridgeport was the home of this popular elixir.

Today, of course, Bridgeport continues to prosper. Under the active leadership of its chamber of commerce and other community groups, Bridgeport has become a friendly community justifiably proud of its continued growth.

What was once a log cabin on the Cass River is now a community of more than

14,000 people. Although many of its people work in the neighboring industrial centers of Saginaw, Flint, and Bay City, many others work in Bridgeports own industrial concerns.

A deep-seated belief in that the utilization of man's personal gifts is a part of God's purpose led a foundry employee to invent a new tool, and thereby place himself at the head of a new industry in the field of metal workings. In 1932, Rollin M. Severance, a supervisor in a Saginaw factory, designed the first midget mill. After 2 years, working at home in his off-hours to perfect his invention, Severance quit the foundry and hired several helpers to fill orders that were swiftly pouring in. In the years since, Severance Tool has expanded from the original shop in a spare bedroom in Mr. Severance's home to a plant in Bridgeport that now occupies about 45,000 square feet.

Another Bridgeport success story is the one of George Gunther and the Great Lakes Guage Co. In 1961, Mr. Gunther converted a 30 by 50-foot tractor shed into a manufacturing facility and hired three employees. Now some 50 people are employed in the manufacture of carbide gages, bushings, and small precision tools. Other industries include a S. & E. Machine Products, Master Tool and Die, and Dixie Tool Industries. It should be noted that Vlastic Foods of Bridgeport, makes some of the best sauerkraut anywhere, and that this sauerkraut is one of the highlights of the festival.

New homes, apartments, schools, churches, and shops mark the spirit of this town of growth and progress. Bridgeport is proof that small towns can remain vibrant and friendly as they prosper. I salute the people of Bridgeport and invite all Americans who may be vacationing or traveling in Michigan to stop and enjoy the Sauerkraut Festival in Bridgeport, Mich.

Mr. Speker, I would like to thank a fine community newspaper, the Bridgeport Future, which in itself is a symbol of growth and community involvement, for the background information contained in my salute to this growing, prosperous American community.

THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct privilege to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues a speech given by the Honorable Joseph John Jova, Ambassador of the United States of America to Mexico. It is a sound, eloquent, scholarly commencement address, delivered to the graduating class of the University of The Americas, Cholula, Mexico, on June 8, 1974.

In this connection, it may be important and interesting to report that Ambassador Jova, a conscientious, competent, hard-working career diplomat earned his every promotion, and they

have been numerous strictly on meritorious service. In the company of, and in no small part, thanks to the brilliant cooperation of, his devoted, charming, London-born wife, Pamela, and his five talented children, he, Ambassador Jova, has been advanced to the grade of Foreign Service Officer, First Class, prior to his appointment as U.S. Ambassador to the key Republic of Honduras. While in that post, Ambassador Jova was fortunate enough to have as his Deputy Chief of Diplomatic Mission another Foreign Service Officer, Miss Jean Marie Wilkowski, who later was appointed the first woman-Ambassador to any nation on the great continent of Africa. It is gratifying to note that Ambassador Wilkowski, is now giving sterling service for the human race as U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Zambia, one of the four most valuable copper-exporting countries on the face of our planet.

After Ambassador Jova's Mission to Honduras, he was promoted to the vital job of Ambassador of the United States of America to the Organization of American States. Here again, the gentleman and his family provided constructive services to the whole Western Hemisphere family of nations. As I have already indicated, he is learning, teaching, and working effectively in Mexico. His speech to the young ladies and gentlemen of the University of the Americas reads as follows:

THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME

Mr. President, Mr. Chairman of the Board, estimado señor secretario, graduates and guests. I should like to thank you most sincerely for having chosen me to talk with you today.

This occasion and this place form a particularly appropriate setting for the issues I shall treat: vital issues brought about by new realities. The time is appropriate because, as graduates, you are just starting a lifetime of confronting those issues and realities. Although I am sure you are happy to have finally completed your studies, you should remember that "commencement" means a beginning, not a termination. The place is especially appropriate. The very idea of a "University of the Americas," with all its associations of the New World, its sense of Oneness and shared values among the Hemispheric community of nations, is intimately linked to the response you must make to future challenges. Finally, our meeting here is significant as coming together of the generations. My generation, though still active in the direction of the world's affairs, can see the time when the torch will be passed to the younger generation. We are pleased with what we see. For it is youth that has so inspiringly answered the call to protect our threatened environment. And it is youth that is fashioning a new culture, a "counter-culture", that seeks fulfillment in the quality of its human relationships and spiritual values, rather than in the quality and quantity of the goods it consumes. With that in mind, let us now examine some of these new realities.

That we are approaching a profound transformation in human affairs is reflected in the rise of the new discipline of "futurology." The general tenor of the futurologists' vision may be gleaned from the titles of their work: thus Peter Drucker foresees an Age of Discontinuity, Zbigniew Brzezinski places us Between Two Ages, and Alvin Toffler frets about Future Shock. In recent months an economist, Robert Hellbroner, has written An Inquiry Into the Human Prospect and

found that prospect frightening and depressing in the extreme.

Most of these writers agree that we are at watershed in human history, that the future promises jolting dislocations that will require nothing less than a thorough re-ordering of our values and life styles if we are to survive, let alone prosper.

A more literary description of what we face is provided by Herman Hesse, the German novelist, in Steppenwolf, a work which has enjoyed a revival in recent years. Hesse wrote that:

"Human life is reduced to real suffering, to hell, only when two ages, two cultures and religions overlap . . . There are times when a whole generation is caught this way between two ages, two modes of life, with the consequence that it loses all power to understand itself and has no standard, no security, no simple acquiescence."

Are we really approaching such a ghastly state of affairs? That such a question can even be asked seriously strikes me as grimly ironic when I recall the prevailing mood of only a decade ago. For, if this were June of 10 or 11 years ago, my remarks and indeed my outlook would be a very different order. It would have been standard for a commencement address to have been something of a pep talk.

After all, had we not just launched an Alliance for Progress that would lift Latin America from centuries of economic want into an era of steadily increasing per capita productivity and consumption? Indeed, was not a Decade of Development underway, powered by a formidable array of American and international organizations with goodwill, technology and resources to spare, promising the beginning of the end of poverty, disease and ignorance for the entire Third World? (A term which itself was new.) Meanwhile, on the home front, plans were being laid for a Great Society that would wage a War on Poverty and see the eternal banishment of urban slums and rural deprivation.

Does all that sound like wishful thinking? It was. Confident economists, to some extent the high priests of the social order, spoke of the "fine tuning" of the economy, with unemployment and inflation presenting no insurmountable barriers to a rational, Keynesian handling of monetary and fiscal policy. In fact, economists did not even countenance the possibility that inflation and unemployment could co-exist. You should remember too that talk of "ecology" and "The Population Bomb" had not yet entered the public debate.

Vietnam was still the scene of a relatively small American presence, and Watergate was just another luxury apartment building. No one talked about the generation gap in those days, and the college man was not only clean cut but also crew cut. Generally speaking, the Victorian idea of continued, unlimited growth and progress was alive and well. So, had I spoken with you at that time I would no doubt have tried to share with you the profound hopefulness and heady optimism that were so widely held for the human condition. But this is not the early sixties, so I cannot.

Now, ten years is a very short time indeed in Man's history, and we are entitled to ask: "What happened? What can account for our descent, in so short a time, from insouciant buoyancy to a rather pervading sense of illness?" Basically what happened was that the Real World, so full of nationalistic fervor, unreason and passion, and inexorably guided by ancient human and natural laws (to which Whiz Kids are not always privy), gave a mighty kick in the pants to the notion that there were simple solutions to age-old problems. We were rebuked by History itself for our arrogance and hubris. It was a learning experience. Certainly one does not see too many panaceas being peddled these days.

And what of the future, which, after all, is the vague, unformed landscape you will

have to inhabit? I would like to look briefly at the past in order to illuminate what awaits us.

For about the last 200 years—that is since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution—visionary statesmen in the West have put their faith in industrial growth as the hope of mankind. This hope was amply justified in the workings of industrial development, for through the application of science and technology, men became Supermen in their productive capacity. Further, the growth and spread of industrialization meant not only a rapid increase in the availability of goods and services—an ever-enlarging pie, if you will—but it also meant an ever-increasing slice of that pie for the people who helped produce it. Even though proportional differences might remain between rich and poor, and in fact might actually grow, each passing year meant an absolute increase in the portion each received.

In the last few years, however, a number of alarmed industrialists, scholars, and prophets have foreseen an end to growth. Not just population growth, mind you, with its obvious and grisly Malthusian consequences, but an absolute ceiling on industrial growth itself. It is not only a matter of exponentially increasing demands for raw materials in the face of a dwindling of those same resources. The final, ultimate Ghost in the Machine of industrialization is the limited capacity of our biosphere—that thin envelope of water, soil and air in which human life is possible—to absorb the heat of industrial processes.

Even if we had unlimited energy and mineral resources, even if we learned how to recycle our waste, at our present rate of industrial growth the planet might be virtually uninhabitable in some 250 years and uncomfortably, even catastrophically, warm long before that. And certainly before thermal pollution really becomes noticeable, we will be confronted with the recurring nightmares of overcrowding, major climatic changes, massive crop failures and starvation, and murderous violence spawned by the bleak desperation of the situation. These symptoms, in fact, have already made their appalling debut. We may be sure that the oil shortage of last winter was but a mild preview of what is to come.

That there are limitations, then, to industrial growth is now widely accepted as fact. What are the human consequences of this? To use the analogy of the pie, it means, given the current growth of population, an absolute decrease in the size of each person's slice with each passing year, beginning perhaps in the next ten to twenty years. This knell, I should point out, sounds as surely for the socialist countries as for the West.

The impact of a limited growth or "steady state" world economy will be hard enough on the developed nations. Certainly much of what we conceive of as the Good Life is predicated on the assumption of sustained industrial growth.

But the blow will fall most cruelly on those less developed countries which are lacking in abundant mineral resources. For it is a fact that the majority of mankind has been experiencing an intense Revolution of Rising Expectations since the Second World War, a revolution enormously aided by another revolution, the rapid rise of global communications. Of particular significance in this matter is the demographic profile of the Third World, and I think we should examine this closely.

Of the world's current population of some 3.6 billion, 2.5 billion live in the less developed countries. The population growth in these countries is such that the total population doubles roughly every 25 years. If present growth levels continue unchecked, the Third World will be forced to support a population of some 40 billion people a hundred years from now, a prospect as disturbing as it is absurd. But let us base our speculation on a

more ideal growth model, however unrealistic that may be. Let us assume that throughout the Third World, a fertility level that would produce Zero Population Growth is achieved by the year 2000—a quarter century hence. Even if this drastic change could come about, the distribution of population below childbearing age would mean that the population would continue to grow until it increased two and a half times, or to well in excess of 12 billion.

Bearing in mind our present inability to properly feed, house, educate and employ the majority of mankind, I think we can grasp the dimensions of the problem. Certainly it is not pleasant to reflect on the political consequences of explosive population growth in the face of limited economic growth. The responses to these severe dislocations will probably range from whole groups of people quietly and hopelessly starving to death to inflamed violence as have nots try to wrest the basis for life itself from the haves. The struggle will be not only between the rich and poor nations, but between the rich and poor classes of individual societies. It is difficult to speculate on the political life of such societies, but I think we can safely say that the climate of reasonableness and measured give-and-take will be noticeably absent.

That, then, is a brief overview of the kind of situation we might expect to encounter in the foreseeable future: a world of increasingly frantic competition for increasing scarce resources, a world haunted and stalked by poverty, famine, violence, and war.

A gloomy scenario? Indeed it is. Is the situation hopeless? I think not.

I think not because of the sterner stuff I have witnessed in human beings, a certain toughness and resiliency implied in Winston Churchill's remark, uttered in the black days of the Battle of Britain, that "Western man has not come this far because he was made of sugar candy." Above all, we must avoid a failure of nerve.

The answer to the future's problems does not ultimately lie in another machine; it lies in the spirit of Man. This applies particularly to you. For when you will be called upon to do is to fashion a new ethos and a new sensibility that must be compatible with the new realities of this old world.

It is impossible now to imagine what the prevailing value system of the 21st century will be, but I would venture a guess at two prominent aspects of such a system, one rather new, the other quite old. The new will involve an extreme sensitivity to the vast, seamless web of nature of which we are a part. This already has a good start in the ecology movement, in which youth played such a part. It is very reassuring to me to hear our planet referred to as "Spaceship Earth"; that is an image we would do well to bear in mind. We are going to have to look at growth and well-being in terms other than the purely monetary. Paul Samuelson, the Nobel Laureate economist from M.I.T., whose economics textbook you may well have used, has recently proposed that the index of Gross National Product be replaced by one called Net Economic Welfare, a measure which would take into account some of the "disamenities" of growth—pollution, overcrowding, and so forth—and thus gauge our progress—or lack of it—more revealingly. Certainly in the future conservation will play as fundamental a role in our economic life as production.

The other, older principle echoes down the centuries. It has been stated in many languages and many cultures long since vanished. Its most eloquent expression was probably given by a carpenter's son on the Mount of Olives nearly 2,000 years ago. It is simply a belief in the Brotherhood of Man—the One-ness of Man.

It means we are all in this together—the Mexican farmer on his ejido, the Pittsburgh

steel worker, the graduating senior at the University of the Americas and the United States Ambassador to Mexico; we are all in it together, all of us passengers on this same Spaceship Earth. Let us never forget that. Brotherhood has existed as an ideal for millennia; the time has come to lift it from the shelf of platitudes, dust it off, and put it to work.

Members of the graduating class, distinguished guests—we have been discussing serious matters this afternoon. But we should remember Plato's admonition that "God alone is worthy of supreme seriousness," and look to the enjoyment of life as well as to its preservation. I earnestly hope that the coming years will find you discovering the richness and wonder that human existence, for all its trials, still offers courageous and inquisitive men and women.

Let us recall a favorite passage from Ecclesiastes:

To every thing there is a reason, and a time for every purpose under heaven:

A time to be born, and a time to die;
A time to weep, and a time to laugh; a time to mourn, and a time to dance.
A time to get, and a time to lose;
A time to rend, and a time to sew; a time to keep silence, and a time to speak;
A time to love, and a time to hate; a time for war, and a time for peace.

And I fervently hope that for you it will be a time for peace—a time for peace in brotherhood and one-ness.

You well know that existence is ever changing—imperfect but wonderful, joyful but marked by tragedy. What is always necessary to state, to write, to sing is that from beginning to end, as individuals or as nations—through joy or tragedy, through concord or discord—We are one. We are one—brothers all.

The most basic purposes of education are to open the students' minds, prepare them to live in today's—and tomorrow's—world, and to launch them on a life-long voyage of self-discovery. Today you start that voyage. I wish you well. Thank you.

IS THERE ANY HOPE FOR OUR NATIONAL SYMBOL?

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the survival of the bald eagle, our national symbol, is threatened today by the relentless development of its natural habitat. Fortunately, constructive action is being taken to protect our bald eagle population. This fine effort, conducted by Eagle Valley Environmentalists, Inc., has been actively involved in the purchase of eagle nesting areas in southwestern Wisconsin to provide a safe haven where the birds can rebuild their depleted numbers.

I commend EVE and the Izaak Walton League for their efforts to promote programs to protect our bald eagles and commend to the attention of the Members an article by EVE's president, Terrence W. Ingram, which was published in the July issue of *Outdoor America*, the official publication of the Izaak Walton League of America.

IS THERE ANY HOPE FOR OUR NATIONAL SYMBOL?

(By Terrence W. Ingram)

For a national symbol, the bald eagle has a tough row to hoe.

Shot at due to misinformation or greed, its reproductive capacity hampered by pesticides and driven from its preferred nesting areas by burgeoning development, this great bird is now in danger of extinction.

How did the bald eagle become so important? How serious are the threats to its existence? Will the species survive outside of zoos, or will it go the way of the passenger pigeon? Opinions vary, but there is reason for hope.

The Continental Congress selected the bald eagle as our national bird in 1787. Benjamin Franklin promoted the wild turkey, but the majestic, fierce fighting giant—loyal to its mate until death—won out.

Bald eagles normally weigh from eight to twelve pounds and build their huge six-to-ten-foot high nests in remote areas away from man. They have a wingspread of seven to eight feet, whereas the red tailed hawk, our largest common hawk, has a wingspread of up to four and one-half feet. Young eagles, "immatures", are completely dark brown and do not acquire the adult plumage of a white head and tail until they are about four years old.

There are two races of the bald eagle—the northern and the southern bald eagles. The southern race is found in the Gulf Coast states, with the main concentration in Florida. Most of these birds nest in or around the Everglades National Park.

The northern race nests mainly in Northern Wisconsin and Minnesota, a stronghold for an estimated 30,000 to 55,000 of the great birds.

This year, new eagle nests have been started in southern Illinois and Kentucky. Each year the U.S. Forest Service conducts a survey of the eagle nests in their forest areas. Of the 171 active nests reported in 1973 throughout the USFS Eastern Region, 107 were successful in producing young. A small increase in the number of young produced over the previous year was recorded. Almost 2/3 of the active nests were successful in producing young. This was five per cent above last year's total and was the highest percentage in the past ten years.

POPULATION DECREASING

The winter population along the Mississippi River and its tributaries was declining for about ten years until about 1969. It held its own for a couple of years and then increased greatly in 1972. Since then the population has started decreasing again. It dropped 18 per cent in 1973 and another 20 per cent in 1974. The percentages of immatures have also dropped from a high of 30 per cent in 1973 to 23 per cent in 1974.

The decline in the eagle population was first noticed about 20 years ago. Often blamed for eating lambs, chickens and fish, they were shot. Some states offered eagle bounties. Although they are now protected throughout the United States, the shooting of eagles still occurs. Possibly the most infamous case happened in Wyoming, where a rancher was charged with killing 366 bald and golden eagles from a helicopter. News reports have indicated that several eagles were shot this past winter, '73-'74, during the bird's annual incursion into the Upper Mississippi Valley.

In April, the Fish and Wildlife Service announced that "a ring of more than two dozen traffickers in illegal eagle and other bird parts and feathers" had been uncovered in Oklahoma. Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton said that the group killed thousands of migratory birds and eagles to manufacture Indian artifacts.

The lucrative trade sees eagle carcasses selling on the black market for as high as \$125 each, according to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

It is now known that in the Midwest over 90 per cent of the bald eagle's food consists of small fish. The wide-spread use of DDT after World War II is blamed for the decline

of the species. The eagles accumulated DDT in their bodies by eating fish contaminated with the pesticide. It's believed this caused a thinning of the eggshells in the annual clutch of one or two eggs. With the thinning of the eggshells, the adult often crushed the eggs while she was brooding. An abrupt temperature change caused by the female being flushed from her nest while incubating would also render them infertile.

WHAT IS BEING DONE?

Bald eagle nesting trees in National Forests are now protected by law. Both the Forest Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service are developing new guidelines for management and protection of the birds. State conservation departments throughout the Midwest are attempting to develop management guidelines for nests and roosts off their lands.

The latest impact on eagle preservation is the setting aside of private lands by interested organizations and persons. Hunt-Wesson Foods has participated in a project to buy an eagle nesting preserve near the Chippewa National Forest in Minnesota. Weyerhaeuser Co. has set aside bald eagle nesting areas on their Klamath, Oregon tree farms and has a wildlife biologist looking after the nesting birds.

Eagle Valley Environmentalists, Inc., The Nature Conservancy, The National Wildlife Federation and the National Audubon Society are each purchasing winter roosting valleys near winter feeding locations. The Nature Conservancy has purchased Cedar Glen in Illinois. Both the Audubon Society and NWF are involved with preserving a roost in South Dakota. Eagle Valley Environmentalists, Inc. is raising funds for the purchase of roosting valleys along the Mississippi and Wisconsin rivers.

A major bald eagle research project in the Midwest is being coordinated by Elton Fawks, a long-time eagle researcher and Izaak Walton League member. This project is being co-sponsored by Eagle Valley Environmentalists, Inc. and other conservation organizations. The project will produce:

1. Semi-annual reports on the status of the bald eagle population.
2. The formation of a clearing house for research ideas and future needs.
3. The encouragement of new research conducted.
4. Locating funds for eagle research.
5. Keeping the public informed of the eagles' needs and changes in the population.

HOW CAN YOU HELP

Nationwide, the bald eagle still has a viable population. Funds are needed for research and the purchase of both roosting and nesting areas. With more conservationists and conservation organizations cooperating, the bald eagle will remain wild and not become just a caged symbol of freedom.

If interested in helping, write EVE, P.O. Box 155, Apple River, Illinois 61001 or the Izaak Walton League National Office, Suite 806, 1800 N. Kent St., Arlington, VA 22209.

EAGLE "EGG-PLANT"

A unique transplant of bald eagle eggs from Minnesota to Maine is now underway, according to Fish and Wildlife Service Director Lynn A. Greenwalt.

The experiment involves taking six bald eagle eggs from active nests in the Chippewa National Forest in Minnesota, where eagle populations are stable, and placing them in bald eagle nests in Maine, where pollution has apparently affected eagle egg hatching success in recent years. Eggs from the Maine nests will be taken to the Fish and Wildlife Service's Patuxent Wildlife Research Center in Laurel, Maryland, for incubation and pollution studies. Previous studies show that the foster parents will accept the eggs and have hatched and fledged the young.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT JOIN TO FIGHT ALCOHOLISM

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on July 10 our distinguished colleague Representative DANIEL FLOOD spoke at a luncheon in connection with the first meeting of the new and largely expanded Labor-Management Committee of the National Council on Alcoholism. The National Council on Alcoholism is the only national voluntary health agency founded to combat the disease of alcoholism.

The cochairmen of the expanded NCA Labor-Management Committee are Mr. George Meany, president, AFL-CIO; and Mr. James M. Roche, chairman of the board, General Motors Corp. The new committee includes some of the top corporate and labor union presidents in the country.

Alcoholism is a disease which affects nine million Americans and costs our economy \$25 billion a year, according to a 219-page report released on July 11 of this year by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At the luncheon at which Congressman FLOOD spoke, Mr. Meany and Mr. Roche released a joint statement:

We are calling for all unions and employers, big and small, to join us in this effort. We urged them to stop kidding themselves by saying, "We don't have that problem here."

The Meany-Roche statement further declared that—

If every industry would use the knowledge available to deal with their alcoholics just as they do with any other sick person, successful industry programs demonstrate that at least three million alcoholics could recover over a six year period.

At the present time we are reaching less than 10 percent of labor and industry. These progressive programs are working for such companies as General Motors, Hughes Aircraft, Firestone, Du Pont and a few others. For example, the General Motors alcoholism recovery program, which is being implemented with the full and complete cooperation of the United Auto Workers, reports the following results with the employees who have gone through their program over the past few years:

First, 80 percent recovery rate;

Second, 85 percent reduction in lost man hours;

Third, 70 percent reduction in sickness and accident benefits paid; and

Fourth, 47 percent reduction in sick leaves.

Mr. Speaker, I include the speech by Congressman FLOOD at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN DANIEL FLOOD

Mr. Meany, Mr. Roche and Members of the Committee:

As you can gather from reading the newspaper, watching television or just talking to your neighbor over the back fence, the United States Congress is enduring—I was going to say enjoying—its busiest session in years.

However, when I received your kind invitation to attend this lunch, I put it on my high-priority list immediately.

As Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HEW which handles a budget which is over \$36 billion a year, I sometimes find that some of the most important health problems in the country are neglected in appropriating that vast sum. This has been true of alcoholism for a number of years but with the passage of the historic Comprehensive Alcoholism Act less than four years ago, our Appropriations Committee has in every subsequent year gone far beyond the recommendations of an Administration which is supposedly interested in combating alcoholism.

I could cite a number of examples but one of our Committee reports will have to suffice.

In February, 1972 top officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appeared at a press conference to announce a massive attack on alcoholism. At the same time they released a 120 page report to the Congress noting that there were nine million alcoholics in the country, that the cost to both business and labor exceeded \$15 billion a year, and they included a whole lot of additional statistics on the fact that alcoholism was the prime cause of 50 percent of our highway fatalities, that two million alcoholics were arrested each year and clogged our court system, and so on.

The rhetoric was fine but they sent up a budget of less than \$100 million for the "massive" attack.

We rejected that budget out-of-hand. We declared in our official report that alcohol is the most abused drug in the United States and it was about time that we launched a drive to combat what we referred to as "one of the world's most serious health problems, alcoholism."

We were short on rhetoric and long on funds. We added \$60 million to the Administration budget for alcoholism. Unfortunately, this sum became part of one of the President's two vetoes of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill in Fiscal 1973, but we still salvaged a considerable increase for alcoholism in the bill which finally cleared the Congress and was at last signed by the President with a reluctant pen.

In the subsequent two years the Administration has continued its penny-pinching attitude toward alcoholism. As a matter of fact, this very year it tried to wipe out the project grants which go to communities all across the country and the training grant program so vital because testimony before our Committee revealed the desperate shortage of trained workers in the field of alcoholism. We rejected the Administration position, restored the project and training monies and added a sizable amount for the National Institute on Alcoholism for Fiscal 1975.

We can do a part of the job but there is obviously a limit to what we can accomplish in terms of existing Federal revenues. I am therefore delighted that this morning, as I understand it, you held the first meeting of a new and greatly strengthened Labor-Management Committee of the National Council on Alcoholism. Through testimony our Committee has received, we know that you have been working in the vineyards for a number of years and that you pioneered in the labor-management attack on alcoholism. However, in looking over the list of members of your new committee, I believe that you now have a lineup rivaling that of the New York Yankees in the days of Babe Ruth and Lou Gehrig.

We know that the disease of alcoholism spares no segment of our society—it hits the blue collar worker on the assembly line, the coal miner in the pits and the white collar executive in the highest corporate echelons.

In past years, untold thousands of workers and executives were fired because of their

disease of alcoholism, an event bringing ruination to not only themselves but to their immediate families and their loved ones. I now say to both labor and business that there is great hope—that we can salvage untold numbers of men and women whom we formerly consigned to the scrapheap.

A significant number of corporations are finding that it is good business to introduce programs for early detection and treatment of both executives and employees. I am delighted to note that James M. Roche, the former Chairman of the Board of the General Motors Corporation is a co-chairman of your committee, and that General Motors has launched a major program to salvage alcoholics. Now I know that my good friend George Meany is co-chairman of your new committee. George, in case you're worried, I am not going to say that what is good for General Motors is good for the country, but in this case this alliance is a deeply significant example of cooperation between the executive and the worker in the solution of a problem common to both.

Finally, what you are doing here is strengthening the bonds of alliance between your publicly-elected officials and the great voluntary sector in which both labor and industry play so significant a role. In fact, I am so carried away by this tremendous cooperative effort that I here and now invite designated representatives of this Labor-Management Committee to come before our House Appropriations Subcommittee next year and tell us of the wonderful work you are doing.

Thank you very much.

REJUVENATION OF AMERICA'S COAL INDUSTRY

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the long-term goal of project independence will necessitate the expansion and rejuvenation of America's coal industry. Approximately 97 percent of our hydrocarbon reserves—fossil fuels—lie in long-neglected coalfields. With this vast potential it is rather foolish to continue our reliance on expensive foreign oil. The controversy concerns the method of extracting that coal.

Our coal wealth is divided into two reserves of the West—3 percent of total—and the deep mined anthracite coal of the East. Whereas the vast majority of our ultimate coal reserves are in the East, the western coal is the most easily accessible and is of lower sulfur content. The recent trends in the energy industry have been to abandon the underground mining, primarily in the East and Midwest, for strip mines in the West. Their rationale is that western coal is low sulfur, and hence meets environmental restrictions; and can be easily and cheaply procured. In 1973 nearly half of the 600 million tons of coal produced in the United States come in from strip mines.

In the proposed strip mining legislation, the Congress is asked to consider the benefits of strip mining in the West in light of the Nation's current shortage of inexpensive energy. Would strip mining alleviate that shortage and at what cost? One bill would ban strip mining altogether (H.R. 15000), another

would closely regulate it through strict land reclamation standards (H.R. 11500), and one would give it virtually a free reign (H.R. 12898). In resolving the attendant controversy I have had to balance three basic arguments: first, America's need for low cost energy; second, strip mining's possible deleterious, irreparable environmental damage; and third, the effect of the proposed legislation of my constituents.

Argument No. 1: The coal companies have held that the only source of low-sulfur coal is west of the Mississippi. They state that any attempts to regulate their efforts in this area will result in either higher costs to the consumer or in no coal at all. Agreed, western, strip-pable coal is low sulfur, lower in most instances than the eastern coal. But it also has a low Btu—heat—value, which means it is necessary to burn more of it to get that same amount of energy as with the high Btu eastern coal. So the actual sulfur emittance level is the same for both groups of coal and the coal companies' main argument is refuted.

Argument No. 2: The coal companies claim that no land reclamation regulations are necessary; that they will regulate themselves. I completely disagree. First, the National Academy of Sciences recently released a report finding that many areas of the West could not be reclaimed to their original state if they were strip mined. Second, West Virginia is living testimony to the travesty that strip mining can work on the landscape. It was a West Virginia Congressman, Mr. HECHLER, who sponsored the bill banning strip mining altogether. It is clear that something must be done to protect the delicate ecological balance of the West from the expedient advances of the energy companies.

Argument No. 3: Coal companies claim that the easily accessible western coal reserves will produce cheaper coal than the deep mines of the East. And well they might—for someone in Montana. But the transportation costs inherent in shipping that coal to Eastern States like Rhode Island would negate the initial cost advantage.

In conclusion, there was no economic, ecological, or environmental justification for giving my support to strip mining in any form. Hence, I have voted just for the Hechler bill banning all strip mining—H.R. 15000—and will strongly support the Udall bill—H.R. 11500—which sets strict land reclamation standards for strip mining. The Udall bill also seeks to encourage the growth of the eastern deep mining industry, to the ultimate benefit of Rhode Island and the country.

HONORABLE PETER RODINO, FAIR,
JUST, AND JUDICIOUS—CHAIR-
MAN IN THE SPOTLIGHT

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress on both sides of

the aisle generally agree that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), the distinguished Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has been a model of fairness and evenhanded treatment in his handling of the difficult impeachment matter.

He is able, experienced, deliberate, and calm—an ideal chairman for one of the most demanding challenges any chairman of any committee has ever faced in history.

In my view he has measured up to the challenge.

Chairman RODINO has patiently directed the presentation of all the evidence—he has even admitted the President's lawyer to the proceedings—and permitted him to argue his position in his effort to be fair.

Throughout the proceedings Chairman RODINO has demonstrated great respect for our system of government—the Constitution and the Presidency—he has steered a middle course, patiently but decisively, with a full and detailed presentation of the evidence, permitting the committee to weigh the allegations carefully in the public interest.

PETER RODINO was a member of the famed "class" of the 80th Congress—the so-called infamous do-nothing Congress of 1947-48—but a Congress which produced two Presidents, the Speaker, Chairman RODINO, and other distinguished leaders.

PETER RODINO is now the man of the hour, and shortly the televised spotlight of the Nation will focus on his committee as the Members begin their final deliberations on whether to recommend impeachment of the president.

Undoubtedly history will record that Chairman PETER RODINO has established sound and reasonable precedents in this historic impeachment proceedings under the Constitution.

In this connection I place in the RECORD herewith a column by Mary McGrory of the Washington Star-News, concerning Chairman RODINO, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people.

The column follows:

[From the Washington Star-News, July 22, 1974]

POINT OF VIEW

(By Mary McGrory)

The House Judiciary Committee has turned a corner. Special counsel John Doar on Friday flung off his "objective" coat and cocked his fists for impeachment.

After the momentous closed-door session, Chairman Peter Rodino turned a corner in the Rayburn Building and ran smack into a covey of ardent Nixon loyalists, wearing their buttons and their grievances.

"Please be fair," pleaded a blonde with an elaborate hairdo.

The chairman looked into her face and said with feeling, "I couldn't be fairer if I had been thinking of my own mother and father."

He took the elevator to the fourth floor and walked into another ambush—a large party from Rabbi Korff's ranks, including an elderly woman in a wheelchair stuffed with flags. The chairman greeted her with slightly flustered, but genuine cordiality.

"That devil," murmured a small black woman with a "Get off his Back" sticker pasted on the back of her sundress addressed him angrily:

"Can't you do something about the irresponsible members of your committee?"

The chairman smiled at her. "I can't tell you what to do, can I? I don't dictate, I preside."

A babble of voices arose, such as is heard often in the Judiciary Committee. The chairman waited patiently for it to subside.

"I am going to do that which is right, for our country, for the republic, for the people," he promised, and edged away.

In his office, where he was planning to eat someone else's carry-out lunch, more protesters turned up. A trio of Massachusetts women set upon him. One of them told him, "Forty-five million people voted for Nixon and still want him, and you should uphold their votes."

Rodino replied gently, "The question is whether Richard Nixon upheld faithfully the laws of the land."

"Let me show you something," he said suddenly, and escorted the women to his inner office. He pointed out a signed photograph of himself with Richard Nixon at a bill-signing and called their attention to a letter, preserved in plastic, from the President congratulating him on an award from the Justinian Society.

"I revere the presidency," he said. Frustrated, but somewhat mollified, they departed.

The chairman, who is 65, and has been working 16-hour days for several months, did not feel imposed-upon. Unlike the politician in the White House soon to be judged, he expects criticism and listens respectfully to dissenting citizens. He will be hearing similar impassioned pleas, in possibly more sophisticated terms, for weeks to come.

"It's the end of the trail," he said. The investigation is over. His conduct of it has pleased no one. Republicans cried he dragged his feet, Democrats that he bent over backwards. Under severe pressure he made vast concessions to bipartisanship. He admitted the President's lawyer, James St. Clair. He capitulated on witnesses, who added little information and chewed up eight days.

He has been accused lately of swamping the committee and the public with evidence. He has been "anxious" about the impatience of the country.

But, he still says, there was no other way. "It would have been indefensible to let facts one way or another escape our attention," he explains earnestly, in defense of the long, bumpy, sometimes stalled journey. It had to take time. It was a search for truth. It needs painstaking professionals like John Doar and Bert Jenner to make the investigations and put the facts together.

"You know we have a saying in Italy, 'Qui va piano va sano e va lontano,' which means 'He who goes slowly goes well and far.' Now the facts are all here and you have to take them all."

The Congress and the country are faced with a mountain of evidence. It is an 8,000-page mountain that cannot be ignored or walked around. It is there, and it will be brought to the floor, the chairman hopes, with solemnity and "no glee whatsoever."

The absence of Edmund Burke, some mighty orator to move the immovables, does not trouble the chairman as it does others.

"This is not the ordinary kind of legislation that one tries to push," he says. "This is for the ages. If a man has heard on the tapes Richard Nixon telling John Mitchell to cover up and says he is relaxing with a friend, you're not going to change him. Beautiful words and high rhetoric and calling on the gods won't help. The facts will have to speak."

"It was the only way," he said again.

Now that the day of judgment draws near, some people begin to think that Peter Rodino, the anxious little man from Newark, was the only man who could have brought it about.

COAL REPORT

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the Upper Midwest Council, a nonprofit, nonpartisan corporation specializing in research for the region roughly comprising the Ninth Federal Reserve District, has had an energy task force at work for about a year.

The council's energy task force issued a newsletter dated April 22, 1974, entitled "Coal Report." The newsletter was an interim report of the task force's coal subcommittee.

The "Coal Report" may be of particular interest to Members who are seeking more information on the strip mining bill now before the House. The tentative recommendation indicates that west coal will have to be utilized to much greater extent and that in the immediate future, the next 6 to 10 years, expanded strip mining of western coal will be required.

The newsletter follows:

COAL REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Currently visible trends indicate that increased development of western coal within the Ninth Federal Reserve District is necessary in order that the U.S. may move toward the administration's desired position of near self-sufficiency. At this point, development of western coal appears inescapable. This report is not intended to excite the demand for energy or to promote the use of western coal. It is, in essence, a statement of the current situation and a discussion of some of the problems inherent in expansion of the use of western coal for the next several years.

Even if the U.S. achieves "Project Independence," and even if the U.S. achieves a state of "zero" growth, western coal development will continue in order that new energy sources are available to replace disappearing ones.

Regarding the environmental implications of western coal development, the subcommittee recognizes that major environmental decisions are involved. Significant national pressures will surely be applied to expand the production of western coal and great caution must be taken to ensure that all environmental impacts are fully assessed and that the trade-offs are fully examined before significant developmental activity takes place.

STATEMENT OF SITUATION

(1) Because of any number of factors, it appears to be in the national, regional and local interest to expand extraction of energy from the region's coal reserves.

(2) Because of the limitations resulting primarily from lead times for coal conversion systems (gasification) the immediate concern is for mining, transporting, handling and burning coal. For the next six to ten years, the major use of western coals will be for electric generation and for boiler fuels. Lead times for gasification, transportation of gas and related requirements are such that the immediate thrust will be an expansion of current uses.

(3) A moderate estimate of when coal utilization will swing significantly to gasification is—about 1985 for large-scale production.

FORCES COMING TO BEAR

It has become a national energy "policy" to expand use of western coal to replace less abundant, more unsure energy supplies. It is

abundant; it is accessible; and the basic technology exists today to mine, transport, handle and utilize coal. It is our own (U.S.) resource, free from direct external (international) political pressures for the most part.

Potential cutbacks of natural gas supplies for this region, coupled with reductions in Canadian crude oil supplies force the region to look to expanded production and use of western coal.

Montana, North Dakota and South Dakota currently derive much of their electrical energy from hydroelectric facilities. Expansion of electric generation facilities in these States in recent years, however, has been almost exclusively into utilization of coal mine-mouth for the most part.

Minnesota and Wisconsin are large consumers of coal for electric generation. Forecasts of natural gas cutbacks and existing long lead times for nuclear power; coupled with the fact that new feasible hydro sites are not available, stresses the reliance of these two States on coal.

Western coal is favored for this region for many reasons; among those are: competitive transportation costs, less sulphur content, long-term firm contracts and purchases can be made, adequate transportation systems are available.

Eastern States will seek to make eastern coal a more competitive commodity through research into better ways to effect sulphur-dioxide and flyash removal from emissions. In addition, eastern coal interests are beginning research and development work on gasification of their coal.

The major question is NOT "Do not want increased western coal utilization?" The questions to be asked are: "Where do we want the coal to come from? Where do we want to locate the plants which will utilize the coal?"

PRIORITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) To combat the current and enduring energy shortage, western coal will have to be utilized to a much greater extent.

(2) For the immediate period—the next six to ten years—expanded strip mining transportation and handling of western coal will be required. Expanded mine-mouth electric generation facilities will be required. Large quantities of western coal will be shipped across the Dakotas, Minnesota and Wisconsin, much of it destined for Illinois, Michigan, Iowa and Missouri. Use of western coal in Minnesota and Wisconsin will expand greatly. Utilities will require greatly expanded coal-handling facilities. Railroad facilities and cars will have to be increased significantly.

Decision-makers will have to begin addressing key mining, transportation and gasification questions. The basic choices are: mine-mouth electric generation and/or gasification and transportation of the end product to user markets; or, mining of coal, transportation to water resources and user markets for gasification and for other industrial uses and electric generation.

Either of these two choices precipitates major problems and demands timely decisions to expedite the choices.

The subcommittee sees the following as the major concerns to focus upon. They are ranked in order of seriousness, and states most affected are indicated. Most all of the major decisions regarding these major concerns will be made within the next 2-3 years.

Immediate concerns, 6-10 years.

(1) Coal-handling and storage systems, e.g. Figs Eye, (Minnesota & Wisconsin)

(2) Rail transportation to handling/storage facilities. (All states)

(3) Strip-mining. Montana, South Dakota, North Dakota. All states indirectly.

(4) Mine-mouth generation plants. North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana.

Long-range concerns, after 1980-1985. These are concerns requiring immediate attention and decisions.

(1) Availability of water. All states.

(2) Economic growth in coal regions such as new communities or expansion of existing communities. Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota.

(3) Increased taxation and higher coal costs. All states.

(4) Gasification and electric generation plant locations. All states.

Governments, organizations, businesses and the general public will have to be made aware of the many problems and the many questions to be answered.

(1) If the coal is mined, shipped out and gasified or otherwise used elsewhere, higher taxes on coal can result in the mining states, significantly boosting the cost of coal.

(2) If the coal is mined, gasified or otherwise used and the end product then transported, a significant economic base will develop in the coal states with resultant economic and social impacts. (Estimates are that a single large coal gasification plant would require a town of about 10,000 people.) Tax revenues in the coal states would, of course, increase.

JOHN F. GRINER IS DEAD—LED AFGE TO GREATEST STATUS

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have paid tribute to John F. Griner, the recently deceased president emeritus of the American Federation of Government Employees.

Many of my colleagues which have been quoted in other publications which have been reprinted in the AFGE Washington Letter.

I include these articles at this point in the RECORD:

JOHN F. GRINER IS DEAD—LED AFGE TO GREATEST STATUS

John F. Griner, president emeritus of the American Federation of Government Employees, a giant of American labor, is dead.

He succumbed to a long illness Monday morning at the Cairo, Ga., hospital.

The funeral was held in Cairo on Wednesday.

Among AFGE leaders attending the rites were National President Clyde M. Webber, Executive Vice President Dennis Garrison, National Secretary-Treasurer Douglas H. Kershaw and District 6 National Vice President A. K. Gardner, representing the National Executive Council.

It was Griner, a farm boy and former railroad telegrapher, who led AFGE to its present position as the largest union in the Federal sector.

It was Griner who fought the good fight for his membership, constantly seeking their betterment and vigilant in the protection of their rights.

Because AFGE was barred by law from striking or using other economic measures, Griner and his deputy and successor, Clyde M. Webber, used the power of persuasion in accomplishing gains for the Federal employee.

Their jawboning and cajoling brought great results—increased pay, better job protection, presidential executive orders which spelled out rights for the government worker. The Monroney Amendment which gave

higher pay and comparability to the blue collar employee could not have been passed had it not been for AFGE and John Griner. Former Sen. Mike Monroney (D-Okla.) gave that tribute to the union and its leader.

Rep. Robert N. C. Nix said in tribute to Griner's lobbying ability:

"John Griner seems to make his home on The Hill. He is always here and is always alert and convincing in working for his union."

Griner was closely involved with the Federal government for 34 years, 26 of those as an employee and later as an executive with the Railroad Retirement Board.

He was elected National President of AFGE in 1962, having previously served as a National Vice President and member of the National Executive Council representing District 7 from 1946.

Griner was elected for five consecutive terms, retiring for ill health shortly after his triumph at the 1972 convention. He was succeeded by Webber, who was named to the post by the National Executive Council.

Before he entered Federal service, Griner worked from 1925 to 1936 at one time or another as a telegrapher, agent, train dispatcher and assistant car accountant for the Atlantic Coast Line, Seaboard, Georgia Northern and Southern Pacific. At his death he still carried cards in five railroad unions.

Griner entered Federal service in 1936 as an adjudicator with the Railroad Retirement Board at the CAF-6 grade and when he left in 1962 to devote full time to being AFGE's National President, he was a GS-15.

For the last 11 years of his employment with the board, he was labor relations officer, serving as liaison between the board and the railroad unions and, in addition, was responsible for labor relations and training.

While employed by the Railroad Retirement Board, he studied at Columbus University, now a part of Catholic University, and received its LLB degree in June, 1940.

When he assumed the presidency of AFGE, its membership was approximately 80,000 and when he retired was over 300,000, making the union larger than all other Federal employee organizations combined, excluding the postal unions.

Griner was born in Camilla, Ga., Aug. 9, 1907 and was graduated from Camilla High School in 1924.

His wife, the former Claranell Nicholson, and two sons, John Jr., and Remer Griner; two grandchildren and two sisters survive.

U.S. LEADERS SADDENED, PRAISE RECORD

Many of America's legislative and executive leaders joined in tribute to the memory of John F. Griner. Here are some of their statements:

Representative JEROME WALDIE, Democrat, of California: "John Griner's leadership in obtaining greater health and retirement benefits, and pay levels comparable to those offered in the private sector will long be remembered and appreciated by all Federal employees. His dedication and energetic pursuit of greater benefits and better guarantees of employees rights serve as the finest example to follow for those of us who represent Federal employee interests."

Senator TED STEVENS, Republican, of Alaska: "Throughout his term as national president, and prior to that District 7 vice president, of AFGE, John Griner's strong and able leadership did much to better the fate of government employees across the nation."

"As a member of the Senate POCs, I had the opportunity to work closely with Mr. Griner prior to his retirement in 1972, and I found him capable and dedicated to representing the best interest of AFGE. I was deeply saddened to learn of his death."

Jerry Wurf, president, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees: "John Griner presided over an im-

portant transition period in Federal employment—a period in which the public employee union movement shifted from its experimental stages to acceptance as a force for justice on the job in government. He made important contributions to the cause of Federal employee unionism. He also showed great foresight in relying upon the assistance of Clyde Webber, making it possible for Webber to move to the forefront of the union and become his successor as president."

Senator ROBERT DOLE, Republican of Kansas: "I was saddened to learn of the death of John Griner."

"He was a devoted and dedicated leader who knew the value and necessity of effective representation for America's civil servant."

"His service as AFGE president spanned virtually my entire career in the House and Senate, and the force of his leadership was highly visible in the state of Kansas as well as in the halls of Congress."

"John Griner's legacy to the AFGE and to the quality of government throughout America will be a lasting monument to his years of effort on behalf of government employees."

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK, Democrat of North Dakota: "The passing of John Griner came as a shock to me as I know it did for many other members of the Senate and Congress. It is difficult for those who worked closely with him to believe that this man, who for so long helped shape the law with respect to government workers, will no longer be here to lend his wise counsel. Even after John's retirement as president of the American Federation of Government Employees, his presence was felt on the Hill and wherever rules and laws affecting federation members were discussed."

"The bible tells us that God is guarded in his ways and until the plan of life is known to all, we must be content in understanding that the spirit of what John Griner stood for will always be with us aiding in efforts to shape better government."

"I want to join with the members of AFGE and all those who knew John in expressing heartfelt sympathy to his wife and family during this time of bereavement."

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat of West Virginia: "John F. Griner was a true American in every sense. His legislative battles were fought for the sole purpose of aiding those who most required help and were unable to help themselves. His work benefited citizens generally. John Griner was loved and respected by a multitude of men, his colleagues in the labor unions, here in the Senate and the House, but most of all by the civil servants he represented."

"As president of AFGE, Mr. Griner's leadership was an inspiration to all the members of that organization. He was the guiding light in the legislative proposals which government-oriented unions set forth. He accepted challenges and met them with wisdom and affirmative action."

"He was a man of courage who fought with all his heart and spirit for the principles in which he believed."

Representative DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Democrat of New Jersey: "The government worker never had a more loyal friend or devoted servant than John Griner. Mrs. Daniels joins with me in expressing my deepest sympathy to the Griner family in their hour of bereavement. However, I know that when the immediate shock wears off they will have the memory of a very wonderful man to comfort them."

Representative DAVID HENDERSON, Democrat of North Carolina: "It was with a deep sense of personal loss that I received the news of the passing of John Griner."

"A forthright, direct and totally honest man, John was quite different from many of the people a Congressman often encounters in the course of his duties."

"It was not uncommon for him to walk into my office without an appointment or

prior notice or to call me off the House floor when he had a matter of urgency he wanted to discuss with me, and he did not hesitate to dial my telephone directly either at my office or my home."

"The cause of employee organizations in the Federal service has been greatly advanced by the long and loyal service of John Griner as president of the AFGE."

"John and I did not always agree, but he was a man I always liked, a man I felt I could always trust, and a man who knew how to work out realistic compromises without wavering in the cause he represented."

"He typified the best of what Federal employee organizations had to offer. Both the American Federation of Government Employees and the civil service in general are the better for his service."

Representative RICHARD WHITE, Democrat of Texas: "Mr. Griner very ably led AFGE for many years bringing it to a position of great prominence and influence. He was a strong advocate of the AFGE position and was a very familiar and forceful figure in legislative circles. He left his imprint on the legislative process and permanently shaped the course of AFGE."

Representative MORRIS UDALL, Democrat of Arizona: "As a member of Congress whose committee assignment has brought me into long and close contact with representatives of Federal employees. I had many discussions with John Griner on major issues."

"He was a battler for decent compensation and working conditions for all Federal employees. He was alert to legislative issues and agency practices which were detrimental to the interest of the employees and was quick to come to the defense of those he felt were being unjustly maligned."

"The AFGE grew in numbers and strength under his dedicated service and he will be remembered for his solid contributions to the betterment of not only the Federal employees but to the Federal government as a whole."

Representative JAMES M. HANLEY, Democrat of New York: "John Griner was a great labor leader and his loss will be mourned by thousands of Federal employees throughout the country. During the many years I worked with him on civil service issues, I found him to be dedicated, fair and tough-minded. Every Federal employee owes him a debt of gratitude for the many battles he led during his distinguished career. We will all miss him."

Representative ROBERT N. C. NIX, Democrat of Pennsylvania: "I was deeply shocked and saddened to learn of the death of John Griner, past president of AFGE, a colleague and friend."

"We worked together very closely in the 60's and early 70's as the American Federation of Government Employees began its great expansion under John Griner's leadership."

"John was a man who was big in all the ways that counted. His word was his bond. He was as concerned as any man I have known since I came to the Congress for the welfare of all of his constituents."

"He brought respect to the government union movement which is his great monument. He did more for race relations in government than any other man by being fair, by being color blind, and an American government worker first and a powerful leader second. It will be a long time before we see his like again."

Representative WILLIAM FORD, Democrat of Michigan: "I was deeply saddened at the news of John Griner's death. He was truly an outstanding person—an effective leader and spokesman of the AFGE, a patriotic American and a truly warm and likeable human being. His country and his people are the better for his having lived."

Representative CHARLES WILSON, Democrat of California: "Few labor leaders have achieved the predominance associated with John Griner's career. During his tenure as

president, AFGE tripled its membership among Federal employees. During that period, I was fortunate to become his friend and work closely with him on matters important to government employees. His death is not only a profound loss to his friends, but an immense loss to hundreds of thousands of civil service employees who benefited from his leadership."

Senator GALE W. MCGEE, Democrat of Wyoming, chairman, POCS Committee: "It is no coincidence that the decade from 1962 to 1972, which was marked by significant increases in the status and benefits of Federal employment, also measure the tenure of John Griner as president of AFGE. John was an aggressive, sometimes stubborn and always tenacious advocate of what's best for the workers. I respected him greatly and feel a sense of loss at his death. He has left a great legacy in a much stronger union and a much stronger labor movement."

Speaker of the House CARL ALBERT, Democrat of Oklahoma: "I am saddened greatly by the death of my friend John Griner, whose name will forever be synonymous with the American Federation of Government Employees which he gave all of life's strength to build. John's unsurpassed effectiveness, dedication and loyalty protected the rights and enhanced the welfare of every employee of the government of the United States. He will be greatly missed by Federal employees."

"Fortunately, John Griner lived to see many of his dreams transferred into law. The comparability bill and the wage board bill are two outstanding examples of the many measures passed by Congress largely due to the effective hard work of John Griner."

He understood Congress as an institution and was loved and respected by its members. My wife Mary and I express our deepest sympathy to John's family."

Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat of Utah: "I am greatly saddened by the death of John Griner. His passing is a great loss to those of us who were fortunate to be counted as his close friends. His death is also a tremendous loss to the American labor movement. John was truly a pioneer. The strides made by the Federal employees in recent years can be attributed mainly to the AFGE, which has been almost synonymous with the name John Griner. The greatest loss of all is to John's wife and family. I extend to them my deepest sympathy."

Representative FRANK BRASCO, Democrat of New York: "It was with a great deal of sadness that I learned of the death of John Griner. Although ill health had forced him to retire from the presidency of AFGE, he never lost his interest in the welfare of government employees everywhere and he will be sorely missed by those thousands of people in whose behalf he so diligently worked for many years. My deepest sympathies are extended to his wife and family."

Representative THADDEUS J. DULSKI, Democrat of New York, chairman, Post Office and Civil Service Committee: "I was saddened to hear of the passing of John Griner, president emeritus of the American Federation of Government Employees. President Griner was one of those energetic and unique individuals whose creative lives do not always make the headlines. Yet, his contributions to legislation for the employees of his union and for all Federal employees are legion."

"As Chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I had a close association with President Griner. My door was always open to him. He was a leader among labor leaders. He presented the views and recommendations of his organization without prejudice to his opponents and respected my right to oppose his recommendations without any pressure whatsoever."

"I always found him cooperative, fair, and reasonable in dealings with me and with

other members of Congress, particularly with the members of our committee."

Senator HENRY BELLMON (Republican of Oklahoma): "During the nearly six years I have served on the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have been ever aware of the impact and influence Mr. Griner has had on the shaping of legislation affecting civil service employees. As members of AFGE will surely miss his able representation, so will members of the Senate miss his respected efforts to achieve with us positive legislative action in civil service matters."

Senator ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, (Democrat of South Carolina): "I am greatly saddened to learn of the passing of John Griner. As head of the AFGE for ten years, John did an outstanding job of representing members of the association. During his tenure, the membership increased threefold and many pieces of significant legislation were passed under John's leadership. Above all, he was a fine man and his presence will be sorely missed."

Senator HIRAM FONG (Republican of Hawaii): "I was deeply saddened upon hearing of the passing of John Griner, a longtime friend, a respected advocate and a devoted American. Mrs. Fong joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathies to his wife Claranel, his two sons, and the rest of John's family."

"Some of my earliest recollections of work on Federal employee legislation in the United States Senate include deep conversations with John. His counsel in formal hearings and in private discussions was always incisive, knowledgeable, and sincere. His understanding of the problems of Federal employees everywhere and his ability to articulate those problems to me and other members of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee were always appreciated."

"He gave very valuable assistance to the committee in our efforts to write Federal pay comparability and fringe benefit laws."

"It was with regret that we heard of his long illness and his retirement from the presidency of the American Federation of Government Employees. He will be missed even more now."

"It was my privilege to have known John Griner personally, to have him visit with me in my home state of Hawaii, and to work together with him in behalf of all Federal employees."

AFL-CIO LEADERS PAY TRIBUTE TO GRINER'S GAINS FOR LABOR

AFL-CIO President George Meany and AFL-CIO Secretary-Treasurer Lane Kirkland sent the following telegram to Mrs. John F. Griner:

"Please accept our deepest sympathy on the death of your husband. John served his fellow government workers with honesty and diligence for many years."

"He made significant contributions to the AFL-CIO Executive Council and all of his colleagues on that body share our sense of loss."

TELEGRAM

The following telegram was sent to National President Clyde M. Webber from Peter Fosco, general president and Terence J. the Laborers' International Union of North America.

"We wish to extend our sincere sympathy to your organization on the death of Brother John F. Griner. Please extend our sympathies also to his family."

FEDERAL AREA PRESS TELLS OF MANY FEATS

Members of the Washington press corps who covered the Federal beat knew John F. Griner well, respected him and knew his friendship.

Joseph Young, staff writer of The Washington Star-News wrote of Griner's stature: "Griner brought to the AFGE an aggressive leadership which made it the No. 1 Federal employee union."

"Although Griner could be tough in bargaining sessions with Federal personnel managers and insistent in his dealings on Capitol Hill concerning government employee legislation, he was adept at the art of compromise at strategic moments to reach the best possible results for his membership and Federal employees in general."

"At times brusque and outspoken in his public appearances, Griner in private was a warm-hearted man who performed many personal kindnesses for friends, AFGE employees and union members."

Mike Causey, Federal Diarist of The Washington Post, was another newsman who held Griner in high regard. He says that he wrote all of the important facts about the president emeritus when he covered the farewell banquet given to him in 1973. Causey wrote in part:

"Leaders, dues-payers and watchers of the government's largest employee union will bury their hatchets tonight for a testimonial banquet honoring John F. Griner, one of the most interesting and colorful labor bosses ever to hit town. . . ."

"None of the speeches, however eloquent, will be able to capture the impact Griner had on the bureaucracy where AFGE now represents five of every ten employees. When elected 11 years ago, many observers figured the rough talking Georgian for a one-termer, figuring his direct approach—enemies called it ham-handed—methods would backfire."

"But the Union prospered—thanks also to dues checkoff—and Griner showed he was a master of backroom union politics as well as legislative wheeling and dealing to benefit union members. . . ."

"Over the decade, the conductors of this column (the Federal Diary), Jerry Klutzz, Willard C. Clopton, Jr., and I have covered, praised and blasted Griner and his actions. If a boxscore were taken, brickbats would probably outnumber bouquets, because that is the nature of this business. But for today bouquets and nothing else are in order for John F. Griner."

John Cramer, also a Star-News staff writer said:

"John Griner lived during the growing period of the great AFGE and personally contributed magnificently to the cause of Federal employee unionism. All government workers forever will owe him a great debt."

GRINER PLAYED STRONG ROLE IN AFL-CIO

John F. Griner played a strong role in AFL-CIO national operations.

He was a vice president and member of the Executive Council of AFL-CIO and also served as a vice president and member of the Executive Committee of the AFL-CIO Industrial Union Department, comprised of some of the largest unions affiliated with AFL-CIO. He was elected to the AFL-CIO Executive Council in October, 1969 and to the IUD Executive Committee in November, 1965.

As National President of the AFGE, he served on the National Wage Policy Committee of the Coordinated Federal Wage System and on the Wage Committee of the Department of Defense within the CFWS; the Federal Safety Committee; the President's Committee for the Handicapped, and the Federal Pay Committee for the GS Employees.

THE IMPEACHMENT QUESTION

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the impeachment question continues on and

on as it becomes more and more involved. The tapes are revealing more information about the alleged coverup, but it is difficult to determine how much bias there is from the people reporting the facts. The Judiciary Committee has the hardest part of its investigation remaining. For the benefit and interest of my colleagues, I wish to insert the three following articles, all from the Wall Street Journal, and all relating to the impeachment issue:

HELP FOR THE PRESIDENT

This week we seem to be running across headline after headline featuring the quote from the tape of President Nixon saying "I want you all to stonewall it. . . ." It appears in some such fashion not only in the editorial cartoons, whose very life depends on wrenching things out of context, but on the front pages of such publications as Newsweek and The New York Times, The Week in Review.

The full quote as it appears in the House Judiciary transcripts has been recorded by many careful reporters, including Carol H. Falk of this newspaper. It comes up in the context of the President saying President Eisenhower was too tough in firing his aide Sherman Adams. Mr. Nixon says:

"And, uh, for that reason, I am perfectly willing to—I don't give a — what happens. I want you all to stonewall it, let them plead the Fifth Amendment, cover-up or anything else, if it'll save it—save the plan. That's the whole point. On the other hand, uh, uh, I would prefer, as I said to you, that you do it the other way. And I would particularly prefer to do it that other way if it's going to come out that way anyway. And that my view, that, uh, with the number of jackass people that they've got that they can call, they're going to—the story they get out through leaks, charges, and so forth, and innuendos, will be a hell of a lot worse than the story they're going to get out by just letting it out there."

Now, we would certainly not argue that even in its full context the quote reflects any great credit on the President. The fact that it was not included in the White House version of the transcripts reflects even less. But in the whole context, it is no more conclusive than anything else in the transcript. Indeed, it neatly sums up to the ambiguity that to our eye appears throughout the transcripts. The President was of two minds. On one hand he was perfectly willing to obstruct justice. On the other, he longed for a forum in which to get out the essential story without innuendos ballooning it beyond what he considered its true proportion.

We are perfectly willing to listen to an argument that either of these motives predominated; reasonable men can differ. But there is an essential ambiguity that has to be faced directly. To take the "stone-walling" quote specifically, it certainly does not prove that we now have a tape of the President explicitly ordering a cover-up. Yet that is precisely the inference a publication creates by throwing away, buying or sliding over the last half of the quotes and putting the first half in a headline.

There is much here that we do not understand. We can't see why the White House would undermine itself by leaving out the section containing this quote when it knew the House committee already had the full tape. Similarly, we can't see why the editors of Newsweek and the Times weekly review want to help the President by fueling the White House contention that the impeachment drive is nothing more than persecution of the President by the media.

But most of all, given our understanding that the purpose of journalism is to promote public understanding of public issues, we cannot understand the scale of news values

that would thrust before the reader only half of the President's quote.

IMPEACHMENT PANEL NEXT WEEK GETS DOWN TO CENTRAL QUESTION: AT LAST IT MUST DECIDE WHAT "HIGH CRIMES" ARE; DEBATE MAY SHIFT VOTES—BIRDSEED FOR THE EAGLE?

(By John Pierson)

WASHINGTON.—Funny thing about the impeachment process: After eight months, 7,000 pages and nine live witnesses, the House Judiciary Committee is only now getting around to asking the real question.

That question:

Should you throw out President Nixon—or any President—only if he has committed a serious crime? Or do you throw him out simply for falling "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed"?

For one anti-Nixon Democrat, when it comes to impeachment, "shooting the Constitution in the head is just as bad as shooting a person in the head."

Not so, says one pro-Nixon Republican, who maintains that "the Constitution itself requires criminality. And it serves the Constitution, rather than slaughtering it, to adhere to that requirement."

The issue will finally be joined next week, when the committee begins a public debate on proposed articles of impeachment. That the committee has waited until the end to define "high Crimes and Misdemeanors" makes its vote on impeachment less certain than conventional wisdom would have it.

CONVENTIONAL WISDOM

Conventional wisdom says that most of the Judiciary Committee's 21 Democrats and a handful of its 17 Republicans will recommend that the House impeach Richard Nixon on the ground that he has, in effect, tried to shoot the Constitution. Meanwhile, most of the Republican minority is expected to oppose such a recommendation on the ground that the inquiry has failed to produce conclusive proof of a criminal act.

But next week could stand such calculations on their ear. Despite months of total immersion in the evidence, many members appear not to have decided yet—or if they have, they are keeping their own counsel. Some members simply haven't taken the time to read all 7,000 pages and thus may be swayed relatively more by the debate itself. And recent partisan wrangling over leaks, witness lists and the like may have made the committee look more polarized than it really is.

"A majority of the Republicans are going to be defenders in any event," predicts Rep. Hamilton Fish of Upstate New York, one of the committee Republicans considered most likely to vote for impeachment. "But a minority, myself included, are not picking up our marbles and going home because of losing a few procedural votes."

THE IMPORTANCE OF DOAR

A lot is going to depend upon the kind of impeachment articles Special Counsel John Doar proposes, the way he relates them to the evidence, and the eloquence and logic the members bring to the debate.

"I don't see how you can decide," says Rep. Ray Thornton, an Arkansas Democrat, "until a structure of words is put together to test against the evidence and the law."

Mr. Doar has been drafting and redrafting a proposed structure of words for some weeks now. But he has ignored repeated pleas from Democrats and Republicans alike to "tell us what all this evidence means." Mr. Doar and Chairman Peter Rodino, a New Jersey Democrat, wanted to put off conclusions as long as possible to avoid splitting the committee until they had crammed those 7,000 pages into the members' heads.

This strategy has left some Republicans overjoyed at what they regard as the inability of the Democrats to bring the inquiry ef-

fectively to bear on anything. "They're losing the needle in the haystack," says Rep. Charles Wiggins of California, the President's ablest defender on the committee.

OF EAGLES AND BIRDSEED

The Doar-Rodino strategy of letting the evidence speak for itself has also left some pro-impeachment Democrats fuming about a lack of leadership and direction. "You can't expect the members to behave like eagles when you're feeding them an overdose of birdseed," a committee staffer complains.

But Rep. James Mann, a moderate Democrat from South Carolina, thinks that the inquiry has been conducted properly. "I can't give up the principle of objectivity and fairness just because there are those who choose to," he says, referring to anti-Nixon leaks from the committee's closed-door hearings as well as to the White House's campaign to discredit the inquiry.

"It would have been helpful to have more focus," adds Rep. Mann, "but it would have been difficult to have it and not seem to be prosecuting the President."

Chairman Rodino has been adamant on this point: The House, like a grand jury, is a fact-finder, trying to determine whether the President has done anything to warrant a Senate trial; only if the House votes to impeach Mr. Nixon does it don a prosecutors robe and argue its case to the Senate.

There comes a time, however, when the committee must focus on the question: Do Mr. Nixon's deeds warrant a recommendation of impeachment? Privately, Judiciary Democrats and Republicans have already begun the focusing process, which won't end until the public debate is finished and the vote taken, around the end of this month.

This schedule could be upset if the Supreme Court rules that Mr. Nixon must give the special prosecutor the additional 64 tapes the prosecutor wants or if committee members demand more time to collect their thoughts. Among members, there is some feeling of resentment that they are being rushed into a decision by a House Democratic leadership caving in to an impatient public.

"I may even vote 'present' (instead of 'yea' or 'nay') if I don't feel prepared," New York's Rep. Fish says.

As they adjust the locus, Democrats are coming to see two kinds of impeachment articles. One would be a set of specific allegations of specific crimes. One might be, for example, that Mr. Nixon took part in a conspiracy to obstruct justice, in part by ordering—or refusing to stop—the payment of hush money to E. Howard Hunt, one of the original Watergate defendants.

The other kind of article would be a more general charge that the President has failed to carry out his constitutionally imposed duties "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed," to "faithfully execute the office of the President of the United States" and to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." Perhaps by using federal agencies to harass his enemies and reward his friends. Or by cutting corners on his own taxes, thus destroying public confidence in the tax system. Or by countenancing obstruction of justice, burglary, warrantless wiretaps and other illegal acts on the part of his subordinates.

Most Republicans are expected to argue that you shouldn't impeach a President on this kind of general count and that the evidence is insufficient to support his impeachment on any specific criminal counts. As one GOP member, not a Nixon defender, puts it: "The smoking gun isn't there."

To which Democrats will reply that the House, like a grand jury, need only find "probable cause" to believe that Mr. Nixon is impeachable, leaving it to the Senate to apply a trial jury's higher standard of proof "beyond a reasonable doubt."

To which the President's defenders will respond that a standard higher than probable cause is required of the House if it wants to win its case in the Senate. "It's inappropriate for a prosecutor—in this case the House—to proceed unless he thinks he can get a conviction," California's Rep. Wiggins says.

To which Democrats will answer that criminal counts are secondary—that what really matters is the general count of failure to uphold the Constitution. "It all comes under a category of abuse of power, abuse of the office," one moderate Democrat says. "There may be specific crimes—the cover-up, a bribe from dairymen, tax fraud—but none of them is as important as the overall pattern."

"The impeachment process isn't a criminal process," Rep. Thornton maintains. "It's a safety valve to preserve our government system."

"The 'take-care' duty emphasizes the responsibility of a President for the overall conduct of the Executive Branch, which the Constitution vests in him alone," Special Counsel Doar argued in a memo last February. "He must take care that the Executive is so organized and operated that this duty is performed."

"The duty of the President to 'preserve, protect and defend the Constitution' to the best of his ability includes the duty not to abuse his powers or transgress their limits—not to violate the rights of citizens, such as those guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, and not to act in derogation of powers vested elsewhere by the Constitution," Mr. Doar continued.

THE ST. CLAIR REBUTTAL

That's quite a mouthful—and quite a mindful, too. And it may come as no surprise that Mr. Nixon's defenders reject it. In an opposing memo last February, the President's lawyer, James St. Clair, argued that "the lesson of history, logic and experience" is that "a President may only be impeached for indictable crimes."

Rep. Wiggins expands on this theme. "Impeachment on broad general grounds is bad law and bad policy," he says. "It's bad law because it gives a meaning to the impeachment clause that's imprecise and impossible for future Presidents to adhere to. It goes to past conduct that wasn't illegal at the time it was done and to conduct that's been condoned in others. Under this standard, one man's abuse is likely to be another man's view of energetic leadership."

"It's bad policy because it turns the corner to a parliamentary system. It's a vote of 'no confidence,'" Rep. Wiggins continues. "If the people want, they can amend the Constitution, but Congress shouldn't do it through the impeachment process."

At least one committee Democrat shares some of these concerns. "I don't foreclose impeaching him for failure to 'take care,'" Rep. Walter Flowers of Alabama says. "But you open up a Pandora's box of what each person thinks a President should do."

"If you're going to zap Richard Nixon on that, you've almost of necessity got to look backward. Nixon has been a very poor steward of the office, and I don't know that his predecessor was a very good one, either."

THE PUBLIC PERCEPTION

There is also the question of whether the public will understand or accept impeachment on such broad grounds. "If the people perceive that their elected President is being railroaded out of office, there could be trouble in this country," Rep. Wiggins declares.

South Carolina's Rep. Mann worries about this too. One drawback to postponing the public debate on fundamentals is that "the American people haven't been called upon to think as to what they want the moral level of their government to be," he

says. "Unless the report of the Judiciary Committee is extremely well done," he adds, a general article of impeachment "won't fly with the people."

Another Southern Democrat, Rep. Flowers, is a little more confident. "I don't think the general public reveres the Constitution as much as we in Congress and the media do," he says. "But the public is prepared for it to go either way—provided it's fair and reasonable."

THOUGHTFUL GUIDE ON IMPEACHMENT

(By Robert L. Bartley)

As the House and the nation near the crucial stage of the debate over impeachment of President Nixon, we are fortunate to have fresh intellectual guidance from Charles L. Black Jr., of Yale Law School. His new booklet "Impeachment; A Handbook" is a model of how so serious an act of state should be approached.

Mr. Black is Luce Professor of Jurisprudence at Yale and a recognized constitutional scholar. Early in the current controversy he attracted attention by arguing that executive privilege means that the Executive has the prerogative of deciding whether or not to release tape recordings. He now notes that this position "enjoyed little support from others." He adds, "I have from my youth quite consistently opposed the President who has been the subject of recent proceedings."

The stance that attracted recent public attention to Professor Black, though, is in some ways uncharacteristic of his thoughts on other legal issues in the impeachment controversy. On issue after issue, he manages to cut through various arguments to record positions that simply *have* to be right. He has managed to package these thoughts in a booklet simple and short enough to be a useful guide to the average concerned citizen, or the average concerned Congressman.

The best example, indeed the heart of the book, is the definition of the constitutional phrase "treason, bribery and other high crimes and misdemeanors." The key to understanding this, the author argues, is the legal rule of *ejusdem generis*, or "of the same kind." He elaborates:

"Thus if I said, 'bring me some ice cream, or some candy, or something else good,' I would think you understood me well if you brought me a piece of good angel food cake, I would boggle a little, perhaps, if you brought me a good baked potato, and I would think you crazy or stupid or willful if you brought me a good book of sermons or a good bicycle tire pump."

In short, the words "high crimes and misdemeanors" should describe something of the same general character as treason or bribery. That is, Professor Black continues, they must be extremely serious, corrupting of the political and governmental process, and plainly wrong in themselves. That is, "those offenses which are rather obviously wrong, whether or not 'criminal,' and which so seriously threaten the order of political society as to make pestilent and dangerous the continuance in power of their perpetrator."

However, there must be a specific offense: "General lowness and shabbiness ought not to be enough. The people take some chances when they elect a man to the presidency, and I think this is one of them."

While not discussing the details of specific accusations against President Nixon, Professor Black runs down the list applying his standard to each. Receiving of bribes is obviously impeachable, though proving motivation is difficult. Serious income-tax fraud is impeachable. The use of the tax system to harass political opponents is particularly heinous, a clear abuse of power.

The impoundment of funds might be impeachable in theory or in some flagrant

case, the author continues, but is not likely to be impeachable in the real world with its real doubts and complexities. Similarly, unauthorized warmaking as it is likely to be actually encountered is probably unimpeachable. Improper campaign tactics, somewhat similarly, would depend on circumstances.

Obstruction of justice is not an easy charge to handle in Professor Black's framework. He can envision cases in which the President could commit this crime without its being an impeachable offense: "In many cases his failure to protect some people at some times might result in his being held in contempt by the public." Yet it does strike at the legal process the President is sworn to uphold, and "there must come a point at which excuses fail."

Other parts of the book include a primer on impeachment procedures, discussion of other technical issues and suggestions on how Congress can curb Executive excesses short of the ultimate sanction of impeachment. There are also several thinly disguised barbs at Raoul Berger, who has made his learning "on English precedents. Mr. Black refers, for example, to the 'superabundant learning' on English precedents. Mr. Black also disputes the contention, offered by and probably only by Mr. Berger, that impeachment is subject to review by the courts.

Not everyone will agree with every point Mr. Black makes. To this reader, his position that executive privilege is absolute seems too much a mirror image of Mr. Berger's position that it does not exist. Mr. Black's opposition to televising a Senate impeachment trial overlooks the vital importance of giving the American people the smell and the feel of the thing, their usual basis for a collective judgment that often in the end proves as keen as that of the most learned legal mind.

Inevitably in a short volume rushed to meet a topical deadline, important issues are overlooked. Most notably in this case, the question of what standards of proof ought to apply in the House. It is not difficult to imagine crucial undecided Congressmen wrestling with the issue of whether they should vote to hold a trial even if they do not believe the President ought to be removed from office. While this question may ultimately be a political one it is clearly one on which some legal learning could be quite helpful.

Yet none of the specifics about Mr. Black's book is as important as its general approach and tone, which treats impeachment as an issue deserving of unusual care and what in an earlier day might have been called unusual prayerfulness. As something that cannot be dismissed but cannot be decided as merely another political issue, as he says, "I confess to a very strong sense of the dreadfulness of the step of removal, of the deep wounding such a step must inflict on the country, and thus approach it as one would approach high-risk major surgery, to be resorted to only when the rightness of diagnosis and treatment is sure."

NIXON CANCELS DEBTS OWED TO U.S. TAXPAYERS BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the cost of peace through détente continues to be brought out. Today's Federal Register carries the President's memorandum of June 29 canceling a \$500 million debt

owed by Israel to the American people and a memorandum of June 30 canceling a \$20 million debt owed by Egypt to the American taxpayers.

If any Member were to introduce legislation calling for Government subsidies to an arms manufacturer, it would be immediately branded as inflationary, anticonsumer, and denounced as materialistic. Yet, for some strange reason the American taxpayers are told that selling arms to foreign governments and then canceling the debts is in the interest of preserving the peace.

President Nixon and Secretary Kissinger continue to prove themselves to be the most philanthropic people in the history of the world—so long, at least, as they are using someone else's money. And they will continue to be hailed great world leaders working for peace, until the American people, who will be paying the bills, find out the true cost of "détente."

I include the two Presidential memorandums at this point in the RECORD:

TITLE 3—THE PRESIDENT—MEMORANDUM OF JUNE 29, 1974

[Presidential Determination No. 74-23]

EMERGENCY SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR ISRAEL
Memorandum for the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 29, 1974.

By virtue of the authority vested in me by section 4 of Public Law 93-199, the Emergency Security Assistance Act of 1973 (hereinafter "the Act"), I hereby release Israel from its contractual liability to the extent of \$500,000,000 to pay for defense articles and defense services financed under the Act by the credit agreement entered into by the Government of Israel and the United States Government on June 3, 1974.

This memorandum shall be published in the Federal Register.

RICHARD NIXON.
[FR Doc. 74-16953 Filed 7-19-74; 4:27 pm]

THE PRESIDENT—MEMORANDUM OF JUNE 30, 1974

[Presidential Determination No. 74-26]

DETERMINATION AND AUTHORIZATION UNDER SECTION 614 (a) OF THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961, AS AMENDED—PROVIDING SECURITY SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE TO EGYPT IN FY 1975

Memorandum for the Acting Secretary of State

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 30, 1974.

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 614(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (hereafter "the Act"), I hereby:

(a) Determine that the use of not to exceed \$20 million of funds available in the fiscal year 1975 for security supporting assistance to Egypt, without regard to the requirements of the Act, is important to the security of the United States; and

(b) authorize such use of not to exceed \$20 million as security supporting assistance to Egypt for the purposes of sweeping mines from the Suez Canal, providing technical assistance and training to the Egyptians in disposing of unexploded ordnance in the Canal and along its banks, and assisting in the salvage of wrecked ships and debris blocking the Canal.

This determination shall be published in the Federal Register.

RICHARD NIXON.
[FR Doc. 74-16954 Filed 7-19-74; 4:27 pm]

U.S. JAYCEES HONOR PITTSBURGH
SELF-HELP GROUPS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Jaycees have just published a book, "Uplift: What People Themselves Can Do," which analyzes the scope and success of small scale self-help projects, operating in low income communities throughout the country.

I am pleased and proud to report that the Jaycees chose four such operations in my congressional district.

These four projects, along with 96 others, were picked from some 1,000 similar activities isolated by the Jaycee research project.

I wish to include in the RECORD at this time a brief description of the neighborhood programs singled out by the Jaycees, and offer my sincere congratulations for jobs well done to Pittsburghers: Mr. Leon Hickman, director of the home-maker skills program; Mr. Richard Barber, director of urban talent development; Mr. Bernard Jones, director of urban youth action; and Mr. James Givner, director of operation better block.

The information follows:

URBAN TALENT DEVELOPMENT

(We're not here to train, we're here to motivate. We want to develop the individual so he can grow within the system.—Pittsburgh, Pa.)

A few years ago Jim Cleveland was a mailman going nowhere.

Today he's an operations supervisor for a major interstate bus company. He's a college graduate with a bachelor of arts degree in political science. And he's a man with a dream of someday perhaps starting a career in law.

At age 44, he has found that life has suddenly become a "heads-I-win-tails-I-lose" proposition.

"As long as I keep using my head and get off my tail, I can't lose," he says, reflecting the new self-confidence that has begun to dominate his philosophy of life.

Jim Cleveland is just one of hundreds of people who have suddenly become aware of themselves and their abilities because of an organization called Urban Talent Development, Inc. (UTD). Started in 1970, UTD has become known as the "Sesame Street" of manpower-training programs throughout the Pittsburgh area.

Cleveland minces no words when he tells someone about the fourteen days he spent at UTD in 1971.

"It was like a spiritual revival," he says unabashedly. "I came away baptized with a renewed faith in myself."

More than anything else, that's exactly what Urban Talent Development is all about.

UTD promises nothing, yet everything. It doesn't teach you how to be an auto mechanic, but it does teach you how to be a self-starter. It does not teach you how to be a carpenter; rather it teaches you how to build confidence in yourself and your abilities. It does not teach you a trade; rather it teaches you how to handle yourself under all job situations and opportunities.

In essence, UTD takes people—primarily people with underdeveloped talents who are wandering aimlessly in the world of work—and tries to instill in them self-motivation to go out and do what they want to do.

There are no stipends for attending UTD.

That's one of the factors that separates the program from other manpower-training concepts. Urban Talent doesn't want the "program hoppers" who jump from one wage-paying program to the next and end up back on the street corners in between.

The basic ingredient demanded by Urban Talent Development is sincerity of purpose. Beyond that, applicants must be 18 years of age or older, in good health, graduates of high school or some equivalent, and with some demonstrated aptitude for the world of work. If these criteria can be met, the doors of UTD are open to everyone—free.

Many of UTD's students even have college degrees. But the college graduate of today—especially the black college graduate—is finding that unemployment plays no favorites, and that welfare rolls can be indiscriminate in their selections.

The dynamic leaders of UTD, Dick Barber and Len Burnett, like to say that perhaps Demosthenes, the ancient Greek philosopher, statesman, and orator, was thinking of them when he said more than 2,000 years ago:

"Small opportunities are often the beginning of great enterprises."

UTD seeks to supply the small opportunities in achieving its self-proclaimed goal of building careers. The statistics of the program over the last three years are proof that the approach is working.

Through the beginning of 1974, a total of 710 students have been enrolled in UTD training programs; of these, 614 have completed the two-to-three-week courses—and 544 have been placed in better jobs or in school for further education and training.

The average UTD student is between 20 and 30. He or she is unemployed, receiving unemployment benefits or welfare benefits, or no benefits at all, and he is groping through a lifestyle of hardship and poverty.

The student-body profile shows an average of \$2,472 in yearly earnings before training, and an average of \$5,271 after training (the after-training figure is deceptively low because it includes the earnings of those who have taken part-time jobs while they continue their schooling).

The bulk of the graduates are going into supervisory and management positions that give them unlimited opportunity for advancement.

Jim Cleveland is one example.

Cora Watley is another. From being an unhappy school teacher frustrated by mandated teaching styles she didn't like and earning just \$5,000 a year, she has moved on to an exciting, \$9,700-a-year job as underwriter for an insurance company.

"UTD didn't teach me how to be an insurance underwriter," Cora Watley says frankly. "I didn't even know what an insurance underwriter was. But UTD did teach me about dealing with people. It taught me about the business world as a whole."

UTD had heard about a trainee position with the insurance company, gave her a crash description of what it was all about, and asked her if she was interested.

"I liked what I heard, applied for the position, and here I am," she says.

Like any successful program, UTD is a product of its leadership. From the very beginning, it looked like it was headed for success, at least in terms of improbability. After all, what else could result from the unlikely teaming of a former sharecropper, a pro football star, a pro football player who didn't make it, a vegetarian, and a Kelly girl?

Urban Talent now has a staff of nine dedicated people, headed by the ex-sharecropper—Richard Barber, nicknamed "Patches" because of his firsthand experience in poverty. But since his childhood as a plantation worker, Barber has managed to use his knack for self-motivation to achieve success in practically everything he's done. Today he's working toward a PhD in business administration at the University of Pittsburgh.

More importantly, he's the president and co-founder of Urban Talent Development.

Dick Barber has a small wooden sign on his desk that says: "The Buck Stops Here." With Barber, it really does.

"We're not here to train, we're here to motivate," he says. "We want to develop the individual so he can grow within the system—any system. For any aspiration or goal to be achieved within the system, you've first got to understand the system. This is what we try to do in Urban Talent Development."

The need for UTD developed as a spin-off from lessons learned in a training program launched by All-Pro Enterprises, Inc., a food-service business organized by Brady Keys, a former football star for the Pittsburgh Steelers.

In developing All-Pro Enterprises, Keys had organized a special series of three-week programs to help train blacks and other minority-group people to be franchise operators. What he found, however, was that the trainees were going back to their home area, opening franchises—and failing as businessmen.

According to Len Burnett, the pro football player who didn't make it and UTD's current executive vice-president, "The lesson we learned was that merely teaching blacks and other minorities about franchises wasn't going to work, and that the real need was in understanding the whole aspect of the business world."

That's how Urban Talent Development was born—with Keys as chairman of the board, Barber as president, and Burnett and other dedicated people involved in operations. At first the program was structured to help minorities to go into business for themselves. After one year, though, it was found that the real need in the business world was for supervisory and management people—with the requisite business skills, of course.

"Civil rights groups were out banging on doors to get jobs," says Burnett. "but once they got them, we didn't have the properly trained people to fill them. Business executives were telling us, 'Okay, give us ten people here, twenty people there'—and we didn't have them."

With that as its challenge, UTD remolded its program and gradually it became what it is today—a concept combining the elements of supervisory management, business management, and career orientation into a series of three-week courses running six hours a day for five days a week.

Classes are small—around 15 to 20 students—and they tend to be informal and loosely structured. They are more like free-wheeling discussion sessions than lectures.

Len Burnett, Les Misk, and Wellington Allen, the teachers, can be found straddling desks or perched on tables as they talk with their students. The language is the language of the student, not the business world. They may use "Peanuts" cartoon characters to demonstrate economics and the free enterprise system. But once the student has completed his studies, he will understand a profit-and-loss statement as well as any businessman.

Techniques of interviewing, personnel traits needed for supervisory positions, and even personal appearance are among the elements emphasized through imaginative methods devised by the instructors themselves.

"It's the little things that turned me on," says Beverly Gaskins, a 22-year-old high school graduate who eventually wants to open her own boutique. "Like interviewing, for example. They gave us some insight into the tricks interviewers are likely to pull in testing you out. What do you do, for example, when an interviewer offers you a cigarette knowing full well there's no ashtray around?"

"They want to see how aggressive you are and whether you will ask for an ashtray or try to quietly sneak the ashes into the cuffs of your pants or somewhere else. These are

the kind of things you'd never be aware of unless someone told you about them."

Role playing, public speaking in front of other members of the class on such topics as "what made me happy this week" or "something I really like to do" are all among the ways UTD seeks to build self-confidence. "We don't want them talking about something they don't know anything about; we want them telling us things they want to talk about," says Barber. "We want them to convey feeling so we can share that feeling. If their experience is a happy one, we listeners should also be happy. And if they are sad, we too should be sad. We're more interested in how they say it than what they say."

Burnett is a living example to the students in terms of overcoming disappointment and hardship, and of turning their lives around through self-motivation.

A pro-football player with a lot of potential, Burnett injured a knee in his first year with the Steelers, and two years later completely washed out in an attempted comeback. Instead of disappearing, however, he emerged with a new all-star credential, this time in the field of education. His influence is seen dramatically in practically every educational aspect of the UTD program.

Urban Talent Development is presently a \$165,000-a-year operation, completely funded through private foundations. There are no governmental or public subsidies. Barber likes it that way, because with no public subsidies there are no bureaucratic strings attached to the program.

"We look at manpower as a business, and so manpower training should be treated as a business," says Barber. "We don't want a program that perpetuates the welfare program. Our goal is to provide alternatives and remedies to welfare. A training program is not completely successful until it places all its trainees in jobs—jobs that are meaningful and offer a rewarding, satisfying career."

In some sense, UTD is ahead of its time, embracing the concept of career education that is only now beginning to infiltrate public education.

Perhaps Burnett captures the whole thing most effectively and dramatically in a poem he reads at some of the graduation exercises for UTD classes.

He calls it the "Penny Poem," and it goes like this:

I bargained with Life for a Penny,
And Life would pay no more,
However, I begged at evening
When I counted my scanty store.

For Life is a just employer.
He give you what you ask,
But once you have set the wages
Why, you must bear the task.

I worked for a menial's hire,
Only to learn dismayed,
That any wage I had asked of Life,
Life would have willingly paid.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Veterans' Administration on the fine work they are doing in the area of health care for the elderly. The aged are perhaps the most neglected minority in our country today, and the VA's efforts can serve as a model for other agencies in correcting the ig-

nomymous treatment of older Americans. It is for the purpose of informing the Members of Congress and all others interested in this most important undertaking, that I respectfully include the following correspondence between my office and the Veterans' Administration:

JUNE 5, 1974.

Mr. DAVID POGOLOFF,
Congressional Liaison, Veterans' Administration,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DAVE: I would greatly appreciate a detailed elaboration of the Veterans Administration plans for "Research and Aging Centers" at six VA hospitals: Bay Pines, Florida; Boston OPC, Bedford, Massachusetts; Little Rock, Arkansas; St. Louis, Missouri; Palo Alto and Los Angeles, California. The project is listed under the heading of "Biomedical Research Projects," pages 8-15 in the Fiscal Year 1975 Budget Justifications, and page 861 of the Appropriations Hearings of the same year.

An explanation of plans, criteria, and timetable for implementation would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

ROBERT O. TIERNAN,
Member of Congress.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1974.

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TIERNAN: I am pleased to respond to your inquiry about the proposed Veterans' Administration Geriatric Research and Clinical Centers. Currently, the Veterans Administration is providing care for 18,400 veterans aged 65 and over in VA hospitals, 4,100 aged veterans in VA nursing bed care units, and 3,500 in VA domiciliarys. These figures represent the largest aged population receiving direct medical and clinical care from a single agency.

The medical, psychological and adjustment problems often encountered by these veterans and their families require specialized knowledge and care. The VA continually endeavors to upgrade the care of these patients by attracting doctors interested in geriatric medicine and by encouraging clinically applied research aimed at better understanding the physiological, intellectual, and emotional functioning of the aged.

The geriatric centers are to provide a focus within the VA hospital system for continued clinical, research and educational development. Out of the specific needs of geriatric patients grow research ideas that require a supportive, professional environment in which the ideas can be explored. In a like manner, the research results need to be applied, tested, and refined in a clinical, daily patient care setting. The Veterans' Administration Geriatric Research and Clinical Centers are envisioned as serving this vital integrative purpose and as providing strong leadership in the training and education of geriatric professionals and paraprofessionals.

The originally suggested hospital sites were chosen because of a history of geriatric research. When it became known that geriatric centers were being planned, additional VA hospitals asked to be considered. As a result, twelve VA facilities were given the opportunity in November 1973 to submit detailed proposals described their particular interest and commitment in the study of aging. Each geriatric center was expected to have a clinical, research and educational component and to develop a total approach to the solution of identified problems which would improve care for the aging.

Eleven proposals were submitted in April

1974. The VA Hospital St. Louis, though originally identified as a potential center, did not submit a proposal. An evaluation of the individual geriatric proposals was conducted by six consultants prominent and knowledgeable in the field of aging. The criteria used to select sites included: the adequacy and clarity of the proposal in describing the center's mission; the degree to which the integrative function of the clinical, research, and educational components was conceptualized; the importance and need in the areas proposed for study; the organization clarity.

At this time, four sites have been chosen for activation as geriatric research and clinical centers: the VA Hospital Los Angeles at Wadsworth; the VA Hospital Little Rock, Arkansas; and two joint centers involving the Boston Outpatient Clinic/Bedford VA Hospital/Boston VA Hospital and the American Lake/Seattle VA Hospitals. Three additional hospitals are still being considered: VA Hospital Bay Pines, Florida; VA Hospital Sepulveda, California; and VA Hospital Palo Alto-Menlo Park, California. Site visits will be arranged to those hospitals to clarify certain elements in the submitted proposals and to assist in the revision and resubmission of a proposal.

The combined clinical and research budget estimates of these proposed centers as submitted indicate a need in the fiscal year 1975 for \$7 million. Additional evaluation of individual clinical and research projects will be conducted to select those of highest merit for initial funding.

Some of the most pressing elderly veteran needs cited by clinical researchers for study are: suicide in the elderly; geriatric cardiovascular studies; memory, learning, and retraining in geriatric patients; effectiveness, dose relationships, and incidence of side effects of psychopharmacologic agents upon geriatric population; "companion" program for depressed patients; lipid metabolism during aging; and, hypothalamic-pituitary neuroendocrine functions and their relationship to osteoporosis in elderly patients.

Enclosed is the activation timetable for the geriatric centers.

Thank you for your interest in the elderly veteran and in our Agency's continued work in his behalf. If at any time you have further questions about the Geriatric Research and Clinical Centers, please contact us and we will be happy to respond.

Sincerely,

R. RONDEBUSH,
Deputy Administrator.

Enclosure.

GERIATRIC RESEARCH AND CLINICAL CENTERS ACTIVATION SCHEDULE

Date and event

July, 1973: Planning Conference, VA Central Office.

October-November, 1973: Proposals solicited from twelve field stations.

February, 1974: Planning Conference—Evaluation Mechanism, VACO.

January-March, 1974: Site visits to potential centers.

April, 1974: Proposals submitted.

May-June, 1974: Proposals evaluated.

August, 1974: Completion of Protocol Evaluation.

September, 1974: Determination of initial funding levels.

October, 1974: Notification and allocation of funds.

January, 1975: Merit review of specific, individual, clinical programs and research projects.

February, 1975: Final allocation of funds for clinical programs and research projects.

March, 1975: Evaluation of implementation progress including field visits.

HISC—SELECTIVE SECURITY?

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I recently received in the mail the printed hearings of the House Internal Security Committee on Chile. I remark on this not because it is unusual to receive hearings in the mail, but because this particular volume came to me from the Embassy of Chile. While I am very aware that it is the responsibility of any embassy to keep abreast of happenings in Washington that affect its government, and that embassies generally try to disseminate in-

formation about their respective countries that they wish made known for one reason or another, it seems to me that the distribution of congressional hearings to Members of Congress by an embassy transcends the limits of good taste. The United States has its difficulties at the moment, but it does not need the Embassy of Chile to keep it abreast of what its own elected representatives are doing.

While we are on the subject of what our Government and its various organs are doing, I am curious as to why the Internal Security Committee, whose mandate is to inquire into internal matters, has taken the time and effort to compile a 225-page hearing record on Chile's internal problems. Dictatorships are not uncommon in this world—we

should know, we support some of the best that money can buy—but none of them have been deemed worthy of the energy and efforts of the Internal Security Committee. It appears that what we have here is a case of selective security: it does not matter how repressive, how undemocratic, or how dictatorial a government, it is OK with HISC—as long as it is not Communist. In my estimation, a dictatorship does not have to be Communist to be odious to free men, and if the Internal Security Committee gets into the business of investigating dictatorships, it is going to have a lot to do for a long time. I think, though, after reading the areas of inquiry that the House has assigned to HISC, it would be far better served by concentrating its efforts on whatever internal threats may exist.

SENATE—Wednesday, July 24, 1974

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the fret and fever of these troubled times, when we know not what a day may bring forth, we thank Thee for this quiet moment when all else is shut out and our hearts are uplifted to Thee. We cannot make better laws or a better world except as we are better persons. Make and keep our inner lives pure and kind and just, that we fail not. May our highest incentive be not to win over one another but to win with one another by doing Thy will for all. Show us what Thou dost will for this Nation and help us to be faithful agents for bringing it to pass. Correct our mistakes, redeem our failures, confirm our right actions, and crown this day with the benediction of Thy peace.

We pray through Him whose joy was to do Thy will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 23, 1974, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar under "New Reports."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of the Treasury.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the National Transportation Safety Board.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL TIME FOR CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 984.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The second assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 15461) to secure to the Congress additional time in which to consider the proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure which the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court transmitted to the Congress on April 22, 1974.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 983, S. 3684, be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on my time, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"BIG SHOTS" REQUIRED TO STAND IN LINE, TOO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 674, Senate Resolution 292, be removed from the general orders on the calendar and placed under "Subjects on the table."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DO WE NEED A CONSUMERS' BUREAU?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, in the July 23 issue of the Wall Street Journal there appeared a very penetrating analysis and commentary on S. 707, the bill to establish a so-called Consumer Protection Agency, now renamed an Agency for Consumer Advocacy.