

H.R. 16099. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973, and other related provisions of law, to increase safety on the Nation's highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 16100. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income taxation for cooperative housing corporations, condominium housing associations, and certain homeowners' associations and to tax the unrelated business income of such organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 16101. A bill to repeal the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 16102. A bill to amend the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973 to exempt from its provisions the period from the last Sunday in October 1974, through the last Sunday in February 1975; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELMAN (for himself, Mr. McKINNEY, and Mr. MOSHER):

H.R. 16103. A bill to amend section 552 of title 5 of the United States Code to clarify certain exemptions from its disclosure requirements, to provide guidelines and limitations for the classification of information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. McSPADEN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. OBEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. ESCH, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. BERGLAND, and Mr. KASTENMEIER):

H.R. 16104. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16105. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to extend the period after discharge in which psychosis is deemed to be incurred in military service from 2 years to 3 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONLAN:

H.R. 16106. A bill to repeal the earnings

limitation of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GINN:

H.R. 16107. A bill to require the establishment of an agricultural service center in each county of a State as part of the implementation of any plan for the establishment of such centers on a nationwide basis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. STEELE, Mr. TALLCOTT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H.R. 16108. A bill to protect the constitutional right of privacy of individuals concerning whom identifiable information is recorded by enacting principles of information practices in furtherance of articles I, III, IV, V, IX, X, and XIV of amendment to the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEBERT (for himself and Mr. BRAY) (by request):

H.R. 16109. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement for quadrennial physical examinations for members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 16110. A bill to terminate the Airlines Mutual Aid Agreement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 16111. A bill to reestablish the fiscal integrity of the Government of the United States and its monetary policy, through the establishment of controls with respect to the levels of its revenues and budget outlays, the issuance of money, and the preparation of the budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 16112. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to improve the business loan program for veterans and to make veterans who served after January 31, 1955, eligible for such program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SEIBERLING (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BREAUX, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. VANDER VEEN):

H.R. 16113. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to

increase the authorization of appropriation for the Land and Water Conservation Fund; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. BAFALIS):

H. Con. Res. 569. Concurrent resolution calling for a domestic summit to develop a unified plan of action to restore stability and prosperity to the American economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LITTON:

H. Res. 1256. Resolution requesting the President to comply with the Supreme Court order and turn over evidentiary information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUKEN:

H. Res. 1257. Resolution creating a select committee to study the impact and ramifications of the Supreme Court decisions on abortion; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. BIESER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. ZABLOCKI):

H. Res. 1258. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning ratification of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, and a comprehensive review of this Nation's national security and international policies regarding chemical warfare; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATES (for himself, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 1259. Resolution providing for television and radio coverage of proceedings in the Chamber of the House of Representatives on any resolution to impeach the President of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. FREY, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts):

H. Res. 1260. Resolution calling for a domestic summit to develop a unified plan of action to restore stability and prosperity to the American economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania introduced a bill (H.R. 16114) for the relief of Victor Henrique Carlos Gibson, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HON. WAYNE MORSE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the death of one of America's most distinguished liberal statesmen, in the midst of his attempt to reenter the public service, represents a great loss for America.

A courageous and outspoken individual with an incredible political perspicacity, former Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon repeatedly demonstrated his expertise on matters relating to agriculture, civil rights, conservation, education and labor. Throughout his 24-year tenure in the Senate, Morse revealed his strong dedication to the public interest; he sought

to place the welfare of the public above his loyalty to "the party."

The interest and concern that Senator Morse directed toward problems in the domestic sphere was extended to the realm of foreign affairs as well. The Senator's bold decision, in 1964, to oppose the Gulf of Tonkin resolution revealed another fine characteristic inherent in his personality—his refusal to abandon the principles he believed in despite the fact that his convictions were considered unpopular or improper by majority standards.

Men of Wayne Morse's caliber, integrity and intelligence are not easily found in government.

Though there can never be another Wayne Morse, let us hope that his spirit will serve as an inspiration to all individuals engaged in the public service. Our Nation needs more leaders with the

stature and conviction of Senator Morse for only they can maintain an independent, fresh and nonpartisan outlook in these times of increasing political distrust, partisanship and disillusionment.

As a further tribute to Senator Morse, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a moving editorial from the New York Times, dated July 23, 1974, memorializing him.

The editorial follows:

THE SENATE'S LOSS

Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon was too much the maverick to be a reliable party man, too much the gadfly to be a hero of the Senate Establishment, too much the independent to be predictable even in his proved liberalism. He was a superb public servant—not in spite of those attributes but because of them.

Originally a Republican of the Western progressive breed known in an earlier day as the "sons of the wild jackass," Wayne Morse

broke with his party when General Eisenhower, whom he had warmly supported, made peace with the conservative Senator Robert A. Taft. He sat in the Senate for a time as an independent by name as well as by nature and a few years later won re-election as a Democrat. He did not disparage the party system as such; he just gave principle a higher priority than party or, for that matter, than the views of his constituents.

Believing with Edmund Burke that a representative's first loyalty is to his own judgment, he took counsel with himself and had the courage to act on it. He could be wrong-headed at times—but most of the time he seemed magnificently right—especially, in the light of history, when he and another great independent liberal, Senator Ernest Gruening of Alaska, who died only a few weeks ago, stood alone against the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

Right or wrong, Wayne Lyman Morse went his own way, cavalierly crossing party lines to vote his conscience. At his death he was in the thick of a fight to make a last comeback to the United States Senate. The Senate lost.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, last Friday, July 19, the Wall Street Journal ran an excellent editorial entitled "Cutting the Federal Budget." It points out that the major administration economic authorities, William Simon, Arthur Burns, and Alan Greenspan, all agree that to fight inflation, we must cut Federal spending. I agree fully.

Inflation is our No. 1 domestic problem, and the No. 1 need is a cut in Federal spending.

The editorial says, however, that whatever effort there is will fail "unless President Nixon joins with enthusiasm."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 19, 1974]

CUTTING THE FEDERAL BUDGET

We continue to hear that Congress is seriously concerned about inflation. We do not believe what we hear, and will not until we see Congress cutting the federal budget instead of piling it on. But at least a handful of people in the capital are starting to talk about spending cuts of a size that would impress us.

Treasury Secretary Simon has presented to the President a list of potential cuts amounting to \$20 billion. Fed Chairman Arthur Burns and House Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur Mills want \$10 billion lopped from the \$305 billion total. Herbert Stein is eager to slash and his putative successor as the President's chief economic adviser, Alan Greenspan, is eager, too. The only member of the economic quadriad who doesn't want to cut the budget by more than nickels and dimes is budget director Roy Ash, who thinks it's a waste of time to even ask Congress.

What effort there is will fail unless President Nixon joins with enthusiasm. His political advisers, who still believe there's room for delaying the hard decisions, want him to

avoid upsetting the public and Republican Congressmen. But the President's indecision quite properly leads to questions about his ability to govern, which is a powerful political consideration pointing toward action. As this is weighed, Mr. Nixon may be drawn to the proponents of a serious budget cut.

Their arguments are powerful. Monetary restraint is the most important anti-inflation weapon, but is a crude weapon when used by itself. A constricting of money growth has its most painful effect on the productive resources of the economy; the government takes the first slice of the money supply to finance its debt and business and industry are left starved by the remainder.

Increasing taxes is no help. Higher taxes also fall hardest on the productive segment of the economy, putting pressure on management to recoup through increased prices and labor through increased wages. The only effective answer is to cut government spending in a way that does least damage to economic output and employment, concentrating in those areas where the government does not receive goods and services for the money it spends.

This is why Mr. Ash is so pessimistic. The least productive government spending is in transfer payments, which politicians equate with the poor, the sick and the aged. Mr. Simon is already having his morality questioned by the liberal press as a result of the budget memo he gave the President. The Treasury Secretary unflinchingly proposed \$9.3 billion cutbacks in the \$126 billion now earmarked for government pensions, disability, health and Social Security benefits. He also proposed whacking billions from manpower, education, highway, farm, revenue sharing and foreign aid programs.

Congress would be appalled if Mr. Nixon asked for these cuts. But cuts in government benefits will have to be made, sooner or later, and it will become more painful the longer Congress waits. Even if there were no immediate inflation problem, the benefit levels of the retirement programs have to be reduced or the programs will eventually collapse in insolvency. For years, imprudent Congresses and administrations have been pumping them up to get votes, predicated their generosity on dizzy assumptions of future economic growth. Up to now, Social Security beneficiaries have kept well ahead of the inflation rate, but it is now impossible to defend the system as actually sound even by traditionally loose definitions. So Mr. Simon asks that the next benefit increase be deferred by six months, a measure that will not only save \$4 billion but also move the Social Security System back toward solvency.

If Mr. Simon's proposal is viewed in this light it could hardly be termed "at once morally, administratively and politically disastrous" as one media pundit has put it. Inflation is sapping the strength of the nation's economic and political institutions and Mr. Simon has come up with the first and only serious program to combat that process that we have seen. We'd venture that an American public frightened by the inflation it sees would support the Simon approach.

President Nixon though has to embrace it and make it his own. Wilbur Mills proposes a presidential television address stating the problem and challenging Congress to slash government spending. Mr. Mills also thinks Mr. Nixon should threaten to impound appropriated funds if Congress refuses to cut.

We think the challenge should be made but not the threat which simply gives Congress a cheap way to avoid the issue. Especially if in the months ahead soaring inflation is matched by rising unemployment the public will have an opportunity to prod Congress during the November elections. If this Congress is not serious about inflation the voters are likely to supply one that is.

THE "NEW" GEORGE WALLACE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, rarely does a major newspaper columnist deal with an important political topic or personality head on. Most columns are fraught with equivocation and moderation, though honesty and decisiveness may be called for. In that light, I was pleasantly surprised to read William V. Shannon's column in the New York Times of July 9, entitled "Mr. Wallace Again." I hope that this piece receives wide consideration, for it eloquently states what is too rarely being said. It is now submitted for the attention of my colleagues.

MR. WALLACE AGAIN

(By William V. Shannon)

WASHINGTON, July 8—Every discussion on the future of the Democratic party goes back to the putative candidacy of Gov. George C. Wallace.

Party leaders and other candidates are treating him in gingerly fashion as if he were a time bomb about to explode. Whatever they think of him privately, they treat him in public as if he were a legitimate fellow Democrat whose opinions are entitled to be heard with respect.

Robert Strauss, the Democratic National Chairman, is careful to see that Wallace agents are represented in every party committee. Senator Edward Kennedy last year attended a civic celebration in Alabama honoring Mr. Wallace. Senator Henry Jackson goes so far as to say that he could envisage Mr. Wallace in either place on the Democratic national ticket in 1976.

The party officials hope that if he is treated with enough courtesy, Governor Wallace will act like a good loyal Democrat and support the ticket next time. Behind the public hypocrisy of the rival candidates, of course, is the desire to conciliate Mr. Wallace's followers and eventually to steal away as many of them as they can for themselves.

Both assumptions are profoundly mistaken.

Mr. Wallace is not going to abide by any party rules or traditions of loyalty unless he benefits from them. If he does not get at least the Vice-Presidential nomination, he will bolt the party again and run for President as an independent.

If he does run, no other candidate is going to take his hard-core supporters away from him. As for his more marginal supporters in the North and West, Senator Kennedy could compete for them because he has a family legend of his own to deploy against Mr. Wallace's extrarational appeal. But in a three-way race for the Presidency in 1976 among Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Wallace and the Republican nominee, the votes of marginal Wallaceite voters would depend on how the candidates positioned themselves on the issues. Butting up Mr. Wallace in the meantime is not going to help in that hard fight and does positive harm. It confers on him a respectability that he does not deserve and could not win in any other way.

Democrats who think that Mr. Wallace can be taken into camp are making the same mistake that many Republicans made from 1950 to 1954 in trying to conciliate and control Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. Throughout history, many liberals and conservatives alike have had difficulty in coping with demagogues. Being rational themselves, willing to compromise and to abide by society's

laws and unwritten rules, they cannot comprehend the true dynamic force of an opponent whose appeal is to irrational forces, who brooks no compromise, and who is willing to conjure up the demons of violence if they serve his purposes. Over and over again, men of goodwill in other political factions are misled by a demagogue's honeyed words and gestures to legality.

Since there has been so much attention paid of late to Governor Wallace crowning a Negro homecoming queen at the university of Alabama and receiving the endorsement of a Negro mayor in his current race for re-election, it is useful to recall his record.

Four Ku Klux Klansmen were convicted by all-white juries and eventually given twenty-year prison sentences for their part in the castration of a black man in Alabama in 1957. As soon as Mr. Wallace became Governor in 1963 and gained control of the state parole board, the board freed these Klansmen even though they had served less than four years. As one Alabama journalist observed, Governor Wallace in allowing them to go free "signaled his support to every white man in Alabama who wanted to use brutality and terrorism to oppose racial change."

It should have been no surprise that shortly thereafter, four black girls lost their lives in Birmingham when their Sunday school was dynamited. The perpetrators of that crime have never been punished.

It was Governor Wallace who ordered the state police to attack the civil rights demonstrators with tear gas and cattle prods when they crossed the bridge at Selma in 1965. In the summer of that same year, a young white Episcopalian seminary student was shot down and killed in Hayneville, Ala., because he was a civil rights worker. In a caricature of a trial, the man who killed him was acquitted on grounds of self-defense.

The blood of these innocent dead and mutilated victims of both races cries out against the new "respectable" George Wallace. His whole appeal was and is based on racism, on the fear and hatred of blacks.

No honorable politician can top Mr. Wallace in appealing to his own followers because no other national candidate has his record of identification with anti-Negro violence or his skill in manipulating covert racist language. Let Mr. Wallace and his followers resume their third-party adventures. Neither America nor the Democratic party can risk legitimizing the cruel and loathsome racial impulses in the South's dark past that now live on in the nightmares of the whole nation.

IMPEACHMENT POLITICS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of a statement made today by Senator JAMES MCCLURE of Idaho.

I commend this to my colleagues and I would like to associate myself with the release of Senator MCCLURE:

STATEMENT OF U.S. SENATOR JAMES A. MCCLURE ON IMPEACHMENT POLITICS

I have learned today that in all likelihood the President will sign the Legal Services Corporation Act into law. To me, and to others in the Congress it looks as if commitments made by the White House staff to Senate liberals will be honored above commitments made by the President himself to the American people in two consecutive elections.

I resent this kind of impeachment politics, and the public should resent it.

On the floor last week, I mentioned dual

commitments and I suggested that it was a case where either Mr. Nixon's Chief of Staff, Alexander Haig was unaware of prior commitments against legal services legislation, or that the President personally saw fit not to honor his pledge to Senator Carl Curtis or Congressman LaMar Baker when they met with him on this issue. Those two men were told by the President there had been no commitment to Senate liberals that Legal Services would be signed. I do not doubt that pledges for support were given Senators Javits and Taft, by General Haig. And I do not doubt that the President denied such pledges had been made.

Here, with the Legal Services bill, there are clearly double and opposite commitments emanating from the White House—the President in trying to stay in office, and his staff assumes that means trying to placate everybody: that means playing both sides. It can't be done.

President Nixon didn't receive his overwhelming mandate from his White House staff. He certainly didn't receive it from his liberal detractors in the Congress. But he does have a mandate from the American people, and if this Legal Services business is a real trend, if the President gives in to pressure to create programs and ideas rejected during the Presidential elections, it can only be seen that he has turned his back on the people.

There are those of us in the Congress and the Senate who want to work with the President to bring his mandate for a change in domestic policy into reality. That has not changed. My pledge to that end is as strong as ever.

In two consecutive elections, Americans called for a change in domestic policy. It became even more important in the last election following the Democratic Convention. The war was ending, there were great steps in foreign policy, but the majority of Americans gave the President a mandate to change what they saw—and the President said he saw—as dangerous trends in domestic issues. But by signing this Legal Services Bill, Richard Nixon, will have given in to those trends, and it must bring his ability to govern effectively, and to lead at all into sharp question.

HON. WAYNE MORSE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, former Oregon Senator Wayne Morse, a man whose name was synonymous with intellectual dignity and courage, died Monday in a Portland hospital at the age of 73. A man of tremendous resourcefulness, death came to him as he was in the midst of an intense campaign to recapture the seat he once held.

As Senator from Oregon for 24 years, Wayne Morse brought an indomitable spirit, a formidable intellect, and a reservoir of legislative skills to the forefront of America. Moreover, he was a man who did not back down from defending his beliefs and who was not afraid to speak to people directly from his heart.

As we all recall, it was Senator Morse and the late Senator Gruening of Alaska who had the courage to stand alone years ago and vote against the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, legislation which ultimately led to the tragedy of Vietnam. Now that

both men are gone, Mr. Speaker, I can not help but wonder how many young lives would have been saved had we heeded their advice and given credibility to their foresight.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my deepest sympathy to the Morse family and to the people of Oregon. They can take comfort in the fact that Wayne Morse will long be remembered as one of America's most outstanding and courageous men.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES APPROPRIATIONS

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, we in this Nation have been fortunate to witness the growth of the performing arts as well as the arts and humanities in recent years—and with it the development of many talented citizens' capabilities in art, music, writing, ballet, music, et cetera.

The appropriation measure now under consideration which would provide \$145 million to the performing arts and the arts and humanities for 1975 is vital if we are to insure the continuation of this important national enlightenment.

Every citizen gains from the national encouragement of the arts and humanities and the visual arts—whether one is the creator or viewer. And we in turn gain as a Nation for insuring that citizens' talents and their abilities to express themselves creatively is not lost to this and future generations.

Mr. BRADEMANS has worked hard to insure the future of this vital aspect of American life. And I am grateful to again witness efforts to continue such important funding that Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and I worked to create when as members of the same subcommittee we sought to insure a brighter future for the arts and humanities in American life.

The late President Kennedy, who did so much to gain greater recognition for the arts and humanities once said:

When power corrupts, poetry cleanses, for art establishes basic human truths which must serve as the touchstone of our judgment.

Surely we in the Congress are aware of the need for even greater encouragement of the arts and humanities—for they represent a universal language and the groundwork for greater understanding among all people. Let us not lose the momentum we have gained in developing national creativity—let us encourage it and insure its future by supporting my distinguished colleague, Mrs. HANSEN's efforts to insure adequate appropriations for the visual arts, and the arts and humanities.

And as I leave the Congress, I will feel proud in knowing that it was through our joint efforts that we were able to insure that young and old alike could share in not only the development of their crea-

tive abilities but also jointly savor the artistic talents of others.

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLES CLAYTON
SNAPP—1904 TO 1974

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the city of Walnut Ridge in Lawrence County, Ark., recently celebrated one of its most joyous occasions—its centennial anniversary. Less than a week later, the city was saddened by the loss of Mr. Charles Clayton Snapp. He was an outstanding civic leader and conservationist who had been one of the most dynamic forces in Walnut Ridge, indeed in the whole region, during the last half century.

Mr. Snapp was a businessman, operating one of northeast Arkansas's outstanding motels and, with his brother Russell, an automobile agency. He had been an organizer of one of Walnut Ridge's banks and had served as the city's postmaster for 12 years.

Particularly during his last 25 years many of his efforts were directed toward improving the quality of life in Lawrence County and the State of Arkansas.

He worked for 7 years as a member of the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission. It was mainly through his relentless efforts that a lake and recreation area for the county was established. And, when the time came for naming it an appreciative people remembered and called the facility Lake Charles.

The scope of Mr. Snapp's dedication to the interests of the people of the region can be seen, to some degree, in the kinds of awards presented to him. These included the Watershed Man of the Year Award for the Arkansas Conservation District in 1974, the Wildlife Conservation Award for Arkansas in 1965, and the Resource Conservation and Development "Conservation Man of the Year Award" from the Soil Conservation Service in Arkansas in 1973.

Soon after my election to the Congress Mr. Snapp invited me to take a trip through the region with him. He wanted me to review the conservation, recreation, and flood control projects that were important to the Ozark foothills. For a full day we rode crosscountry, over hills and through dales, up and down ditch banks, to see first hand the projects that would benefit the people and economy of Lawrence and the surrounding counties.

I will always remember one statement he made:

Bill, there is not one dime in this for me! I am working for our people, so they can prosper.

As his Congressman, I worked with Mr. Snapp on improvements that will for generations to come benefit Arkansas. Mr. Snapp was diligent in his pursuit and dedicated to the success of any undertaking on which he embarked.

Mr. Snapp maintained his pace until his fatal heart attack. His continued involvement in making the countryside of America a better place to live was best

described in an editorial in the May 2, 1974, issue of the Walnut Ridge Times Dispatch. It said, in part,

At 70, many men have retired, but Charles C. Snapp had more projects going when he was fatally stricken last week than many people undertake in a lifetime.

His life was a tribute to the frontier spirit that has made America great.

**ST. CLAIR CALLS EVIDENCE
INADEQUATE**

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include for the RECORD a report of a press conference given by Presidential lawyer, James D. St. Clair, on the matter of evidence in the impeachment inquiry: [From the Washington Post, July 23, 1974]

ST. CLAIR CALLS EVIDENCE INADEQUATE
(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

SAN CLEMENTE, CALIF., July 22.—Presidential lawyer James D. St. Clair said he advised Mr. Nixon in a two-hour meeting today that "in my judgment, if all the evidence were viewed objectively, it would not sustain any" of the impeachment articles.

St. Clair charged that the staff of the House Judiciary Committee, in preparing articles of impeachment, abandoned its impartial role and assumed "a prosecutorial role."

Moreover, St. Clair said in a televised news conference, the staff by its actions has attempted to tell members of Congress how to vote on the impeachment issue.

That raises the question of what kind of advice the committee is going to get from its staff, he said.

"It had always been my understanding they had been employed by the committee to act as an impartial adviser to the committee, developing such facts, both pro and con, as existed," St. Clair said.

The evidence developed during the lengthy committee inquiry "doesn't even come close to establishing guilt" on the President's part, St. Clair argued.

Like all other White House spokesmen, St. Clair declined to say whether Mr. Nixon would abide by a Supreme Court decision ordering him to turn over additional tape recordings to Watergate Special Prosecutor Leon Jaworski.

Declaring it would be "highly improper" for a lawyer to discuss a pending case, St. Clair said that to answer the question would "require speculation on my part as to whether the court would say this . . . or that."

He said the responsibility rests clearly with the House not to impeach and bring "that burden on the American people unless the evidence is clear."

"If there is substantial doubt or no evidence, as I suggest is the case, the House of Representatives ought not to simply pass the matter on to the Senate . . ."

"There is no provision if there is a finding of probable cause to impeach. They have to decide whether or not to impeach, and I think they ultimately will assume that responsibility."

St. Clair answered reporters' questions for more than 30 minutes. On a number of occasions, he used a handkerchief to blot perspiration on his face.

While declining to say what the President would do regarding a Supreme Court ruling, St. Clair said Mr. Nixon would not invoke the Fifth Amendment.

Earlier today, Samuel A. Garrison, the new chief counsel for the Republicans on the Judiciary Committee, argued that Mr. Nixon's

refusal to give up more tapes was covered by the Fifth Amendment.

St. Clair's attack on the committee staff follows a series of attacks last week by White House press secretary Ronald L. Ziegler and counselor to the President Dean Burch.

White House aides have acknowledged that the committee is likely to vote a bill of impeachment, but they maintain that the House will not do so. Their strategy appears to be to challenge the committee's impartiality before it takes a vote to impeach.

St. Clair said he believed that Congress "will home in" on the issue of whether the President authorized payment of hush money to convicted Watergate conspirator E. Howard Hunt.

That is the "narrow issue" and the evidence supports the President's claim that he did not authorize the payment, St. Clair argued.

The tapes show that Mr. Nixon "could not have known of nor authorized" the payment because the day after the payment "he is still talking about it," St. Clair said.

John W. Dean III, former presidential counsel and chief witness against the President, "initiated the payment before he met with the President" on March 21, 1973, St. Clair contended.

St. Clair said he had written to House Judiciary Committee counsel John Doar requesting that he be permitted to participate in open hearings the committee plans. Doar has not yet replied, St. Clair said.

An impeachable offense must be defined as a major or serious crime, the attorney argued. He said he did not think the American people would accept anything else. That is why the allegation of presidential approval for payment of hush money is the principal issue, St. Clair said.

When asked how he found the President's mood when he met with him today, St. Clair replied that "to me, he seems quite confident."

LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 3 of this year, I told my colleagues in the House that I had mailed a legislature questionnaire covering several items of importance and interest to my constituents.

At that time I indicated that I would inform my colleagues of the results of the questionnaire, and I would like to place those results in the RECORD at this point:

LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

64.7% of the respondents indicated that they do not favor the impeachment of President Nixon. 35% said they favor impeachment based on their knowledge at the time of the questionnaire.

24.3% of the respondents favor reduction of Environmental Protection Agency air quality standards to permit increased use of coal to alleviate the current energy problem. 22.9% would reduce new car emission standards, and 28.5% favor legislation to tax excessive profits of oil companies. 24.2% of the respondents indicated their support of legislation to permit deep water ports for oil importation.

On the question of whether or not funds should be diverted from the highway trust fund to support public mass transit systems, 54.7% indicated opposition to such diversion of funds, while 45.3% support the use of trust funds for mass transit.

76.2% of those responding said they favor federal legislation which would establish minimum standards for no-fault automobile insurance plans. 23.8% oppose such legislation.

To combat inflation, 24.9% favor the re-establishment of wage and price controls across the board. 28.3% would limit Federal spending, while 21.2% said they would increase Federal taxes. 25.7% of the respondents favor a balanced federal budget.

86.4% of the Fifth District citizens who mailed in their questionnaires indicated that they favor increasing the earning limitation for persons receiving social security benefits. 13.6% oppose such a move.

When asked where they stand on a national health insurance program to cover catastrophic or prolonged illness, 70.4% indicated support and 29.6% opposition.

77.2% of the respondents opposed public financing of all candidates for Federal office, while 22.8% support this approach.

Noting that the U.S. Postal Service was, "... for all intents and purposes, removed from Federal or Congressional control" in 1970, Representative Mizell asked "How would you rate your postal service?" 30% said "Good," 45.1% "Fair," and 24.9% "Poor."

LET 'EM EAT FM

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, sometimes, it seems that government does too much for the people of America. At least that is the viewpoint recently expressed by the Detroit Free Press in an editorial on July 9, 1974, which addressed itself to the bill passed by the other body requiring radio manufacturers to provide radios capable of receiving both FM and AM signals. This is certainly a case of too much assistance. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

LET 'EM EAT FM

The U.S. Senate has approved a bill that promises to revolutionize American living styles. The only problem with the legislation that would require radio manufacturers to provide sets capable of receiving both FM and AM signals is that it doesn't go far enough, and include enough territory.

FM reception requires circuitry considerably more sophisticated than AM and therefore costs more. A person who wants to pay only for AM reception, however, would naturally be unaware of the delights he has been missing in the higher frequencies, and should be required to have them available.

Pursuing this line of thought indicates that nobody should be able to purchase a radio that did not have reception capability for submarines broadcasting at 1,000 meters, foreign short-wave stations at 19 meters and Sputniks at 20 centimeters. It would be one wild radio set and cost a mint, but what the heck.

By the same token it is idiotic to provide cars without the amenities to any sap who might wish to live austerely. He should be required to take power brakes, air conditioning, rear-window defoggers and a factory-installed shoe buffer.

It is outlandish to permit people to build houses with only one bathroom. Every refrigerator should have at least an ice maker and an ice-water dispenser.

The Senate is on the right track. Permit-

CXX—1579—Part 19

ting people to buy only what they want and can afford keeps the economy stagnant and denies them pleasures that they should have, whether they have the money or not.

AMERICAN TROTSKYITES SPLIT ON TERRORISM

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Socialist Workers Party, the American Trotskyite organization has expelled 69 of its members because they support the proterrorist majority of the Fourth International.

The House Committee on Internal Security has published documents showing the development of a proterrorist majority in the Fourth International, the World Trotskyite Movement. Trotskyites have engaged in terrorist activities in Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Ireland and Spain. There are contacts between the Fourth International and other terrorist groups such as the Palestinians.

The majority of the Socialist Workers Party has argued against the use of terrorism at this time due to the small size of its movement. The group just expelled which calls itself "The Internationalist Tendency" supports terrorism but has not engaged in such activity.

The two leaders of the "Internationalist Tendency" William Massey and John Barzman are now operating out of headquarters in Chicago at 1450 West Belle Plaine, Chicago, Ill. Massey and Barzman both attended the World Congress of the Fourth International held in Sweden, February 1974, where they voted in support of every resolution favoring terrorism and "armed struggle."

Last year the Socialist Workers Party through their surveillance of the "Internationalist Tendency" secured a secret letter written from France by Barzman to his comrades in the United States. Barzman, who lived in France for 12 years, has been closely associated with the Communist League, the French section of the Fourth International which has been outlawed by the French Government because of its violent activities. This group now calls itself "The Revolutionary Communist Front."

Barzman's secret letter was published in the confidential Socialist Workers Party Discussion Bulletin and was reprinted by the House Committee on Internal Security in its hearing on "The Theory and Practice of Communism," part 3—Expocuba. The letter revealed that Barzman has received advice and instructions from Alain Krivine and Gerard Vergeat. Krivine was arrested by the French Government as one of the main instigators of the violence that led to the outlawing of the Communist League. Vergeat has among his other duties, liaison with Arab terrorist groups and is attempting to organize an Arab Trotskyite organization.

One of the complaints made by Massey

against the leadership of the Socialist Workers Party was that—

The SWP leadership has refused to put forth an adequate defense of the "Internationalist Tendency" which has been the target of a series of attacks not only on the part of the House Internal Security Committee of the U.S. Congress, but on the part of a number of its pimp journalists.

This statement was made by Massey in a letter to the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party dated June 9, 1974, and printed in the Internal Information Bulletin of the Socialist Workers Party, a confidential publication dated July 19, 1974, which was obtained last week by the minority staff of the House Committee on Internal Security. "The series of attacks" referred to by Massey consisted of the House Committee on Internal Security publishing confidential documents of the Socialist Workers Party showing the support given by Massey and his group to international terrorism. The reference to the journalists probably refers to the fact that such knowledgeable writers as Victor Reisel and such publications as Human Events used the documents of the House Committee on Internal Security to expose the Terrorist International.

If Mr. Massey and his friends confine themselves to sitting around the coffee table and talking, obviously the authorities will take no action against them. But if they decide to translate talk into action, they will find that the authorities know where to locate them.

SAM GARRISON NEW CHIEF MINORITY COUNSEL

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in order to further explain the recent action taken by the Republican members of the House Judiciary Committee in the designation of Samuel A. Garrison III, as chief minority counsel to represent the interests of the minority members, I draw your attention to a thoughtful editorial, which appeared in yesterday's Chicago Tribune.

The editorial is reproduced herewith for the benefit of my colleagues in the House, and others who may have occasion to peruse the article:

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 23, 1974]

JENNER OUT, GARRISON IN

With impeachment hearings approaching their climax, the Republicans on the House Judiciary Committee have dropped Albert E. Jenner Jr. as minority counsel and turned his duties over to Sam Garrison, his deputy.

Rep. Robert McClory of Illinois, second ranking Republican on the committee, disclosed the change on television Sunday. He said that Mr. Jenner "has taken a strong position pro impeachment, entirely in line with the Democratic leadership. . . . In order that Republicans can be served, we need the action of—the partisan service of—Mr. Garrison."

Mr. McClory is right. We happen to agree with Mr. Jenner that the committee should recommend impeachment, and so do a good many other Republicans. But that isn't the

point. Mr. Jenner was supposed to be representing the 17 Republicans on the committee, and on the record, at least, most of them are still holding out against impeachment.

Many of them never were happy with the appointment of Mr. Jenner, who once helped raise funds for Illinois' Democratic Sen. Adlai Stevenson. Last Friday, the Democratic counsel, John Doar, presented the proposed articles of impeachment and said that "reasonable men acting reasonably would find the President guilty." Mr. Jenner said he agreed with every word. This convinced most of the Republicans that Mr. Jenner could not properly represent them.

Even if a majority of Republicans on the committee did favor impeachment, it wouldn't make sense to have opposing counsel taking the same side and nobody except the President's lawyer, James St. Clair, arguing the case against impeachment. This wouldn't help the public to understand the case or the committee to make a proper judgment. It would only have lent credence to White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler's charge that the committee is conducting a "kangaroo court."

INFLATION

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, inflation is indeed a problem that must be handled immediately and decisively. A Congress that has been Democratic-controlled for over 40 years continues to support wasteful and extravagant programs and deficit financing which results in a grossly unbalanced budget. We must shoulder much of the blame for this on the Democratic leadership.

There are no two ways about it. We must stop spending more than we are taking in. In the last 20 years, the Government has amassed \$218 billion in budget deficits in addition to adding \$234 billion to the national debt. This is a deplorable situation and should not be allowed to continue. The inflation rate jumped 8.8 percent in 1973, the highest rate of increase since World War II. However, while we must reexamine the budget, we must not eliminate needed social and economic programs necessary for the well-being of our citizens and the economy. We must exert pressure on the rest of the Congress to enact certain measures to save money.

For my part, I have supported various pieces of legislation to aid in fighting inflation. Only a few months after I began my first term in office last year, I co-sponsored a bill to keep revenues in line with expenditures.

I supported legislation which will give conservative thinkers in Congress their rightful power to have an effect on the expenditure of funds. This new bill calls for the creation of a budget control committee. It will insure that we Congressmen concerned about extravagant Federal spending will have the power necessary to keep the country within its budget.

Finally, I am in favor of the proposal to overhaul the committee structure in the House. The plan would consolidate

the now diffuse responsibilities for the complex and overlapping areas of health, energy, foreign affairs, and transportation now handled jointly by a number of separate committees. Hopefully, this would cut the bureaucratic red tape and reduce Government spending. The result would be a lessening of inflation.

OUR POSTAL SERVICE WOES CONTINUE

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, since the creation of the U.S. Postal Service 3 years ago as a "quasi-independent" agency, we have seen a steady deterioration of service to the countryside. As I prepare for hearings in the First Congressional District on the management and operations of the Postal Service, I find a wealth of complaints in Arkansas alone that dictate the need for a broad reassessment of our decision to "let go" of the Postal Service. I would like to share with my colleagues two of the most recent comments I have received from the folks back home regarding the lack of service they are getting in the delivery of mail:

July 22, 1974.

DEAR BILL: I find your efforts to examine the U.S. Postal Service and seek ways to improve its service commendable.

Recently I discovered that there was no provision for registering mail after 5:30 p.m. in the whole state of Arkansas!

How ridiculous that in a State capital (with its attendant courts, businesses, banks, and law matters) there should be no facilities for the registration or certification of important mail or provision for buying U.S. or foreign airmail stamps after hours.

LANE LARRIEU,
Little Rock, Ark.

JONESBORO, ARK.,
July 22, 1974.

Re U.S. Postal Service (or lack of it)

HON. BILL ALEXANDER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I don't know how many people may complain—some, as you know, "suffer in silence". I can't be silent about it any longer.

The local situation—I do not know now—as of this date—whomsoever the Postmaster may be—nor do I know whether he's still known as Postmaster or by some other consummate title. Makes no difference about title.

Let's look at the 3 or 4 or 5 "windows" in our local office—on numerous occasions lately I have personally experienced the unpleasant duty of finding only one window open for service with long lines of waiting patrons. In an office in a city the size of Jonesboro I think this is ridiculous—absolutely ridiculous.

On Friday, July 19, 1974—I personally took a piece of mail to be processed by Certified Mail to our local postoffice at 4 P.M. I found one Service Window Open. I saw 6 People standing in line in addition to the Customer at the window. This Customer had 5 Packages to mail and the Forms all had to be completed. I waited some 20-30 minutes and saw that it would probably be an hour before I could be waited on. My time is as valuable—

probably more so—than the postal employees—so it was necessary for me to go back to my Office and again try on July 22, 1974 to get this mailing done.

I submit to you that we have here in Jonesboro a ridiculous service bottleneck as to local service—who is to blame I do not know but I would guess the top man—whether he be now Postmaster or otherwise—somebody is dragging his feet and is not earning his pay—which we taxpayers are paying.

I can tell you without equivocation that there are a few of the "little employees" who really try to render service and break this bottleneck but they can't do it all by themselves.

Think the problem is at the top man—whomsoever he may be.

It is disgraceful!
I could—if I had the time—get you a hundred letters like this but I don't have the time to be "Running the Postal Service". What can you do about it?

Sincerely,

T. H. BUCK PRYOR.

THE SECOND ATTACK AT PEARL HARBOR

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, how are we Americans doing in the second attack at Pearl Harbor? I believe this question needs to be asked. And, I submit, that the answer to it is that we are not doing very well. In fact, we are in grave danger of losing a good part of the State in which historic Pearl Harbor is located.

The Associated Press carried a dispatch from Honolulu the other day to the effect that Japanese financier Kenji Osano had completed a deal with ITT Sheraton Corp. whereby three major Hawaiian resort hotels will pass into Japanese hands.

The hotels are well known in the tourist trade. One, the Royal Hawaiian on Waikiki Beach is perhaps the best known of all. The others are the Sheraton Waikiki and the Sheraton Maui on the island of Maui, the hotel which has the distinction of descending a scenic hillside. All three have heavy patronage from the U.S. mainland.

Perhaps, if Osano and his interests, which paid \$105 million for the three establishments, were unique in their Hawaiian takeovers, we might accept their purchases as an expected instance of internationalism. But the fact is that more and more Japanese businessmen are buying up more and more of our 50th State to the exclusion of the Hawaiian people and their mainland countrymen. And they are doing so with dollars which I insist were obtained through long-standing trade advantages in their overall dealings with us.

Most of us are old enough to recall vividly the first attack at Pearl Harbor and how that catapulted us into the greatest war in history and how the late President Roosevelt determined at that time it would live forever as a "day of infamy." But here we are, three decades later, seeing the Japanese people, armed with our dollars, accomplishing far more in a conquest at Pearl Harbor than did that country's air arm and navy.

Japanese militarists destroyed a large part of our fleet and killed hundreds of young Americans. But we quickly recovered and Pearl Harbor became a rallying cry as we proceeded on to victory. But what of today? How can we get back the Royal Hawaiian, the Sheraton Waikiki, the Sheraton Maui, and all the other multimillion dollar parts of Hawaii which the Japanese already have captured? And how can we halt the continuing Japanese business offensive before Hawaii in all but loyalty becomes a province of Japan rather than a free and sovereign member of our Union?

As a people, we did remember the first Pearl Harbor. Are we now to overlook the second? Hawaii is far too important to allow the assault by the Japanese business forces to continue. It is a national challenge.

MOBILE HOMES

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently become very concerned about certain anticompetitive business practices in the mobile home industry.

My office has received complaints from many Wisconsin residents regarding "closed court" purchasing and "tie-in sales." These two devices are often used by unscrupulous mobile home park operators who force prospective mobile homeowners to buy a home from the operator of the court rather than purchase one from an outside source and move it into the court.

On July 10, I wrote to Chairman Lewis Engman of the Federal Trade Commission and asked him to investigate this possible violation of antitrust statutes in the hope that the FTC will order mobile home court operators to halt this restrictive practice.

I believe that mobile home court operators may be violating antitrust laws through their use of closed court and tie-in arrangements.

Forcing mobile homeowners to purchase their home from the operator of the park is not only anticompetitive, but has the effect of limiting one of our basic rights—the freedom to live where we choose.

So that my colleagues will have a better idea of this problem, I am inserting in the RECORD my letter to Chairman Engman of the Federal Trade Commission:

JULY 10, 1974.

HON. LEWIS ENGMAN,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to a conversation between Brad Gary of my staff and your Congressional Relations office, I am requesting an investigation of an anti-competitive practice known as "closed court" purchasing.

This problem appears to be particularly widespread in Southeastern Wisconsin where prospective mobile home owners are often required to "buy into" a mobile home community, rather than having the option of purchasing a mobile home from an outside

source and moving it to the individual trailer park.

I hope you will be able to determine whether this practice is a violation of antitrust statutes and I would also appreciate your informing me of what corrective measures can be taken to remedy this matter.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

EDDIE ROECKER—HE HAS DONE SO MUCH FOR ALL OF US

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, last night in Mount Ephraim, N.J., the "little guys" went to bat for Ed Roecker.

Who is Ed Roecker? Ed Roecker is a big man, with a big heart, and a big voice. At Williamsport, Pa., the heart of Little League baseball, he is known as "Mr. National Anthem." Thousands of little leaguers, past and present know Ed Roecker. Their parents and friends know Ed, and he is loved by all.

Ed has spent a lifetime giving—last night he received the gratitude of a most thankful public.

I submit for the RECORD Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Tuesday, June 25 edition of the Camden Courier-Post, which succinctly tells the Ed Roecker story:

"LITTLE GUYS" BAT FOR ED ROECKER

(By Leroy Samuels)

Joe Brennan of Camden says when Eddie Roecker sings the National Anthem at a ball game, the whole world stops. Everyone is suddenly all ears, because Eddie Roecker of Camden sings from the heart: he is loud and clear and he is very sincere.

"Each time I go to a ball game and Eddie sings the National Anthem—it tears me apart," said Brennan the other night. "Each time he does it, the whole ballpark stands still and the people get filled with emotion. When Eddie finishes, everyone feels like fighting a tiger. They have that kind of inspiration from Eddie. That kind of warmth and love for the man."

Eddie Roecker, an ex-semi-pro baseball player who made it into the big leagues of entertainment, always drifted back to the ball parks, the stadiums, the sandlot field with a wire fence for a backstop and a hand microphone and a scratchy speaker nailed to the wood.

"The big guy always amazed people because he made the big-time in music and the shows—but he always came home to Merchantville and helped the little people here," said Brennan. "The higher Eddie Roecker went, the more intense he became to help us here at home. He worked in so many benefits, anything to help the little people. He did so much . . ."

Eddie Roecker. A man with a big heart. Founder of the Merchantville Little League, singer of the National Anthem at the Little League games in Williamsport, Pa., each summer the people there called him "Mr. National Anthem." A big hit at the local sports dinners. Opener of the annual oldtimers softball games in Camden County each summer. He really did so much.

And now the little people are going to do something for Eddie Roecker.

The big guy is in the hospital. He had

recent major surgery and is clinging to hopes of singing again. "Already, Eddie has shown so much determination and will-power," said Brennan. "Already, the doctors are hoping for a great, great recovery from his operation."

But Eddie Roecker will be hospitalized for weeks and the Camden County people are going to do something which is long overdue; hold a social night to tribute all of the good things Eddie Roecker has done in his life.

Eddie's night is scheduled July 23 at Schillig's Black Horse Farms in Mt. Ephraim and Joe Brennan expects a full house of sports people, entertainers, and dozens of people helped somehow by Eddie.

"For the first time, we will properly be able to thank Eddie," said Brennan, "and it gets me all choked-up to think about the opportunity. When you know a guy like Eddie for 25, maybe 30 years, you think of all the wonderful things he has done—it's certainly time to say thank you, Eddie."

Eddie strikes home hard to so many people—right into the heart of their emotions. It happened to Marie Christian of the Teener Leagues baseball several years ago. After Eddie sang at an All-Star baseball dinner, Marie wrote to the big guy.

"When you finished singing the Lord's Prayer, a pin could have been dropped," she wrote. "Even the young boys enjoyed your singing . . . and you know how boys can be at a dinner. You see, Eddie, they recognize quality. Thanks so much, Eddie."

Dozens of local people are helping to lift off the big dinner, including Mike Hayes, Frank DiRenzo, Pete DelGrande, Joseph Cupparo, Jack Belfri, Joe Borreggine, John Giuseppe, George Montanaro, Jack Steck, Pete Kaighn, and Mayor Bertram German of Merchantville. Brennan says the next committee meeting is tonight, six o'clock, in Giuseppe's Restaurant, and interested persons can contact Brennan at 228-2335 for more information.

"It's the least we can do for Eddie," said Brennan. "After all, he's done so much for us."

ERRONEOUSLY QUOTED

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I was erroneously quoted by UPI as having told a group of Republican Members of the other body that—in my view—there are now enough votes in the House of Representatives to impeach the President of the United States.

I said no such thing. I told the Senators that an assessment of the outcome of an impeachment vote in the House depends on what day it is, so volatile is the issue. The Senator who was the alleged source of the story informed me that he had been grossly misquoted and issued an immediate correction to the press.

But it was too late. The original wire story had moved across the country and was featured on at least one of the major network news programs last night.

Mr. Speaker, all of us can agree that it is highly important that the American people receive a consistently fair and accurate account of the historic impeachment investigation. In order for this to happen, the media must exercise extraordinary caution and restraint in reporting to the people the frequently sensational events of the day. Generally

speaking, I think that the press has done a remarkable job. But they are only human and susceptible to fatigue and strain, as we all are.

I hope the press will find the physical and mental reserve needed to report the news accurately, lest the people receive a distorted account of what is happening in this House—as they did yesterday concerning my position.

EVIDENCE FOR IMPEACHMENT— THEN AND NOW

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, this is, indeed, an historic day in the House of Representatives and the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Today we begin the actual deliberations on articles of impeachment of the President of the United States.

It has been a long and deliberate process between the introduction of a resolution of impeachment and the actual debate on the articles.

On October 23, 1973, I and 30 cosponsors introduced such a resolution. That action followed the firing on October 20 of Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox and the forced resignation of Attorney General Elliott Richardson and Deputy Attorney General William Ruckelshaus by President Nixon.

Immediately after the "Saturday Night Massacre"—taken because Mr. Cox refused to cease his efforts to obtain evidence by court action from the White House, I called the President's action an obstruction of justice—especially the President's apparent refusal to comply with Judge Sirica's court order to turn over nine tape recordings of White House conversation. In fact, the President had allowed the deadline set by the court to pass without complying. He did offer a compromise by which he would release not tapes, but transcripts with verification to be made by Senator JOHN STENNIS. This was not acceptable to Mr. Cox and after he made his views known at a news conference he was summarily dismissed by the President and the President ordered the Office of Special Prosecutor abolished.

Mr. Speaker, after the President's action against Mr. Cox, and the ensuing resignations of Attorney General Elliot Richardson and the Deputy Attorney General, William Ruckelshaus, there was an immediate outcry of protest from all over the Nation. The President capitulated and relinquished subpoenaed tapes and agreed to continue the Office of Special Prosecutor.

While this reaction of the President stemmed some of the criticism of the events of October 20, it did not stop entirely the call for an impeachment investigation.

On the day after I introduced the resolution of impeachment I issued a statement indicating that I, and all the co-

sponsors of the resolution would continue to press for impeachment proceedings. In that statement we explained why we believed it was necessary to continue:

The President's belated action (turning over the tapes) while welcome, removes only one of the grounds on which we sought impeachment, and it occurred only after the even graver attempt to obstruct justice by abolishing the office of the Special Prosecutor was carried out.

Mr. Nixon's belated and angry submission on the tapes issue no way alters the fact that as President he has knowingly and willfully undertaken concerted and systematic action to render all branches of our government incapable of resolving charges and allegations of misconduct and criminal behavior.

The full and solemn discharge of the Constitutional responsibilities imposed upon the House in the face of grave evidence and allegations of willful, wrongful, and prolonged attempts to obstruct justice makes a continuation of proceedings for impeachment an inescapable duty.

Mr. Speaker, looking at that statement in retrospect it is interesting and instructive to review the "grave evidence and allegations" referred to in the statement.

Watergate, of course, was the spark. The allegations of White House and possible presidential involvement first were raised by me in a speech on the floor of the House on Monday, June 19, 1972, the first business day after the break-in at the Watergate offices of the Democratic National Committee.

On that date I said the following:

Mr. Speaker, illegal wiretapping, electronic surveillance, and breaking and entering are despicable activities under all circumstances. They are particularly despicable when used as tools in a political campaign.

It is unbelievably despicable when such activities are engaged in by a national political party as a part of a presidential campaign.

The recent incident involving an attempt to plant electronic devices in the Democratic National Committee headquarters, allegedly master-minded by the chief security officer of the Republican National Committee and the Committee to re-elect the President demands on inquiry by the Fair Campaign Practices Committee as well as the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

It may be, as John Mitchell, the former Attorney General and now campaign manager for the re-election of Richard Nixon, states—that James McCord was not authorized to bug the Democratic National Committee headquarters—it may also not be.

Mr. Speaker, I followed that speech with a formal protest that same day to the Fair Campaign Practices Committee charging "representatives of the Republican National Committee and the Committee to Re-Elect the President" with planting illegal electronic listening devices and photographing material in the offices of the Democratic National Committee.

I called this activity clearly outside the Code of Fair Campaign Practice adopted by both major political parties and said that I considered such action to be a "disastrous breach in public confidence in the American political system."

The Fair Campaign Practices Committee forwarded my complaint to the Committee to Re-Elect the President. On July 14, 1972, CRP Counsel Glenn J.

Sedam, Jr., responded saying it would be "inappropriate" to comment on my charges because the matter was in the courts, the Democratic National Committee having filed a civil suit—Democratic National Committee and others against James W. McCord and others.

Mr. Speaker, on July 24, 1972, I challenged Mr. Sedam's view and called for an open investigation to "clear the pall of doubt that hangs over this distasteful affair." I said that—

It would be in the best interest of Republicans and Democrats alike to air this matter in an open investigation in an effort to remove present doubts as to the honesty and integrity of our system of free elections.

On February 7, 1973, the Senate voted 70 to 0 to establish a select committee chaired by Senator SAM ERVIN to investigate Watergate and Presidential campaign practices during the 1972 campaign. Even before the select committee opened hearings, other evidence began to be revealed regarding White House involvement. This included the acknowledgement of L. Patrick Gray that he had shown FBI Watergate files to John Dean, the President's counsel.

The public hearings and the testimony at the Senate select committee hearings and the information developed by the Special Prosecutor Leon Jaworski compiled more and more evidence of White House and Presidential involvement.

Key developments prior to my introduction of a resolution of impeachment included: James McCord's letter of March 19, 1973, in which he revealed political pressure on the Watergate defendants to plead guilty, that perjury had occurred and that allegations about a CIA role and national security involving the Watergate break-in were not true; the resignation on April 30, 1973, of Ehrlichman, Haldeman, Kleindienst, and Dean; the dismissal in Los Angeles of the Ellsberg-Russo trial after it was revealed the Government participated in an illegal wiretap and that Ehrlichman had offered the directorship of the FBI to the presiding judge in the case while the trial was in progress.

The "cap" was really popped from the "bottle" on July 16, 1973, when Alexander Butterfield revealed to the Senate select committee the existence of a recording system in the President's offices at the White House and the Executive Office Building as well as the White House telephones.

Immediately after that disclosure I raised the question about the availability of the White House tape recordings in the event of impeachment proceedings.

On July 25, I issued a statement suggesting a possible impeachment action by the House of Representatives to secure necessary evidence—including the tapes—in the event the White House would not release them to the select committee or the Special Prosecutor.

In the event that the President's assertion of separation of powers or executive privilege are sustained in the courts, or if the litigation becomes inextricably bogged down over jurisdictional questions . . . it will be abundantly clear that the present procedures are not adequate to resolve the fundamental question of Presidential involvement (in

Watergate) . . . if this situation occurs, I believe the House of Representatives should seriously begin steps necessary for the initiation of an impeachment process as a means of acquiring the documents or tapes in dispute.

Other serious matters involving the President came to light before I introduced the Resolution of Impeachment on October 23. Among these were the charges that improvements had been made on the President's properties at San Clemente and Key Biscayne.

In August I requested permission to inspect the President's property at San Clemente to see for myself if charges that some \$700,000 in public funds had been expended for nonsecurity and nonofficial purposes. I was allowed to examine the Federal installation at San Clemente, but denied access to the private grounds. Two days later, however, Congressmen JACK BROOKS and EDWARD ROYBAL were permitted on the grounds. Later Congressman Brooks' Government Operations Subcommittee issued a report that was most critical of the expense of public funds to improve the President's private residences.

By the time of the President's refusal to surrender the tapes and other evidence and the firing of Cox, several other events occurred which strengthened my own view that impeachment proceedings should be initiated.

There were revelations about illegal political intelligence gathering. The ITT role in the selection of the San Diego Republican convention site and the role of the White House in the ITT antitrust cases came to light. There was a report regarding political campaign contributions and the administration's raising of milk price supports.

There were reports of the President being accused of willful evasion of income taxes. In September I urged the President to make public his income tax returns for the years in question. He did this in December.

In the courts, there were more events which strengthened the allegations that the President and the White House were involved in the Watergate break-in and coverup. Seven persons were indicted in conjunction with the break-in—including E. Howard Hunt, Jr., Gordon Liddy, and James W. McCord, all involved with the White House and the Committee To Re-Elect the President.

John W. Dean III, the President's counsel, plead guilty on October 19, 1973, to conspiracy to violate the civil rights of Daniel Ellsberg. White House staff members Ehrlichman, Liddy, Krogh, and Young were indicted on September 4, 1973, with regard to the Ellsberg case. Frederick C. LaRue, former White House aide and assistant to John Mitchell at CRP, plead guilty to obstruction of justice on June 27, 1973. Jeb Magruder plead guilty to obstruction of justice and conspiracy on August 16, 1973. On October 1, 1973, Donald Segretti plead guilty to campaign violations. On October 18, 1973, Egil Krogh plead guilty to two counts of perjury. And, prior to the October 23, 1973 introduction of the resolution of impeachment, three corporations and four corporate executives plead

guilty to illegal campaign contributions to the President's reelection effort. That number has since risen to 17 individuals and 13 corporations. The individuals include Herbert Kalmbach, the President's personal attorney.

The record, Mr. Speaker, is replete with evidence, prior to October 23, 1973, that there was every reason to justify the Judiciary Committee's beginning impeachment proceedings.

After I introduced my resolution on that date, I stated that if the President could produce evidence showing his exculpation—then I would vote against impeachment by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the long Judiciary Committee proceedings which I have been privileged to play a part in have not revealed such exculpatory evidence. Rather, more damning evidence has been brought forward, not the least of that being the edited transcripts of White House conversations.

So, today we begin formal debate on the articles of impeachment of President Richard M. Nixon. Today, as was the case on October 23, 1973, I think the evidence warrants a vote for impeachment.

Today's decision by the Supreme Court upholding a lower court decision that the President should make available other tapes though not unexpected, is, nonetheless, welcome. I do not think it will have great impact on the impeachment proceedings because we already have ample evidence to warrant a vote for impeachment.

It is my view that if evidence on those tapes existed that would exonerate the President, it would have been made available long ago.

Any subsequent evidence will only add weight to a case for impeachment that is already overwhelming. I see no reason at all to delay our proceedings awaiting access to these latter tapes and documents.

HON. WAYNE MORSE

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, a great friend of human rights, peace and self-government for the District of Columbia has died.

Wayne Morse served the State of Oregon and his country with distinction for 24 years in the U.S. Senate. During that tenure, he established a noble reputation for intelligence and independence.

In the 1950's, Senator Morse was a key Republican opponent of Senator Joseph McCarthy's "witch hunts" and a proponent of important civil rights legislation.

As a member of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, he fought for many years for home rule for the District—a struggle I fully supported this year as a member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia.

But perhaps his most unique and in-

delible mark on history was made in 1964 when Wayne Morse—with typical foresight—voted against the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which was later cited as congressional approval of American action in Vietnam.

This vote against the resolution—a stance he shared with only one other Senator—demonstrated his usual independence. Senator Morse continued to oppose the Vietnam war in the Senate and in speeches across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation is grateful for the unique and lasting contributions of Wayne Morse to the causes of peace and social justice.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S THREAT TO VETO CPA IS INSULT TO INFLATION-WEARY AMERICANS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's threat to veto the Consumer Protection Agency legislation which passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming 293 to 94 vote on April 3 and is now pending before the Senate—is an indication of his total alienation from the needs of the American people.

His veto threat is not only an insult to millions of inflation-weary Americans, but it places him in opposition to the advice of his own consumer adviser, Virginia Knauer, and the wishes of a strong bipartisan majority of the Congress. It will prove harmful to the efforts of Mr. Nixon's own political party to throw off its reputation as the party of big business.

Because the establishment of the CPA will have a chilling effect on the sale of Government decisions to the highest corporate bidder, its fate will be as important to our Nation's future well-being as the fate of campaign finance reform legislation.

It is impossible not to conclude that Mr. Nixon's veto threat is directly related to his anti-impeachment strategy. What he is attempting to do is to maintain the loyalty of a big business community angered by high interest rates, a bearish stock market, and a recession-bound economy. He is attempting as well to garner the votes of conservative anti-consumer Senators whose votes he will need during an impeachment trial.

But if these desperation tactics—designed to cover up Mr. Nixon's declining political fortunes and the country's worsening economic situation—are allowed to succeed then the Congress will become an accomplice in the further alienation of the American people from their Government in Washington.

It is my hope and expectation that the Senate, which has been so forthright in approving legislation to reform our political system, will also approve, by a two-third majority if necessary, this equally vital piece of legislation.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the 15th anniversary of Captive Nations Week was observed this year between July 14 and 20. This week provided a national forum for the discussion of détente in all its aspects.

There is, in my opinion, a serious misconception that should be corrected concerning the attitudes of the captive nations groups in this country toward détente. These groups and individuals do not oppose détente, rather they support it.

A letter I have recently received from the chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, Lev. E. Dobriansky, best explains that support. A portion of that letter follows:

We have always been for détente as a process, but for one pursued on grounds of knowledgeability, accurate conceptualization, and trained perception. When, in relation to the USSR—the only real critical threat to our national security—some in our leadership still think of the USSR as a nation-state, ignore the historic messages of Sakharov, Solzhenitsyn and others, and have become party to such Moscow-bred myths as "non-interference in internal affairs," "peaceful coexistence" and others, the urgency for this national forum during the "15th" is greater than ever. The over 2 dozen captive nations, nearly 1/2 in the USSR itself, are an "internal" problem for Moscow. Are they, therefore, of no life-and-death concern to us? By our silence are we prepared to consign them to permanent captivity in the naive hope of thereby securing "peace"?

In addition to the above letter, I would also like to share with my colleagues the 1974 "Captive Nations Week Manifesto" sent me by the Assembly of Captive European Nations. The manifesto briefly describes the history of the week and explains this year's dramatic backdrop.

The manifesto follows:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—MANIFESTO 1974

Dedicated to the restoration of freedom, self-determination and human rights to the captive peoples of East-Central Europe, the Assembly of Captive European Nations calls attention to Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July is annually designated as Captive Nations Week.

This year Captive Nations Week runs from July 14 to 20. It reminds us of the fate of one hundred million East and Central Europeans who are living under Communist rule. To maintain this rule huge Soviet armies were entrenched in the heart of Europe separating the Soviet sphere from the rest of the continent. They interrupted the normal flow of people, information and ideas as practiced amongst free nations, and guaranteed the continued existence of imposed Communist governments unable to survive the test of free elections.

This year's Captive Nations Week will be observed against the background of the 35-nation Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Soviet leadership now feels within reach of a cherished dream of nearly three decades: getting all of Europe and North America to formalize the existing political division of Europe, and to set a seal of approval on the status quo.

The Conference which opened in Helsinki nearly 1 1/2 years ago and then shifted to Geneva, is entering its last stage. According to Soviet proposals it should return to Helsinki to wind up its deliberations and proclaim to the world a unanimous acceptance and recognition of the present status quo in East-Central Europe by 35 nations represented for that purpose by their Chiefs of States.

If the Soviet Union has its way, this meeting should be a ceremony to bury the hopes of the captive nations for the restoration of their freedom and independence from Soviet domination. Only one side—the Soviet Union—is demanding and winning all the concessions. Even after the West agreed to a far-reaching concession of the inviolability of frontiers, it has never asked Russia and her satellites to discuss human and political rights of the nations they hold in their grip behind those frontiers. Among the few problems related to the situation of the captive nations the Western side confronted the Communists with, was the freer exchange of people and ideas. But even in this matter the West met with refusal.

May we recall the words of the distinguished Soviet scientist Andrei Sokharov who warned the Western world that " rapprochement cannot be unconditional, otherwise, it will be just one more capitulation to our anti-democratic regime, an encouragement to its sins, and will have particularly heavy and tragic consequences for the entire world situation".

The ending of the Security Conference, as proposed by the Soviet Union in a bigpageant in Helsinki on a note of the recognition of the present status quo, would have far-reaching repercussions, not only among the people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania, but far beyond the Moscow dominated area of Europe.

While enormously strengthening the position of the Soviet Union, this policy would not strengthen the prospect for durable peace. By giving the Soviets security in the possession of their European conquests it would only make it easier for them to apply their power at other vulnerable points of the globe. Neither would the nations of East-Central, which historically a culturally feel part of the Western civilization, resign themselves to Communist slavery. Their discontent would lead, as in the past to periodic outbursts of unrest which may have a potential of involving the rest of the world.

Captive Nations Week serves as a reminder to the Communist rulers that Americans continue to care about the plight of the captive nations, that they have not been forgotten, and that their hopes and aspirations are shared by millions who have the privilege of living in freedom.

While commemorating this year's Captive Nations Week:

We appeal to the United States Congress to raise their voice in the annual Captive Nations Week debate in defense of the inalienable rights of the captive nations to freedom and independence as equal members of the community of free peoples.

We appeal to the Governors and Mayors in the United States to issue proclamations designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week in their status or cities.

We appeal to religious leaders of all denominations to hold services during Captive Nations Week, and to remember the peoples of East and Central Europe in their sermons.

We appeal to the People of the United States of America to manifest during Captive Nations Week, July 14-20, their awareness of the importance of the fate of 100 million Europeans to mankind's long quest for peace and justice.

STEFAN KORBONSKI,

Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

TAX REFORM OR COMMITTEE REFORM

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish that I were here speaking under different circumstances. Right now, I would rather be addressing my colleagues as part of a debate on tax reform bill. Unfortunately, I am not. I am speaking in a legislative vacuum.

Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee has been meeting on tax reform for almost a year and a half now. I know the committee has had many pressing matters before it, but perhaps if its overfed jurisdiction were cut back or it were divided into subcommittees more expeditious action would be forthcoming. Hopefully the House will approve the Bolling committee reforms to meet this problem. I also know that the tax code is complex—mostly because of all the tax concessions and loopholes for the favored few. But it does seem that some of the more glaring inequities could be remedied and some measure of relief given to the consumer.

Low and moderate income people carry a disproportionate tax burden, while the wealthy and profit-laden industries are provided with numerous opportunities to avoid paying their share. Low and middle income wage earners also are paying the heaviest tolls to inflation because they spend such a large proportion of their budgets on those items that have most risen in price, such as food, fuel and housing. Even in economically stable times we would be obliged to bring greater fairness and equity into the tax system. Confronted with the crippled buying power and declining standards of living accompanying inflation, we cannot turn our backs on tax reform.

The panel of leading economists convened by the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee has called for a balanced program of tax revision including both tax relief and tax reform. I am delighted the Policy Committee's entire set of proposals for combating inflation has been adopted by the full Democratic caucus earlier today.

The panel suggests tax relief in the form of reduced payroll taxes and/or an increase in the standard deduction or an alternative income tax credit. I and many other Members already have submitted legislation in this area to the Ways and Means Committee. My bill to increase the personal exemption to more realistically reflect the increased cost of living has 30 sponsors. Congressman JAMES BURKE's bill to revise and make more progressive the payroll tax structure, which I have also cosponsored, has the endorsement of over 130 Members. Despite this broad support the Ways and Means Committee is not even considering the proposal in its current work on an all-encompassing tax reform bill.

This tax relief, especially the payroll tax reduction which would show up immediately in the checks of millions of wage earners, is not only simple equity;

it would also diminish labor's demand for catchup wage increases. If accompanied, as it must be, by solid loophole-closing reforms and cuts in spending, these tax cuts favoring persons of modest means would moderate, not intensify inflation and would provide needed economic stimulus as we fall into what is now a full-scale recession.

**WILLA BENGE WINS EMMY FOR
"BLACK ON BLACK"**

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I take this opportunity to applaud the recent selection of Willa Benge for an Emmy award for her outstanding program, "Black on Black." The award was given for best achievement in community service programming by the Cleveland chapter of the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences.

A charming and aggressive hostess, Ms. Benge has brought tremendous notoriety and success to television station's WEW's "Black on Black." The show focuses on black political life in Cleveland, and includes discussions with prominent national and international figures as well.

Ms. Benge is beginning her sixth year as moderator of the program, and she is one of the city's most talented and dynamic media personalities. Her candid, "to-the-point" style has earned her national recognition as one of the industry's most highly rated, successful interviewers, and has won the entertaining and informative "Black on Black" a wide and approving audience.

I wish to take this occasion to direct the attention of my colleagues to an insightful article about Ms. Benge that appeared in a recent edition of the Cleveland Journal which provides a glimpse of her provocative personality, and briefly details her contributions to and achievements in the field of broadcasting:

[From the Cleveland Journal, July 2, 1974]

"THE PEOPLE IN THIS CITY MADE THE PROGRAM
WHAT IT WAS"—WILLA BENGE

The event is the Fifth Annual Emmy Awards Banquet of the Cleveland Chapter of the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, Friday, June 21, 1974, at the Grand Ballroom of the Sheraton-Cleveland Hotel.

Billed as Cleveland tv's "Night of Nights", and hosted by talk-show host Phil Donahue, Emmy nominees are being awarded for Achievement Telecast within the calendar year 1973.

Nominated for an Emmy in the second largest category, Community Service Programming, are "Christmas at Hale", Richard Pitsche and Leigh Wilson, Cinematographers; "Risko", Kent Geist and Ralph DiGuglielmo, producers; "When Generations Meet", Effie Hall, Producer; "Scene on Sunday", John Owen, Producer; "Flop Mop", Lou Gatozzi, Producer; "Vincent", David Cromwell, Producer-director; "Downtown Cleveland Lives", Bill Jacobs, Producer; and "Black", Willa Benge, Producer—The envelope please—

"It was the first time in my life that I was speechless! I had said earlier that just because 'Black on Black' was nominated, it was no guarantee of winning an Emmy," Willa Benge explained. We were thumbing through early photos of guests that had appeared on "Black on Black" over the past five years.

"When we celebrated 'Black on Black's' fifth anniversary earlier this year, many people came back to Cleveland for the occasion.

James Farmer, the founder of the Congress On Racial Equality, Ruth Turner, who inspired people to lay down under tractors to die for all of this, Roy Innis, who was the first guest to appear on BOB, cancelled a trip to Africa to attend the anniversary."

In the beginning—

In 1968 there was a conference held at CWRU. Personalities from the media, station general managers, and leaders of the white and Black communities attended.

At that meeting, Willa Benge, who was working at CORE, met Don Perris, President of Scripps-Howard Broadcasting.

She told Perris that she had an idea for a tv show. His response was "Fine, let's talk about it." Willa's main reason for the creation of "Black on Black" was the fact that "there were no Blacks in tv actually enunciating the prime concerns of the Black community."

"It is a known fact that Black folks can sing and dance and throw footballs and play basketball. But, if in fact, there was going to be any real progress in Cleveland, the total community needed to understand the concerns and needs of Blacks in this city."

"We have to address ourselves to the fact there is still a very large number of people in Cleveland who are illiterate, and their only source of reference is television. They don't read newspapers, they don't read books."

The first show was on Black Nationalism. A panel of Blacks in media, some well known and other just coming into prominence then, were selected: Geraldine Williams, Gerard Anderson, Charles Loeb and Louis G. Robinson. Roy Innis was the first guest."

"A few of us 'old COREites' were together the night before the 5th anniversary. As we talked we realized that if anyone were to take the time to check the old records they would see that most of the prominent people across the country, the prime movers in this country, were involved in the Civil Rights movement at one time or another."

"But what's unfortunate today is that there is no movement for our young to address themselves to now. And you can't play 1968 Civil Rights games in 1974. We've learned as a result of what happened out in LA with DeFreeze and what happened here in East Cleveland, that anybody who is foolish enough to start throwing molotov cocktails will pay the price."

In looking back over these past five years, I have found that you can be different and survive. You don't have to deal with pacification-type situations as far as Black people are concerned. You can deal with the hard-core truth and get over. That's what this Emmy has meant to me.

It's meaningful for me to know that my peer group, in the media, the Establishment, recognizes the fact that we have accomplished a lot. At the same time, I realize that this Emmy belongs to the Black community, who made "Black on Black."

What do we have to do to make Blacks in all fields of endeavor realize what they owe to the Black community?

Someone said to me that I was limiting myself on the program by addressing only Black problems. I said that I could drop Black and deal with things relating only to the poor and the majority of Black people fall into that category.

Willa, who is a Community Relations Consultant for the Gulf Oil Corporation and

works in Foster Home Recruitment for Social Services of the Cuyahoga County Welfare Dept., has definitely received a fitting reward for five years of service to the community.

**JAYCEES SELECT BILL MELTON AS
OUTSTANDING YOUNG TEXAN**

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, I received a piece of real good news today, and good news is hard to find these days.

Bill Melton, president of the Oak Cliff Chamber of Commerce, has been selected as one of the five outstanding young men in Texas by the Texas Jaycees.

I know Bill Melton well, and a lot of you probably know him, if not by name, by voice. Bill was the network announcer for the halftime show at Super Bowl VI.

Before I go into Bill's personal achievements, I would like to tell you a little about Oak Cliff, a strong community which it is my privilege to represent.

Oak Cliff, originally an incorporated city all its own, is now a part of the city of Dallas. The people of Oak Cliff, however, still consider this area to be a separate entity, with its own community pride and problems. And the pride has set about solving the problems within the community.

One of the results of this outstanding sense of community and community spirit has been an outstanding chamber of commerce. A vital organization such as this brings forth people like Bill Melton.

I am about to tell you about some of the things Bill Melton has done to richly deserve this honor, but before I do, I ought to reassure you that, in addition to his community service, Bill does hold a paying job, where he is also outstanding. He is executive director of the Commissioners Court of Dallas County.

In his spare time, Bill has found a number of community projects where he has proved to be a real achiever.

He has been chairman of the city of Dallas Radio Commission, which operates a first-rate AM radio station, WRR. He has been chairman of the Oak Cliff YMCA Board of Management. He is a member of the board of the Dallas County March of Dimes and the Creative Arts Center of Dallas. He is second vice president of the Oak Cliff Lions Club. He is a member and Sunday school teacher at the Glen Oaks United Methodist Church, and serves as a member of the board of the North Central Texas Board of Church Extension for the United Methodist Church.

Bill is also a member of the Greater Dallas Planning Council, and many Dallas civic organizations.

In addition to his network television debut, which I mentioned earlier, Bill is heading into his 7th year as the public address system announcer for the Dallas Cowboys. He also performs this function

for many other area sports teams not quite so well known as the Cowboys.

Bill's achievements have not gone unnoticed. In 1972 he was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal by the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., and he was "Member of the Year" of the Oak Cliff Chamber for 1971-72.

Today's honor is not the first Bill has received from the Jaycees, either. He received the Distinguished Service Award from the Oak Cliff Jaycees in 1972 and from the Dallas Jaycees in 1973. I might add, as an aside, that public service runs in the Melton family. Bill's father, Allen, received the Distinguished Service Award from the Dallas Jaycees some several years ago—he would not tell me exactly how many.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of Bill, proud of Oak Cliff, and proud of the fine job of leadership the chamber of commerce is performing in that community. I hope our colleagues share that pride with me.

**FEDERAL COCHAIRMAN OF APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION,
DONALD W. WHITEHEAD, EN-
DORSES LEGISLATION TO SAVE
THE NEW RIVER**

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter from Mr. Donald W. Whitehead, the Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission, endorsing legislation I have introduced which would study the New River in North Carolina and Virginia for possible inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The Appalachian Regional Commission has established itself as an influential body within North Carolina and the other States that it operates. Therefore, it is significant that its Cochairman would feel strongly enough to express his concern on the fact that the New River should be saved. For the benefit of my colleagues I would like to insert the text of Mr. Whitehead's letter in the RECORD:

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1974.

Hon. WILMER D. MIZELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MIZELL: This is in reply to your July 17, 1974, request for my comments on the bill (S. 2439/H.R. 11120) which would include the New River in North Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia as one of the rivers to be studied for possible inclusion in the list of protected wild and scenic rivers.

As you know, we have twice in the past commented adversely during our consideration of the environmental impact statement on the Blue Ridge project of the Appalachian Power Company which is proposed for this river. I believe that a full study, within a limit of two years, of this river is justified, and therefore I join Secretary of Interior Morton in his comments contained in his April 4, 1974, letter to Senator Helms and EPA Administrator Train in his comments to you of July 15, 1974, wherein they both recommend passage of this legislation.

Because of the time constraints involved,

it was not possible to obtain the position of the Commission as a whole, and therefore these comments reflect my views only.

Sincerely,

DONALD W. WHITEHEAD,
Federal Cochairman.

A PROGRAM FOR THE UNITED STATES

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of the House an excellent editorial in the Santa Barbara News-Press.

The editorial follows:

[From the Santa Barbara News-Press,
July 18, 1974]

A PROGRAM FOR THE UNITED STATES

Preamble of the Constitution.—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.

The nation is awakening to a bitter fact; that we have been entertaining a thief in our midst—inflation.

He came in with the distress of the great depression of the 1930s. This country, imbued with the delusion that it had proved itself invincible in the first World War, settled down to supply a war-deprived people with the goods they craved.

The economy went through the roof and disaster fell upon us like a thunderbolt. Our house of cards collapsed around us. Our faith in the old-fashioned virtues was shaken as never before.

Having won the war—or so we thought—we set out to win the peace. New economic philosophies sprang into the language—full employment will create its own successes—let the government provide the remedies that hard work and enterprise had fashioned before. Thus we repealed the law of supply and demand.

We haven't balanced our national accounts since. It takes a king's ransom to pay the interest alone on the public debt. We are surviving on borrowed money.

And where does the borrowed money come from? It is supplied by the exhausted resources of the earth which we have appropriated to our use without restoring the damage as we go along.

Thus we delude ourselves!

Is it any wonder that we have a government that deludes itself—and tells us everything but the naked truth?

Which is that each morning an hour's work will buy less—not more; that each day we are using more of the world's goods without paying for them by building a sound economy.

Is it not time that we get back to the fact that we cannot repeal the law of supply and demand? And that common sense tells us that a nation rich in resources and rich in human skills should bow its head in shame to pay its bills and to pay its workers with debased currency?

Let us make a new beginning.

Let us tell our Congress that We, the People, are sick and tired of an annual accounting that is not balanced—of a legislature that spends more money than it takes in, and thus adds constantly to the public debt.

That We, the People, are tired of sending

to Congress those who haven't the guts to stand up and demand of the executive branch that they tell the truth to the Congress and to the American people.

That We, the People, are sick and tired of those in the House and Senate who take a pledge before God and the people to defend the Constitution and have not the honesty to give the public the simplest unpleasant facts so that the most innocent information has to be "leaked" instead of being presented to the public straightforwardly and correctly in an official manner.

That We, the People, do not believe that a self-governing nation can survive with its liberties intact—let alone, be great—if it does not practice the simple virtues and know the difference between "right" and "wrong." It must set an example to our youth that will enable them to grow up strong and proud that they are citizens of a country that abhors decent and distrust, that reveres integrity, forthright courage and wholesome simplicity. These are the qualities that make it possible for a self-governing people to work together in trust and confidence.

**TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE
D. THOMAS IORIO**

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to note that the Italian Government is in agreement with me about one very important matter—appreciation of the helpfulness, kindness, and loyalty of the Honorable D. Thomas Iorio, the Deputy Sergeant at Arms and Majority Pair Clerk here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Recently, at the Italian Embassy here in Washington, our friend the Ambassador of Italy to the United States, His Excellency Egidio Ortona, showed his government's appreciation for Tom Iorio's numerous contributions over the years toward furthering the friendship and cooperation that exists between the people of the United States and the people of Italy by presenting Tom with the title Commendatore Stella della Solidarieta Italiana, the Order of the Star of Solidarity of Italy.

Tom Iorio is a living example of the millions of Americans of Italian birth and descent who have assisted this country to achieve its greatness and who continue to make that greatness grow. His helpfulness and trustworthy loyal service to the House of Representatives itself as well as to individual Members who have made up this august legislative body over a quarter of a century have been of invaluable assistance to all of us.

It has been my privilege to call Tom Iorio my close friend for over 35 years. His willingness to help at all times shall always be remembered and appreciated by me. I want to extend the congratulations of all the Rooney family to Tom on receiving this much deserved decoration. I know that his lovely wife Clara and his family are justifiably proud of him. I hope that this House of Representatives will continue to have the benefit of Tom Iorio's assistance and loyalty for many years to come.

FREEDOM CENTER PICKS "HOME NEWS" PUBLISHER

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the unheralded legislative achievements of the historic 89th Congress was the Freedom of Information Act, which I cosponsored. Because of that law, the citizens of this country are able to have access to more information about the policies and programs of the Federal Government.

Recently, Hugh N. Boyd, president and publisher of the "Home News" of New Brunswick, N.J., was named chairman of the 28-member advisory council to the Freedom of Information Center in Columbia, Mo.

The advisory council includes outstanding media leaders throughout the Nation, all of them concerned with freedom of information, so I am especially proud that Hugh Boyd was named chairman. He is an exceptionally capable, respected, and dedicated newspaper executive and I know that under his effective leadership, significant progress will be made by the council.

The article covering his appointment follows:

[From the Home News, July 16, 1974]

FREEDOM CENTER PICKS PUBLISHER OF HOME NEWS

Hugh N. Boyd, president and publisher of The Home News, has been named chairman of the 28-member advisory council to the Freedom of Information Center in Columbia, Mo.

The center, funded by subscriptions and contributions, is an international clearing house for materials and reports on the free flow of information.

Since its inception in 1958, the center has issued over 300 special reports. It answers more than 2,000 queries annually from editors and other media leaders from many nations. Boyd was one of the center's founders.

"The advisory council will give advice concerning the mission of the Freedom of Information Center, suggest topics for research projects and assist in formulating the center's guidelines and goals," explained Dwight E. Sargent, president of the center.

The advisory council members, which Sargent called "a good cross section of people concerned with the freedom of information" includes leaders from the newspaper, magazine and broadcasting industries, and representatives from academia and the library profession.

The council appointments were announced by Sargent, on behalf of the center's board of trustees. Sargent said he hoped groups of council members would gather several times each year.

The other members of the advisory council are:

Robert B. Atwood, president and publisher, The Anchorage Times, Alaska; Roderick W. Beaton, president, United Press International, New York; Barry Bingham Sr., chairman, The Courier-Journal Times Louisville, Ky.; Robert U. Brown, president and publisher, Editor & Publisher, New York; Erwin D. Canham, editor-in-chief, Christian Science Monitor, Boston; George Chaplin, vice president and editor, The Advertiser, Honolulu, and Helen K. Copley, chairman, Copley Newspapers La Jolla, Calif.

Verne E. Edwards Jr., Journalism Depart-

ment, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio; Robert H. Estabrook, publisher, The Lakeville Journal, Conn.; James Hester, president, New York University; Larry H. Israel, president, Washington Post Co.; John H. Johnson, president, Johnson Publishing Co., New York, and Stuart Keate, publisher, The Vancouver Sun, British Columbia.

Robert E. Lee, chief of libraries, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.; Hobart Lewis, chairman and editor-in-chief, Reader's Digest, Pleasantville, N.Y.; Merrill Lindsay, president, Illinois Broadcasting Co., Decatur, Ill.; Elmer Lower, president ABC News Division, New York; Donald H. McGannon, president, Westinghouse Broadcasting Corp., New York; and Harold Niven, vice president, National Association of Broadcasters, Wash. and Vermont Royster, contributing editor, Wall Street Journal, New York.

Richard S. Salant, president, CBS News Division, New York; Theodore A. Serrill, executive vice president, National Newspaper Assn., Washington; Robert W. Smith, publisher, Minneapolis Star and Tribune, Minn.; Roger Tatarian, journalism department, Fresno State College, Calif.; Martin Umansky, president and general manager, KAKE-TV, Wichita, Kansas; Richard Wald, president, NBC News Division New York, and Robert M. White II, editor and publisher, Mexico Evening Ledger, Mexico, Mo.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET DEALS
SERVE SOVIET INTERESTS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the question of U.S. trade with the Soviet Union is vitally important to the national security of the United States. The Soviet Union needs Western technology to develop industrially and militarily. I say industrially and militarily because the development of sophisticated modern weaponry requires a technologically developed industrial base.

Some proponents of expanding United States-Soviet trade have argued that such trade financed by American taxpayer subsidized credits will increase Soviet dependence on the United States. I have suggested that the opposite is the case—the United States would be dependent on the Soviets for raw materials and finished products under some of the deals being negotiated. Also, the Soviets owing the United States large sums of money will result in further American dependence on the Soviets if this country wants to be repaid.

Zbigniew Brezezinski, an authority on Soviet affairs, seems to be of the same opinion. He has recently stated:

One can certainly conceive of a Soviet leadership being tempted to use both its indebtedness to the United States and American dependence on Soviet raw materials for political ends.

The case can be made that the Soviets have already done this on some past debts to the United States by their tying payment of those debts to the United States granting the Soviet Union most-favored status.

American national security is not enhanced by American dependence on the Soviet Union.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF RAILROAD
TRACKS GAINS SUPPORT

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in his "In The Nation" column in the July 21, 1974, New York Times, Tom Wicker endorses Congressman ASPIN's proposed legislation to establish an interstate railroad system, designed to restore and improve the condition of present railroad roadbeds and trackage.

I have cosponsored Congressman ASPIN's IRC legislation, because it seems to me that our need for such an agency is critical in light of the increasing number of train accidents due to decaying track conditions, and the threatened abandonment of rail service in many rural areas.

I insert Mr. Wicker's column in the RECORD at this time, and urge my colleagues to seriously weigh the merits of Congressman ASPIN's Interstate Rail Corporation legislation.

The text follows:

MAKING TRACKS

(By Tom Wicker)

The French Line has made one of the more melancholy announcements of the summer—that its great passenger liner, the France, will be withdrawn from service after Oct. 25. A veteran of several trans-Atlantic crossings in the France can hardly help wondering why something couldn't be done to preserve the leisurely and civilized means of travel. Must everything be sacrificed to speed and efficiency?

Something is being done, for example, to preserve, perhaps even restore, rail travel in America. Only a few years ago, it seemed as moribund as the France; now, while many problems remain, the vital signs are strong.

Most recently, Amtrak and several states have announced the restoration of some useful routes in the continental rail system, with several others about to be put into service. This is the result of Federal legislation providing that Amtrak must make passenger service available when states demanding it agree to assume two-thirds of any operational losses. Federal funds make up the deficit.

This ought not to be dismissed as a "subsidized" service. In the first place, if the service can be improved enough, there need be no great operating losses; but even if there are such losses, it makes sense that government should help finance a useful and desirable public service, rather than requiring that it necessarily pay for itself or make a profit. The Government does not require that Federal highways make a profit, and it pours huge sums into airport construction and other support to the airlines.

The state-Federal underwriting of operational losses has led to restoration, beginning this fall, of direct New York-Detroit service, via Albany, Buffalo, Niagara Falls and a run through Ontario. New York State also is arranging to underwrite renewed service between New York City and Montreal on the Hudson Valley route (service through Vermont has been restored), and from New York to Binghamton.

Michigan is getting ready to finance a link in a Chicago-Toronto service, Florida is proposing a turbo-train to run along the Gold Coast, and other states have various additional routes under consideration. Thus,

many of the gaping holes in the original Amtrak route system may soon be filled and something like a national service provided.

But if that could be swiftly achieved and modern, new equipment provided, Amtrak passengers would still be facing a major obstacle to really good service—as any rider on the lucrative New York-Washington line could testify. On that route, even the comforts of the Metroliners, Amtrak's premier trains, cannot conceal the fact that much of the roadbed is obsolete.

From New York to Boston, the turbo-train does its best, but the roadbed is too elderly and meandering to permit a really competitive schedule. Much of the trackage over which Amtrak's trains must run is literally dangerous; most of it is old and rough, at best; many routes have duplicating tracks; and many are not as direct as they would be if they had been built to serve contemporary needs.

The fact is that no major intercity rail line has been built in America since the nineteen-twenties. As the railroads have declined, moreover, they have not kept the existing trackage in the best condition. This is a limitation on Amtrak service that Amtrak alone cannot meet; and most of the freight carriers can't either.

Representative Les Aspin of Wisconsin has proposed a means of dealing with the roadbed-track problem that seems well worth consideration. His legislation would set up an Interstate Railroad Corporation that would take over, rehabilitate and maintain the national railroad track system—but not the railroads themselves. Private carriers and Amtrak would continue to operate the trains.

Existing railroad companies could turn their trackage over to the new corporation, or continue to own and maintain it themselves. The trackage turned over to the new system would be "rehabilitated" with the proceeds of a one per cent tax on all surface freight shipments for a six-year period. Long-term maintenance would be provided by a charge of \$1 per 1,000 gross ton-miles levied on freight and passenger carriers. Mr. Aspin thinks such a maintenance charge would be less than most carriers now pay for equivalent costs. Carriers retaining their own trackage would have to meet the standards set by the Interstate Railroad Corporation.

There may be other ideas, but Mr. Aspin has grasped an essential point—that Metroliners and Turbo-trains need a decent roadbed if they are to deliver their full potential to the growing numbers of railroad passengers.

TRIBUTE TO WAYNE MORSE

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1974

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, this week the Nation mourns the passing of one of its great sons and one of the most brilliant and distinguished men ever to serve in the other body—Wayne Lyman Morse of Oregon.

I feel the personal loss sharply, for over the years I came to know Wayne Morse well as our committee assignments in our respective Houses of Congress brought us into frequent contact.

I know of no man who loved his country more, or who tried harder to serve the people.

Wayne Morse's final illness came swiftly, and struck him down in the

midst of a campaign. He could have wanted no greater accommodation, for he was a man of action and movement. Long lingering illness or long lingering inactivity was no role for him, and I am glad he was spared it.

Courage is the word one thinks of immediately when one thinks of Wayne Morse. He had it in abundant measure, and he exhibited it many times during his long public career. He was not afraid to stand alone for what he believed to be right, and in many instances, his lonely stands have been vindicated by time.

The country will miss Wayne Morse; and his passing leaves those of us who admired him and served with him, with realization of our loss.

VIETNAM FORUM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, an event took place recently on Capitol Hill which I think is of considerable importance. A forum to discuss the situation in Vietnam was cosponsored by the Young Republican National Federation, Young Americans for Freedom, and the American Conservative Union. Instead of being a closed and elaborately orchestrated propaganda device, such as we have lately seen organized by opponents of the Republic of Vietnam, this forum sought to promote free discussion by opening its doors to interested parties.

From the discussion emerged details of the double standard used in judging South Vietnam, and how perfection was demanded of the South, whereas repression and brutality by the North were either tolerated or conveniently ignored. The falsity of the charge that the Vietnamese Government detains 200,000 political prisoners was shown by figures which established the total capacity of the prisons at only a small fraction of that number.

The story of continued North Vietnamese aggression and cease-fire violations was well brought out during the course of the discussion, especially their illegal infiltration of massive quantities of arms, ammunition, and men into the South.

I was pleased to participate in a forum which showed that supporters of the Republic of Vietnam are still prepared to speak out about the true situation in that country. I would like to share with my colleagues a report of the forum by James Roberts, political director of the American Conservative Union, as it appeared in the June 29, 1974, issue of Human Events:

CONSERVATIVES RESPOND TO HAYDEN-FONDA
VIET FORUM

(By James Roberts)

With the signing of the Vietnam cease-fire agreement on Jan. 27, 1973, America's longest—and perhaps most difficult—war came to an end.

Though in disagreement with the restricted

way in which the United States fought the war, most American conservatives agree that, in retrospect, the U.S. commitment there was necessary. And, despite the enormous cost in lives and treasure, most feel that the price was justified by the end result—namely, the stabilization of the strategic situation in Southeast Asia, the fulfillment of our military commitment to South Vietnam, the preservation of American credibility, the prevention of a Communist takeover in South Vietnam and the establishment of a viable government in Saigon capable of governing the country effectively and possessing the resolve and ability to defend itself against continued aggression from the North.

Ironically, but expectedly, leftists in Congress and the media have sought to undermine the considerable success achieved in Vietnam. Having relentlessly opposed the American military effort there on the grounds that the South Vietnamese should be willing to defend themselves, they are now out to make that self-defense impossible by terminating U.S. aid.

Led by such senators as Ted Kennedy (D.-Mass.), Frank Church (D.-Idaho), William Fulbright (D.-Ark.), and Charles Mathias (R.-Md.) and Congressmen like Ron Dellums (D.-Calif.), Pete McCloskey (R.-Calif.) and Bella Abzug (D.-N.Y.), liberals in Congress have sought repeatedly to drastically cut or eliminate altogether the military aid that Saigon desperately needs to counter the massive infusions of Soviet and Communist Chinese aid that the North Vietnamese are sending southward in violation of the Paris accords.

They have been aided in this drive by the liberal media and by radicals such as Jane Fonda and Tom Hayden—the dynamic duo who held the well-publicized propaganda "seminars" on Capitol Hill some months ago in an attempt to force the end of all support of the Thieu government.

In an effort to present the case for continued aid to South Vietnam, correct distorted reporting of the situation there and counter radical propaganda, the Young Republican National Federation, Young Americans for Freedom and the American Conservative Union co-sponsored a forum in Washington recently to discuss the situation in Vietnam. The meeting was held on Capitol Hill and was well attended by congressional staff members and members of the press.

The panelists included Elbridge Durbrow, former U.S. ambassador to South Vietnam (1959-1961); Frank Sleverts, special adviser to the assistant secretary of state on POW affairs; Reed Irvine, chairman of Accuracy in Media; Navy Capt. Ed Martin, a POW for six years in North Vietnam; Ed Feulner, executive director of the House Republican Steering Committee, and Representatives Phil Crane (R.-Ill.), and G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery (D.-Miss.). Moderator was Dick Smith, president of the Young Republican National Federation.

At the outset Smith stated the theme of the forum: in view of the \$150-billion investment in South Vietnam, the current U.S. aid level is quite modest indeed (the Administration had asked for \$1.6 billion for fiscal year 1975). Having enabled the South Vietnamese to defend themselves, it would be immoral to deprive them of the weapons they need for the task.

Speaking of the 50,000 U.S. dead and the hundreds of thousands of wounded, Smith said, "It would be a shameful slap in the face to the memory of these men and to their families for us to abdicate our responsibilities now. It's just not the American heritage to abandon a struggle, especially when the goal is in sight, or to desert a friend in need."

Ambassador Durbrow noted in his remarks that a double standard is used in judging

South Vietnam—that the Thieu government is expected to meet standards of perfection, while the brutality and barbarism of the Hanoi regime is explained away or ignored.

Durbrow went on to refute a number of leftist charges about South Vietnam, among them the contention that there are 200,000 political prisoners in the South. Durbrow stated that a thorough study by the U.S. Embassy in Saigon revealed that the maximum capacity of all prisons in South Vietnam is about 35,000. Indeed, even Sen. James Abourezk (D-S.D.), who originally bruted about the 200,000 figure, has backed off from his original charge.

Durbrow also deflated the charge that Thieu is the ruthless dictator of a repressive police state, pointing out that Thieu has vocal opposition in the Assembly and that a vigorous opposition press exists.

"If Thieu is a dictator he's pretty naive," Durbrow said. "I can't understand why any dictator would be so stupid as to arm the peasants."

He pointed out that Thieu has distributed arms to more than 500,000 peasants—and that these guns could have been used against the government if it were intolerably repressive.

As for the police state allegation, the ambassador responded that there are 120,000 police in South Vietnam and that this is not an unduly large number considering that the country is still at war and that the Vietcong continue to perpetrate terrorism on a massive scale.

Accuracy in Media Director Reed Irvine added that one of the reasons for the existence of the double standard is biased media coverage of Vietnam.

"A good example is the Hué massacre during the Tet offensive," he said. "This was one of the greatest atrocities of the post-World War II era. More than 5,000 civilians were murdered in Hué, many of them by being buried alive in mass graves. Yet the New York Times ran only two stories on it. Contrast this to the coverage of the My Lai massacre in which about 109 civilians were shot in a combat situation. The New York Times subject index for a six-week period shows three and one half pages of titles on My Lai."

Ed Feulner, executive director of the House Republican Steering Committee, had recently returned from a trip to South Vietnam and he focused his remarks on North Vietnamese violations of the cease-fire agreement.

He said that, in direct violation of the accord, the North Vietnamese had:

- Committed approximately 60,000 military violations and 7,000 acts of terrorism, killing 2,000 civilians, wounding 6,000 more and imprisoning 2,000 others.

- Infiltrated 60,000 troops into South Vietnam;

- Expanded oil pipelines in Communist-controlled areas;

- Infiltrated 600 tanks, 1,000 artillery pieces, constructed numerous missile sites and built or expanded 12 airfields;

- Failed to specify the point of entry for their one-for-one troop replacements;

- Refused to cooperate with the International Control Commission in the search for MIAs (Missing in Action).

- Shot at helicopters searching for MIAs, despite the fact that they were clearly marked and flying on predetermined routes on pre-arranged days.

- Organized their released POWs into three infantry units based in South Vietnam.

There was so much war materiel coming into South Vietnam, Feulner said, that "the Ho Chi Minh Trail looked like Shirley Highway [a major Washington area thoroughfare] at 5:00 in the afternoon."

Frank Sieverts of the State Department pointed out that between 1965 and 1973 the

Red Cross had conducted 475 inspections of POW camps in South Vietnam, adding that the North Vietnamese allowed no such inspections during the same period.

Sieverts said that after signing the Paris treaty Hanoi even tried to renege on its pledge to release all American POWs and conspicuously failed to respond to requests for information on MIAs. He said that in contrast the South Vietnamese had responded promptly to the 100 requests made by North Vietnam.

Sieverts emphasized that we have free access to South Vietnam and are therefore able to judge it against American standards. No such access exists to North Vietnam, which means that the North Vietnamese are exempt from any standards of comparison.

While anxious to make the case for continued aid to South Vietnam, the three sponsoring organizations sought to promote free discussion of the subject. Repelled by the closed and carefully stage-managed propaganda marathons held by Jane Fonda and Tom Hayden on Capitol Hill, the forum organizers opted for a meeting open to staff members in all congressional offices.

Not surprisingly, liberals and leftists were out in force. Their comments dealt almost exclusively with the alleged brutality of the South Vietnamese prison system.

For instance, Jean Pierre Debris, a French citizen released from prison by the Saigon government in 1972, stated that "hundreds of my friends didn't walk out and can't walk anymore because their legs were shackled so long."

Capt. Martin replied that Americans were able to walk upon release only because they had been relatively well-treated in the final weeks. He also told of seeing women and children as young as five shackled and held in cramped North Vietnamese prisons.

Rep. Crane addressed his remarks specifically to the so-called "tiger cages" on Con Son Island which he personally visited and investigated. While the prisons were hardly comfortable, Crane said that they were no worse—and in some respects were better—than similar prisons he had seen in South Vietnam and in many other countries, including the United States. The cells measured 10½ feet in depth, 10 feet in height and four to five feet in width, and accommodated a maximum of four, Crane said. In contrast to this, Capt. Martin said prison cells in North Vietnam measured 78 inches by 53 inches, each of them holding five men.

Toward the end of the session radical leader Don Luce contended that U.S. military aid to South Vietnam was vastly greater than Soviet and Communist Chinese aid to North Vietnam.

Mr. Sieverts replied, "The figure being used for Soviet and Chinese aid to North Vietnam is \$290 million [per year.] That of course is hardware, most of which is going South for fighting purposes. I think the first thing on which we should agree is that the United States is providing zero aid for the purpose of attacking North Vietnam. Our aid to South Vietnam is being used in South Vietnam to defend South Vietnam."

The Thieu-haters, of course, want that aid terminated so that their prophecy that the Thieu government will inevitably fall would be self-fulfilled. Similar predictions had been made before, of course, as Rep. Montgomery pointed out.

"During the early '70s it was suggested that if 200,000 American troops were pulled out it would be another Dunkirk for the remaining troops," he said. Many people felt that the South Vietnamese couldn't hold. Well, they held and they're still holding."

Their ability to continue holding, of course, is linked directly to the aid they receive from the United States. It's all very simple: if the Crane-Montgomery side wins over the Dellums-Fonda side, South Vietnam will win as well.

BROADCASTING THE IMPEACHMENT DEBATES

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the impeachment clause in our Constitution is the American people's primary check over the power of the Presidency. As such, the utilization of the impeachment machinery should be for the people.

In this light, I support full broadcast coverage of all the impeachment proceedings. A Washington Post editorial of July 19, entitled "Broadcasting the Impeachment Debates," effectively outlines the reasons for full impeachment coverage. It is now submitted for the thoughtful attention of my colleagues:

BROADCASTING THE IMPEACHMENT DEBATES

By approving Rep. Wayne Owens' resolution to permit broadcast coverage of open committee meetings in the House, the House Rules Committee has taken the first important step toward letting the entire nation witness first-hand the momentous impeachment debates which begin next week. The full House must still approve the Owens measure, and then the Judiciary Committee itself must agree to let the cameras in. But both hurdles can be cleared easily if enough members recognize the utility of providing direct, complete nationwide coverage of these historic events.

The key question is how much the nation should be able to learn about congressional deliberations on the impeachment of the President—the committee's actions, the House floor debates and, if the House votes for impeachment, the Senate trial. If tradition prevails and broadcasting is barred, the only direct observers of these proceedings would be the few members of the press and public who can squeeze into the chambers. The rest of the nation would be blacked out. Fortunately, more and more legislators are coming to realize how unwise such restrictions on communications would be. In addition to the Rules Committee's 10-3 vote, Rep. Sidney R. Yates (D-Ill.) now has at least 87 cosponsors of his resolution to authorize live broadcasting of the House impeachment debates. So far, however, Speaker Carl Albert and Majority Leader Thomas P. O'Neill have failed to exercise any leadership toward enlarging public understanding of the actions of the House.

There is still some congressional uneasiness about the possible effects of full coverage. Some feel, for instance, that the presence of the cameras is inherently disruptive, but this is not necessarily the case. The major networks, including public broadcasting, have pledged that, if permitted to cover the sessions, they will do so in decorous and unobtrusive ways. This would probably mean continuous coverage without any arbitrary interruptions, using relatively soft lights and fixed cameras. There need not be any reporters cluttering the chamber, any panning of the audience, or any of the other techniques which could create an unseemly convention like atmosphere.

The next question is whether, no matter how well the broadcasters behave, the fact of being televised would alter the legislators' demeanor. Some suspect that, with the cameras on, some representatives might be tempted to grandstand, to engage in histrionics, or otherwise trifle with the solemn undertakings. That danger always exists. But continuous broadcasting could well be a steadying, restraining force, since all mem-

bers would know that their constituents are watching how they carry out the most important duty of their political careers.

Another problem of possible distortion has been raised, especially by Republicans such as Rep. Delbert Latta (D-Ohio) who worry that the networks might not be "fair." But this is really an argument for more comprehensive coverage, not less, since the dangers of distortion or over-simplification by the media would be greatest, one would think, when the public is forced to rely entirely on compressed, selective reporting through the printed press and broadcast summaries. The more voluminous the evidence, the more intricate the debate, the more ambiguous a few particulars may be, the more important it becomes for the entire nation to have every opportunity to watch the arguments, to hear the tapes, and to weigh for themselves the presidential conduct which is being judged—and the conduct of the Congress sitting in judgment.

The notion that the nation should be watching these events continues to trouble some, mostly lawyers and mostly outside Congress, who equate impeachment debates with criminal proceedings from which broadcasting has traditionally been barred. That analogy does not stand up. However judicious impeachment ought to be in its procedures and findings, it is not, strictly speaking, a judicial process. It is a political process in the most basic constitutional sense; it is the means by which the people's elected representatives assess alleged abuses of the public trust. Public opinion as reflected in the mail or polls should not be the decisive influence on any member's vote. But in the long run popular opinion will provide the ultimate judgments on the outcome and the way in which it is reached. Thus it is in the best interests of everyone for Congress to give the public every opportunity to be fully informed at every stage of the process, by permitting the full, nationwide airing of the debates ahead.

A WELCOME CHANGE IN GREECE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of a restoration of civilian government in Athens yesterday is an event that should be greeted enthusiastically by all friends of Greece. Civilian rule marks the first important step toward a democratic government which has been denied Greece—the birthplace of democracy—for over 7 years.

Constantine Karamanlis is a seasoned and responsible political leader whose experience as premier for 8 years should help guide Greece in the difficult months ahead. This democratic restoration will not be easy. Premier Karamanlis and his government need and deserve the support of all for the interim period until elections can be held.

The tragic fighting in Cyprus, which has already cost many lives of the citizens of three countries, must now end. Turkey's role in achieving and maintaining a cease-fire is critical. I hope that Prime Minister Ecevit will respond to the changes in government in Athens and Nicosia by committing himself immediately to a cease-fire and withdrawal from

Cyprus without either preconditions or recriminations. It would be tragic if Turkey tried to capitalize on the present conditions in these two countries by seeking unrealistic and unfounded benefits in Cyprus.

THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my Washington Report entitled "The Nuclear Arms Race":

[From Hamilton's Washington Report, July 24, 1974]

THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

Each time an American President and the leader of the Soviet Union hold a summit meeting the most critical item on the agenda is the limitation on nuclear arms. Both countries acknowledge that continuous development of bigger and better nuclear weapons is futile, dangerous, and costly, and yet the mad momentum of the nuclear arms race goes on.

The central reality of the nuclear arms race is that each country can destroy the other no matter which country strikes first. Upon this capability of mutual-assured destruction and the essential equivalence of nuclear arms rests the hope of deterrence of nuclear war.

Some progress has been made in stopping the nuclear arms race. In 1963, the Limited Test Ban Treaty stopped nuclear testing in the atmosphere but not underground. The Non-Proliferation Treaty, which went into force in 1970, is intended to limit the number of countries with nuclear weapons, and the Outer Space Treaty and the Sea Bed Treaty prohibited nuclear weapons in orbit or in the sea bed. The 1972 SALT agreements include a permanent ABM treaty limiting anti-ballistic missile systems (i.e., missiles designed to shoot down an attacking missile) and a five-year interim agreement placing limits on the number of offensive strategic missiles each side could build.

This month the United States and the Soviet Union signed another treaty limiting the size of underground nuclear weapons testing, starting March 1, 1976. Unfortunately, the negotiations did not move forward in the critical area of controlling the offensive nuclear arms race. Both sides did agree to seek a new ten-year interim agreement to replace the present interim agreement which expires in 1977. Most experts were disappointed with the treaty, believing it will not prevent either side from doing what it wants to do and that it may relieve pressure for a complete ban.

With each country able to destroy the other with only a small portion of its strategic forces and with the cost of weapons absolutely staggering, it would appear that an agreement limiting arms could be reached, but the bargaining problems, the measurement of arms equality in particular, present enormous complexities. Each country's leader must contend with powerful groups within his own country, which make a national position on nuclear arms limitation difficult to achieve. Domestic, as well as international, considerations must be weighed. The U.S.S.R. has emphasized large land-based weapons; the U.S. has placed relatively greater emphasis on sea-based weapons and smaller more flexible land-based weapons. As a re-

sult the weapons systems of the two sides are difficult to compare. The status of forces, the race of technology, the variety of geography, and the differing strategic concepts must be considered, along with the Soviet weapons aimed at Europe and the NATO weapons poised to strike at the Soviet Union. Each side wants equality, but neither can agree on what weapons are equal to what other weapons. The most urgent issue is controlling multiple warheads (MIRVs), but limiting them is especially difficult because there are so many ways to measure equality. Moreover, the discussions occur in an atmosphere of suspicion and doubt about the other side's intentions.

All in all, there are not many solid reasons for hope that effective nuclear arms controls can soon be achieved. The day may come when the superpowers will reduce their reliance upon strategic nuclear forces. Already nuclear arms have become less credible for use, and at some point, although probably not soon, the superpowers may feel that nuclear arms competition is no longer required.

In the meantime, the costly and potentially deadly search for new weapons and strategies goes on. The refinement of MIRVs will heighten the vulnerability of land-based missiles to surprise attack, threatening to make an entire weapons system ineffective. Secretary of Defense Schlesinger has announced a new counterforce strategy, a change in targeting practices so that some U.S. missiles are programmed for Soviet military sites as well as cities. The objective is to give the President greater flexibility and selectivity in choosing among targets in the Soviet Union, but it also raises all kinds of questions about encouraging limited nuclear war, setting off another cycle of the arms race, and, if the Russians should conclude that their land-based missiles are vulnerable, increasing the possibility of a first strike.

In these circumstances, the objectives of U.S. strategic policy must be to deter the Soviet Union from launching a nuclear attack by the development of a secure and multiple deterrent force that will not threaten the Soviet deterrence. The U.S. should seek a verifiable arms limitation agreement which will keep the two countries in about the same relative strategic positions they are in now. U.S. policy must continue to enhance security by trying to slow down strategic arms competition and by minimizing the economic burden of the arms race. Direct discussions with the Russians can increase each side's understanding of the other's posture and contribute to a stable relationship. The risks of talking are far smaller than the risks of not trying for an agreement. Even so, the U.S. can reasonably expect negotiations to continue for many years.

FIREFLY CRISIS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in an age of chronic shortages, it might be wise at this time to point out that not even mother nature is immune to the classic laws of economics and the free market system which governs our daily lives.

I should like to call the attention of the Members to the following article from the Washington Post, which shows how Adam Smith's "invisible hand" influences the availability of resources in all facets of life—even the animal kingdom:

MOTHER NATURE IS SUFFERING FIREFLY CRISIS

St. Louis, July 19.—Mother Nature apparently has some shortages of her own, according to officials at the Sigma Chemical Co. of St. Louis.

Fireflies are in short supply, the officials say, so much so they have to be rationed.

"The demand for fireflies is so great we can't keep up with it, particularly during drought years, which are very hard on fireflies," a company spokesman said. "They have to be rationed."

The company has sponsored a national firefly collection for the last 13 years because the male insect is the only known source of active luciferase—ATP—a substance valued by many medical researchers, ecologists, and space scientists.

EASTERN EUROPE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, quite predictably, the press has taken its readers from one major foreign crisis, from the Middle East to Cyprus, and then on to the next.

However, the area that has been somewhat neglected by the American press is Eastern Europe. I believe an article in this morning's Wall Street Journal, July 24, by Ambassador Jacob Beam, who as the Members know is one of most outstanding career diplomats of the United States, is an effective appraisal of U.S. foreign policy, of "détente" and the effects of suppression in Eastern Europe.

The article follows:

EASTERN EUROPE, IGNORED BY DÉTENTE (By Jacob D. Beam)

While few people would like to see the recent improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations reversed, some of the implications which flow from the concept of détente are coming under increasingly close scrutiny.

One area that invites attention is the effect of détente on the condition and future of the captive peoples in Europe.

From a moral point of view, the fate of Eastern Europe, taken together with that of the overrun Baltic states, remains World War II's most monstrous legacy. Soviet rule in the region affronts the historic cultures of its peoples, while holding them to levels of economic stagnation not far different from those which prevail in Russia itself.

This injustice is of longer duration, more deeply frustrating and larger in scope than any witnessed in modern times. The Arab and African worlds have waged successful struggles for independence, and our country has thought enough of the principle of freedom of choice in Korea and Vietnam to try to uphold it in two costly endeavors. Such opportunities have been denied the Eastern Europeans whose captivity is already at the point of transcending one generation. Their ultimate yoke could endure as long as the Tatar and Turkish conquests which for centuries laid a dead hand over the respective civilizations of Eurasia and the Mediterranean.

The satellites seem condemned to be the victims of no-win situations. When the going is tough between the big powers, they get squeezed. They tend to be forgotten during those periods when the West finds the So-

viets in a mood to negotiate seriously on armaments and other important matters. Even our country with its Eastern European ethnic associations is unlikely to spoil the atmosphere by championing the rights of the captive nations, at the consequent risk of being accused of reviving the Cold War.

It is not my purpose to spoil détente by issuing a rash and hypocritical call to arms to save the satellites, but rather to explain their predicament. In between unpredictable outbreaks, which incidentally have caused the Soviets to be the only nation to use arms on the European Continent since the war, the satellite cause has failed to evoke sustained world indignation. There are even some in European official circles who say that the West is well quit of Eastern Europe, including East Germany, despite its accretion to Soviet strategic power. Indeed, Frenchmen have been heard to say: "We love Germany so much, we want two of them."

It is argued that the instability of the small Central European countries contributed to the outbreak of World War II and the same result could re-occur. Such was doubtless what President Podgorny was trying to tell me when I presented my credentials to him as U.S. ambassador in April 1969. He was probably speaking sincerely when he said Soviet action in Czechoslovakia had prevented the beginning of another European war. How much more may the Soviets really believe that détente has confirmed their mission to keep the peace in Europe by despotic methods?

A DEATH KNEEL

Czechoslovakia sounded the death-knell to the idea that "convergence" offered a peaceful and painless solution. That doctrine, espoused in American academic circles and also by the leading Yugoslav party theoretician Kardelj, envisaged that the course of history favored an inevitable compromise between communism on the one hand and social democracy or evolving capitalism on the other. (It is less than comforting that the advocates of convergence reassure us that the Christian-Muslim conflict worked itself out over the centuries.)

The movement of course is in the other direction. The allegiance of the Soviets (and the Chinese) to the objective of ideological struggle makes it inconceivable that they would permit a reversal of the called-for progression from socialism to communism. The Czech leaders of 1968 went down to defeat as an advance party for convergence which would have tolerated a sweeping revision of party statutes. This would have provided, among other things, for secret votes for party officials and open meetings of the Central Committee (which incidentally was the practice in Lenin's time). From the Soviet point of view, the Czech party lost control by degenerating into a mass movement for "Communism with a human face." As in other countries, the issue is not whether capitalism or socialism shall prevail—there is little doubt that given a free choice some form of socialism would win out—the real issue is the degree of party and therefore Soviet control.

There have been some positive changes in Eastern Europe. Following the world outcry over the Czech invasion, the Soviets held back from using Russian forces to put down the Polish workers' riots in Stettin and Gdansk in late 1970. This does not mean that they would not have done so if the Polish police had not been up to the task, and if there had been a less satisfactory candidate than Gierke to replace the discredited Gomulka as first secretary.

There also have been practical variations from the Soviet norm. Most important is Poland's ability to safeguard private farming and a fair respect for the Church. Rumania is allowed the luxury of thumbing its

nose at certain features of Soviet foreign policy, but mainly because it has no common frontier with the West and because Ceausescu runs a tight ideological ship. Hungary's economy is supposed to be a miracle by comparison with the others. American exports to state-operated industries in the satellites have increased manifold. They have been absorbed in the pattern which promotes economic as well as ideological integration of the entire Soviet commonwealth.

Except in Poland's case, such manifestations of autonomy have not basically touched society, and could be merely transitory, depending on the local personalities involved. Human rights and freedom in the satellites have not benefitted correspondingly, and there have been recent retrogressions in Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

Moscow remains in charge. It coordinates the secret police in each country and determines party personnel policies. It can punish through the control of state investment and resource allocation. Realistically there is no foreseeable prospect of the captive nations themselves being able to cast off their yoke.

How much do the satellites benefit from Western attempts to circumvent the Soviet Union? The purpose of President Johnson's "bridge-building" exercise was too obvious and ended up a non-starter. Willy Brandt chose the alternate method of trying to get through to Eastern Europe over the bridge of a non-aggression agreement with the Russians. Even this has not been too successful, for while it has fostered détente between the Soviet Union and the West, it has as yet brought little relief to the satellites. In Soviet logic, relaxation of tension between East and West threatens to undermine the basis of Eastern control over the Western-oriented subject states.

Apart from the choice of a conscience-saving escape, leaving it to "good" historical forces to work things out, what are the possibilities of righting the injustices inflicted on the people of Eastern Europe?

Rollback: Presumably by force or pressure as proposed by the Republicans in the 1952 presidential campaign: The West will risk nothing for such a cause.

Revolt: Success possible only as a result of Soviet disintegration, or in the unlikely event an Eastern European or Baltic leader should take over the central government and party apparatus now dominated by the Russians.

Appeal to Russian better instincts: A matter for pious, prayerful hope.

Moderate evolution within the Communist movement: Encouragement of this trend is at the root of most Western policy and is deemed to be the safest, most logical way to proceed. In any event, it will be a slow, painstaking process.

LITTLE WE CAN DO

Realistically there is little we can do to alter basically the Soviet grip on its subject peoples. We hesitated to aid Hungary in 1956 in any substantial way for fear of upsetting the 1955 agreement with the Soviets establishing Austria's independence. Furthermore, the British, French and Israeli attack on Egypt at that time was a most complicating factor. President Johnson's response to the 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia was restrained by his forlorn wish to end his administration with a summit with the Soviets and an agreement on strategic arms.

World reaction to Czechoslovakia, especially among the European Communist parties, probably did play a part, however, in bringing the Soviets around to general détente. The international meeting of Communist parties in Moscow in 1969 showed them to be faltering in their contest with the Chinese for ideological leadership. The

new ingredient of improved relations with the West was added to the 24th Soviet Party Congress in March 1970. In the subsequent negotiations the Eastern European Communist leaders profited from settlements which confirmed the legality of their regimes and the national boundaries of their states. The issue of Soviet control remains, however, with its grip strengthened by the good use the Soviets make of periods of relative relative relaxation to consolidate their questionably acquired gains.

Considerable concern is now being expressed—and rightly—over the fate of oppressed minorities in the Soviet Union. It is hard to argue that our moral commitment to the captive peoples is any less great. The conference on European Security and Cooperation, which is reaching a crucial point in Geneva, offers us a chance to do something for them. Over and against the Soviet desire to consecrate East-West detente in a general summit meeting, we are still holding out for a freer movement of persons and ideas, of a kind which would help the isolation of Eastern Europe, and indeed, of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

There will be other occasions to show the Soviets in negotiation that a mitigation of their despotism can yield a range of subsidiary benefits and we should not shrink from utilizing them. To imply, as has been done by some of our own government spokesmen, that American concern for human rights might impede the business of preventing nuclear war, makes no sense.

CONGRESSMAN THADDEUS DULSKI HAS DONE HIS JOB

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, my good friend and fellow western New Yorker, THADDEUS DULSKI, has announced that he will retire from the House of Representatives at the end of this year. Since I have made a similar announcement, I can share with Ted the mixed feelings which go with such a decision—looking forward to more time for family and personal pursuits while regretting leaving the House with its great challenges and its opportunities for service and its fellowship.

Ted was already a veteran of 6 years standing when I came to the Congress in 1965. From that time through today, he has been a steadfast friend, cooperative in every way. I am honored to have served the Niagara Frontier in Washington in tandem with our dean, TED DULSKI, and I know that his service to the city of Buffalo will continue after he goes home next year.

George Borrelli, political columnist for the Buffalo Evening News, had a fine column in tribute to Ted which appeared on July 20, 1974. I submit the column in its entirety for my colleagues to read, since I think it is an honest evaluation of TED DULSKI's outstanding career in the House of Representatives:

"PEOPLE'S CONGRESSMAN," DULSKI HAS DONE HIS JOB

(By George Borrelli)

After more than 20 years as an elected public official, Ted Dulski has decided to retire from the rigors of government.

It had long been rumored that Rep. Thaddeus J. Dulski, a Buffalo Democrat, would retire. But nobody really expected the suddenness with which the decision came this week.

Mr. Dulski, one of the area's most colorful political figures, explained his decision in typical fashion:

"I figure I've done my job," he said simply.

The timing of Mr. Dulski's retirement—he announced it Friday, four days after his primary designating petitions had been filed—aroused suspicions that it had been carefully orchestrated to preclude a Democratic primary fight for his congressional seat.

Not so, insists Mr. Dulski. "I didn't even make up my mind until last Monday. And I didn't tell Joe Crangle until late Thursday. He was dumbfounded."

Joseph F. Crangle, state and Erie County chairman, confirmed Mr. Dulski's account of the chronology.

The timing, of course, is convenient to Mr. Crangle and the Erie County Democratic organization, since it rules out a primary fight for Mr. Dulski's 37th District seat.

Last Monday was the deadline for filing petitions for the Sept. 10 primary election.

Since Mr. Dulski's petitions were filed and he declined to be a candidate, the Committee on Vacancies listed on his petitions will name the candidate to replace the retiring congressman on the Democratic ticket.

Chairman Crangle and six other organization Democrats constitute the Committee on Vacancies.

County Comptroller Henry J. Nowak, one of the party's top vote-getters who long has aspired to Congress, is rated the odds-on favorite to be designated for the Dulski seat.

Mr. Dulski, who is completing his 16th year in the House, is an amiable, hard-working lawmaker who likes to be known as the "people's congressman."

He's not a gifted orator. Nor is he a flashy performer. Rather, he takes pride in his folksy mannerisms and his ability to deal with constituents at all levels.

"I know a lot of people, businessmen, politicians, just plain working people. I like them and I think they like me. I have sympathy for their problems. And I've tried to help them."

Mr. Dulski's first congressional campaign in 1958 was against Republican James O. Moore Jr., then one of the Buffalo area's best known trial attorneys and now a Supreme Court justice.

A practical man, Mr. Dulski avoided head-to-head confrontations with Mr. Moore, such as public and television debates. Instead, Mr. Dulski chose to campaign in the style to which he was comfortable, person-to-person contact with as many voters as he could reach.

It proved to be the right strategy, with Mr. Dulski winning a narrow victory in a district that was Republican in enrollment by more than 35,000.

Shifting population patterns and reapportionment have now made Mr. Dulski's district better than 2 to 1 Democratic in enrollment.

"As a first generation Pole, I am proud of my heritage and I cherish the opportunity the people of my district have given me," said Mr. Dulski, who served five years in the Buffalo Common Council before going to Congress.

The highlight of Mr. Dulski's career in Washington came in 1967 when a series of retirements and election upsets the previous year, made him the senior majority party member of the powerful House Post Office & Civil Service Committee, automatically elevating him to the chairmanship.

It was during Mr. Dulski's term as chairman that the Congress enacted legislation

shifting operation of the U.S. postal system to a government corporation.

The shift has produced some troublesome problems and remedial legislation has been introduced to correct them. Mr. Dulski, who is still chairman of the committee, will preside over hearings on the remedial legislation July 30-31.

As Mr. Dulski, who will be 60 on Sept. 27, heads into retirement, he's involved in one of the most serious constitutional controversies in the history of the nation—impeachment proceedings against President Nixon.

Rep. Dulski, who in the past had refused to take a position against the President in the impeachment proceedings, now says:

"With the new revelations in the case, I'm beginning to think the President was involved."

He declines, however, to state flatly that he will vote for impeachment if the issue comes before the full House in the remaining months of his term.

Mr. Dulski's right arm, James McCabe, his administrative assistant, was at the congressman's side when the retirement announcement was made.

He recalled the "shoestring" campaigns Mr. Dulski ran for Congress.

"We never spent more than \$5000 on a congressional campaign. And we won them all."

That's the way Mr. Dulski is leaving public life—a winner.

CHALK UP ANOTHER VICTORY FOR KISSINGER AND THE ADMINISTRATION

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the perseverance, the astuteness and the diplomatic abilities of Henry Kissinger, Joseph Sisco and this administration have again paid off in averting a major war—this time in Cyprus.

I include for the RECORD portions of a statement by Murrey Marder of the Washington Post of July 23, 1974:

KISSINGER: MAJOR WAR AVERTED

(By Murrey Marder)

Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger expressed the belief yesterday that the threat of major Greek-Turkish warfare has been averted although heavy fighting continued on Cyprus after the agreed cease-fire deadline.

The United States continued to make peace appeals in Athens and Ankara throughout the day after the intended 10 a.m. EDT cease-fire was to go into force. Continued shooting on Cyprus caused American officials to say early last night that there may be "some slippage" in plans for Greece and Turkey to begin peace talks Wednesday in Geneva, under British auspices.

Despite breaches in the cease-fire, Kissinger said at midday, "We believe . . . that a rather complicated crisis which had dangers of internationalization has been overcome."

Throughout a week of warfare on Cyprus following the coup led by Greek officers of the Cyprus National Guard which deposed Archbishop Makarios as President on July 15, unanticipated developments confounded the diplomacy of the United States and other mediators. In the same pattern, the United States yesterday was simultaneously receiving praise for achieving the cease-fire and working intensively to sustain it.

Archbishop Makarios, initially reported killed in the coup, and then rated politically finished by many U.S. strategists when he escaped from Cyprus, appeared yesterday in the State Department, smiling benignly on everyone, including Kissinger.

INFLATION AND THE ECONOMY: REDUCING THE FEDERAL BUDGET

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, today the economy of the United States finds itself in its worst economic condition since World War II. We are experiencing the largest prolonged peacetime inflation in this century, unemployment has attained an unacceptable level and is increasing while many are persuaded that we are suffering a recession. Solutions to these problems—especially from the executive branch of Government, and more particularly from the Office of Management and Budget—OMB—have not been forthcoming.

All the President's men seem to have different solutions as to the best ways to solve our economic problems—their house is divided.

Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur Burns is calling for a \$10 billion cut in Federal spending in fiscal year 1975 from the proposed \$305.4 billion budget, but does not urge easing of exorbitant interest rates now charged by banks. Mr. Roy Ash, Director of OMB, initially set his sights on a \$2 to \$5 billion cut reluctantly, but now says the President has urged that an additional \$10 billion reduction might be possible through a reduction in the number of Federal employees—not necessarily a satisfactory answer. Kenneth Rush, the President's new chief economic adviser, is uncertain that even a \$5 billion cut is possible; and Treasury Secretary William Simon, who often appears to be at odds with Ash on fiscal matters, has urged a \$9.4 billion reduction in Federal spending.

What is the public to think of this brand of economics, where every so-called economic adviser comes up with a different solution? Thus far, none of these men appear to have the President's ear in regard to budget-cutting, or have emerged as a leading spokesman for White House economic policy.

Let us face it; there is no economic leadership presently evident in the administration, nor is there any promise thereof. Weak pronouncements from second or third-echelon administration spokesmen do not equate leadership.

This lack of leadership has been evident for the past few years and has been primarily responsible for the downturn in the Nation's economy. Our current economic dilemma of no growth and high inflation will go into the books as the most disastrous situation of the century, with the possible exception of the depression in the 1930's.

Never has inflation raged with such violence and for so long as it has in the

past 7 years. Never have interest rates skyrocketed to such devastating levels and with such minor constructive impact. The stock market has proven a disaster area, with millions of investors suffering unconscionable financial losses and withdrawing from the market. And it appears that the end is not yet in sight.

Now is the time for someone to take the initiative and lead this country back to the road of prosperity for all, and to obtain an end to the inflation that has been causing so great a grief to millions of Americans—but especially to the poor and aged.

Today, I am asking the House of Representatives to turn its serious attention to the restriction of spending to no more than \$295 billion for fiscal year 1975. This figure is still \$20 billion more than we spent in fiscal year 1974, but is \$10 billion under current OMB spending estimates. The best way to stop inflation is to stop excess spending. This is one certain action that Congress and the executive branch of Government can take conjointly that will have an impact on inflation, both at home and abroad.

Congress can and should use its constitutionally granted power of the purse—it must accept this responsibility—it must lead by example.

The OMB budget proposal for fiscal year 1975 constitutes the largest dollar increase in Federal spending in peacetime history. How can the Congress, under the conditions of today, agree to such spending? The answer is, and must be, that we simply cannot.

Although the administration often tells the public that Congress is "the big spender," this is simply not the case. The facts are that in the past 5½ years the OMB has proposed large increases in Federal outlays. During this period, the Federal budget has grown from \$196 billion to the proposed \$305.4 billion, an increase of 56 percent. This growth would have been even greater had not the Congress refused to appropriate some of the OMB requests. It is evident that this kind of spending cannot now continue unabated. It must be brought under control.

It is no secret that many Federal programs contain considerable waste, the mere size of our Government makes evident this fact. But we should be able to use our advanced technology—a technology that leads the world, and our managerial skills—to streamline Federal expenditures and render more efficient our Government's programs.

A reduction at this time of \$10 billion in our Federal spending would constitute the initiation of the necessary chipping away at a budget that has become so swollen in the last 5½ years as to have reached the bursting point. Such continual excesses both have triggered and fired inflation, not only in the United States, but throughout the world.

Of course, the problem that remains is this: Just where do we cut the budget? There are, perhaps, as many differing ideas as to what is necessarily unnecessary in Government, as there are Members on this floor. I would not undertake the imposition of my ideas as to where

this spending should be cut—but I am certain that the Congress is resourceful enough to come up with a solution. One thing, however, is certain; we should be able to live within a \$295 billion budget in fiscal year 1975—the largest in the history of mankind.

Ten billion dollar cut in Federal spending would have a profound effect on the inflationary psychology which has infected our economy. It would hopefully lead to the breaking of the back of inflation; the economy would have fewer inflationary expectations; inventory spending to avoid inflation would be cut back; unwarranted plans to add more plant or equipment simply to beat rising prices would be revised; unions would be under lesser constraints to seek inflationary wage demands, confident that inflation was being brought under control. The Federal Reserve Board would be less inclined to pursue so tight a money policy that it burdens the next generation, if it saw that Congress was shouldering a part of the burden by cutting spending. A relaxation of monetary policy would help to bring down interest rates and revive the depressed homebuilding industry, which is already suffering from an unemployment rate in excess of 8 percent.

A cut of \$10 billion is in itself deflationary. It decreases the aggregate demand for goods and services by a similar amount of dollars, and, such spending cuts will curb inflationary expectations by convincing the public that the Federal Government is finally playing its part in curbing inflation.

All we need is the will and determination to cut the budget. The Congress has shown such a will and determination recently by passing the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, which will allow the Congress better control over its budgeting, beginning on July 1 of next year. But we should not wait another full year before coming to grips with this problem; we must act, now—immediately.

To oversimplify some of the problems caused by inflation, you need only to read a June 17, 1974, article published in the U.S. News & World Report magazine which contains some illuminating facts on the horrors of inflation. Some of the points made were:

Placing the 1969 dollar at a value of 100 cents, that dollar today is worth 75 cents, and, at the current rate of inflation, by 1979 will be reduced to 57 cents.

If the present inflation is not curbed, the houses now costing \$37,500 will cost \$51,000 in 1979.

The price of food will go from \$54.40 per family today to \$80.50 in 1979.

The price of gasoline will go from an average of 58 cents a gallon today to 88 cents in 1979.

The article also points out that a family of four that has had an increase in income from \$20,000 in 1967 to \$28,000 in 1974, has in theory, kept up with inflation—income before taxes and cost-of-living are both 44 percent higher. However, the family's social security and Federal income taxes are up 76 percent. The result, of course, is less buying power.

It is a truism that something must be done about Federal spending—a pri-

mary contributing cause of inflation. And it is evident that the administration and the OMB have thus far failed completely to halt this runaway, double-digit inflation that is consuming our future. The Congress must therefore accept the responsibility for accepting the leadership in solving this problem.

As we all know, of the proposed \$305.4 billion OMB's budget, only some \$84 billion is considered controllable. A spending item is considered controllable by OMB only if the President has discretion over the amount of appropriation or other budget authority he may recommend.

The remainder of the budget is considered uncontrollable, thus not subject to Presidential discretion in terms of budget recommendations. An example of an uncontrollable expense would be the authorizing legislation for social security benefits, veterans' pensions and compensation, and public assistance grants that stipulate the rates to be paid and conditions of eligibility for payment.

To cut \$10 billion from the controllable \$84 billion portion of the budget will undoubtedly prove a difficult and complex chore, fraught with political problems—but one that nonetheless must be undertaken. If the Congress acts now, prior to the completion of action on the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1975, we have the opportunity to make our own determinations as to budget cuts; we have, in short, the opportunity to substitute the House for the OMB, orderly constitutional processes for the administration's practice of impoundment to which we are all imposed. Failing this, we will again let the President have the final say in budget matters.

As far as I am personally concerned, I believe that the people are looking to Congress—to their elected Representatives—to get this country off dead center and back on a sound economic footing; and I feel that this can now best be done at this time by a reduction of the Federal budget for fiscal year 1975 by some \$10 billion, more or less. I shall do everything in my power to obtain this objective, and will work with and welcome the advice and assistance of those who agree.

The time has come to—in fact—balance the budget.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MRS. MINK

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I intend to introduce the following amendments under the 5-minute rule:

Amendments to H.R. 11500 offered by Mrs. MINK:

Section 210(b), page 175, line 13, strike all words after "geologist" and the words "surface information" on line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "when specific subsurface information is deemed essential and requested by the regulatory authority."

Section 214, (a), page 204, line 25, delete all words after the word "weeks", and on page 205, delete all of line 1 and on line 2, delete the words "of letters which he has sent to" and insert in lieu thereof the words, "The regulatory authority shall notify", and on line 5, delete the words "his" and insert in lieu thereof the word "the operator's".

Section 404, page 252, delete all of (a) and (b).

Section 705, page 284, lines 18 through 25, strike all of paragraph (3).

AMPLE PRECEDENT AIDS NIXON IN HIS POSITION ON EVIDENCE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as a longtime admirer of the philosophy of James J. Kilpatrick, I include in the Record his words of wisdom for the perusal of this fearless forum:

AMPLE PRECEDENT AIDS NIXON IN HIS POSITION ON EVIDENCE

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

WASHINGTON.—It is understandable but it is also regrettable, that so little public attention has been paid to President Nixon's letter of June 10 to Peter Rodino. The letter provides an excellent statement of Mr. Nixon's reasons for refusing to surrender further tapes and documents to the House Judiciary Committee.

Unfortunately, this long letter was released at a time when editors were struggling with a torrent of news. The President was off to the Mideast. Henry Kissinger was erupting in Salzburg. In Washington, the Judiciary Committee was leaking like a rusty bucket. Few newspapers had space to print the text of Mr. Nixon's letter, and few readers would have had time for it anyhow. The letter deserved something better.

The situation, in brief, is that the House committee had issued subpoenas demanding that the President surrender certain records. The President refused to honor the subpoenas. His reasons are solidly rooted in the doctrine of separation of powers.

"While many functions of government require the concurrence or interaction of two or more branches," Mr. Nixon wrote, "each branch historically has been steadfast in maintaining its own independence by turning back attempts of the others, whenever made, to assert an authority to invade, without consent, the privacy of its own deliberations."

Mr. Nixon supplied examples. In 1962, a federal district court issued a subpoena to the Senate, demanding certain evidence for use in the trial of James Hoffa. The Senate, by formal resolution, flatly refused to comply. More recently, in the case of Lt. William Calley, the House Armed Services Committee refused to provide evidence demanded by Calley's attorneys. Chairman Edward Hebert based his refusal on precisely the same grounds invoked by President Nixon today.

The judicial branch has taken the same view. In 1953, the House Un-American Activities Committee attempted to subpoena Justice Tom Clark. He refused to obey the subpoena. "The independence of the three branches of our government," said Clark, "is the cardinal principle on which our constitutional system is founded."

In his letter of June 10, Mr. Nixon cited a further example. In 1962, a Senate subcommittee demanded certain information from

President Kennedy. When he refused to supply it, Sen. John Stennis of Mississippi upheld Kennedy's position: "I know of no case where the court has ever made the Senate or the House surrender records from its files, or where the executive has made the legislative branch surrender records from its files—and I do not think either of them could. So the rule works three ways. Each is supreme within its field, and each is responsible within its field."

This strikes me as sound doctrine. It is not the power of the law, it is only the power of public opinion that makes Presidents obey court orders. As the Supreme Court long ago acknowledged in *Mississippi vs. Johnson*, a Reconstruction case, a federal court is powerless to enforce an order a President chooses to ignore. It is universally assumed that if Rodino's committee were to ask a federal court to approve its subpoenas, and if a court should order Mr. Nixon to comply, Mr. Nixon would obey. But Rodino's refusal to seek judicial aid is in itself a reflection of the doctrine of separation of powers. A House committee does not want to leave an impression that it is subject to court orders.

Mr. Nixon is right in the position he has taken. He is right, that is, as a matter of law. The presidential office simply cannot be made a happy hunting ground for grandstanding federal judges and bloodthirsty congressmen, not even in the name of impeachment. The presidency could not survive as we know it.

THE AFRICAN DROUGHT: AMERICA'S SHAME

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 years, the 25 million citizens of Mauritania, Mali, Chad, Senegal, Upper Volta, and Niger in West Africa have experienced a drought of cataclysmic proportions. Crops and animal herds have died, rivers, lakes and wells have dried up, the Sahara Desert has advanced southward at a rate of 30 miles a year, and people have starved.

In a well-researched, revealing article in the *Village Voice* of July 4, Jeffrey L. Hodes considered the insufficient, chaotic American response to this tragedy. The article, entitled "The Shame of the Sahel," is submitted for the thoughtful attention of my colleagues:

THE SHAME OF THE SAHEL

(By Jeffrey L. Hodes)

("Here is a great mass of people, yet it takes an effort of the intellect and will even to see them . . ."—Michael Harrington, in "The Other America.")

Nothing has changed in drought-stricken West Africa since the world first took notice of the catastrophe a year ago. As the devastation enters its sixth year, it carries with it an ominous vision of that horseman of the Apocalypse: famine.

Once again, the international community will boldly proclaim that massive death is being averted with emergency aid, when, as last year, hundreds of thousands will probably perish or slowly die from disease or malnutrition.

Nowhere is this attitude more prevalent than in the highest recesses of government, where the modus operandi seems to be: do as little as possible until cajoled into doing more, and then proclaim that the situation is under control.

Whether it's in the United Nations, the State Department, or the Agency for International Development (AID)—the fact is, the international response to the Sahel represents a pattern of inertia, insensitivity, and racism. For the Sahel does not have much strategic, political, or economic value to the U.S. Government which is the basis for most (sic) "humanitarian" assistance.

Black Africa never received much U.S. aid and Washington's rhetoric notwithstanding, we're still doing less than we proclaim. In the last 19 years, Black Africa received only five percent of the \$6.3 billion worth of excess food given away by the U.S.—which is the world's breadbasket. This past year, AID has given more to feed the Sahel's starving masses than it has given in the last 19 years. But even this aid is deceptive.

For this year, in a sleight of hand, AID juggled its money. First it decreased economic aid to Black Africa by \$13 million to \$160 million, and then cut another \$50 million which it redirected to South Vietnam. Later, under Congressional prodding, AID agreed to an additional \$25 million for the six countries of the Sahel—but lumped this sum to the total of the slashed African aid package to cover up the huge cut.

And now, it's been revealed that last year \$87 million in food credits to the African states was actually \$50 million, and starting July 1, food grants went down to \$5 million.

But whatever the amount, it's precious little, and represents what old "African hands" at the State Department call "presence money." After the early euphoria of the Kennedy administration for assisting the emerging nations of Black Africa, by 1966 the all-consuming passion of the Johnson administration had riveted most assistance for Vietnam.

The U.S. adopted a policy of benign neglect toward Black Africa—rationalized in a report only partially declassified last year, which to this date remains the basis of U.S. policy in Africa.

The "Korry Report" was written by a State Department task force headed by former U.S. Ambassador to Chile, Edward M. Korry, who was then Ambassador to Ethiopia.

Korry suggested an "emphasis country policy," concentrating U.S. aid in those Third World countries that could be used as pawns on the chessboard of global power politics. Rewards were to go only to explicit collaborators, or where the U.S. had economic self-interests.

What little aid was destined for Africa went to Ethiopia, Liberia, and Morocco—where there were military installations; resource-rich Uganda, Zaire, and Tanzania, as well as oil-rich Nigeria, and Ghana and Kenya—where Korry saw European influence eroding.

For the remainder of Africa, Korry suggested "regional self-help" projects, with minimal U.S. financing, because he didn't consider these nation-states as much more than conglomerations of tribes, rather than nations.

Korry's brand of imperialism is extraordinary. In sections of the report still classified, he wrote: "A quantitative distinction (should be made) explicit between resources for economic development and for political purposes . . . But these resources should be recognized for what they are: a limited but indispensable tool. . . ."

Regarding former French West Africa, the heartland of the Sahel, Korry suggested a hands-off policy. "It is not desirable at this time to challenge the special position of France in tropical Africa," he argued, because despite our differences with Paris, "the benefits of French influence . . . on the proper political organization of the African continent" are considerable.

The French record of neglect speaks for itself. The Sahel exists today in a time capsule, as it tries to shake loose the shackles of

colonial servitude while leaping across centuries of economic development. The six nations—Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, and Upper Volta—carved out of what was once semiarid French West Africa, are still scarred by the worst kind of economic Balkanization, perpetrated by artificial national boundaries imposed by a colonial power.

So by 1972, when the drought was officially "recognized," it's understandable that the Sahelian governments felt they had no place to turn for relief.

There are stories of African ambassadors roaming the halls of the State Department asking for help, and of AID officials suggesting the effects of the drought were being exaggerated.

By Christmas 1972, the Sahelian states turned to the United Nations. During the closing days of the annual General Assembly session, the Secretary General, Kurt Waldheim, was informed by his Secretariat and African ambassadors about what was happening. His response was to order a study of the problems of "desert encroachment."

In early 1973, as the horror stories and reports increased, UN agencies debated what to do, and whether the UN should issue a public appeal for aid. It's a measure of the moral bankruptcy of the UN that the agencies procrastinated another five months before anything was done.

In March 1973, the Sahelian governments met in Ouagadougou, Upper Volta, and issued a formal plea for help. Waldheim's staff placed the Sahel on his agenda for his weekly staff meetings. But it wasn't until May that he discussed the drought.

By then, the situation had deteriorated to the point where—just as Martin Walker of the Manchester Guardian reported in the New York Times Magazine is happening again this year—the fumbling had screwed up the delivery of emergency food, necessitating an expensive and frantic airlift in early summer before the monsoons washed out roads.

But while the international community slowly galvanized itself to do something last summer—under the prodding from church and black groups, a bizarre but tragic thing happened.

On its own initiative the U.S. Public Health Service in Atlanta, Georgia sent a team of physicians to West Africa to assess the situation. They reported 100,000 deaths with levels of starvation greater than that of the historic famine in Bangladesh.

To prevent further mortality, the Public Health Service mapped a plan for special children's rations, vaccine against measles (a major killer, and food distribution. The PHA report quotes official AID reports identifying some U.S. relief shipments of sorghum (a high-protein cereal) to West Africa as "animal feed." Indeed, "indigestible" sorghum appeared in AID documents as life-saving relief, according to some Washington sources, while in Sahelian refugee camps, it was cramps and diarrhea.

The Public Health Service reports were largely ignored by AID and the State Department—and, in fact, covertly concealed. In October, the State Department publicly spoke of "pockets" of malnutrition existing in West Africa. And this February, the President's Disaster Relief Coordinator told Congress that "widespread starvation was prevented."

Could the U.S. have done more? Last year of the aid given Africa, more than 40 percent was in the form of excess food commodities. But the emergency food assistance given the Sahel came out of a special fund. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the "Contingency Fund," authorized AID to spend funds for unforeseen catastrophes. However, AID has taken it upon itself to allocate funds "for situations involving the security of the United States."

During fiscal 1973, only half of the Contingency Fund was spent on disaster relief. Other grants were made for financing livestock research in the Bahamas, and an international plan to combat cholera. But in prior years, the funds were put to more dubious use.

During fiscal 1973, only half of the Contingency Fund was spent on disaster relief. Other grants were made for financing livestock research in the Bahamas, and an international plan to combat cholera. But in prior years, the funds were put to more dubious use.

During 1972, \$24.5 million of \$30 million in Contingency Funds was misallocated for "security assistance," such as:

\$9.5 million to Malta to "support economic and political stability of the government . . ."
\$15 million to Jordan to "maintain its political stability."

Under pressure from black legislators—in particular, Representative Charles Diggs, head of the African Affairs Subcommittee—AID reallocated its funds in the closing months of 1973—reducing aid for earthquake-shaken Nicaragua to make up the difference for the Sahel.

But between the Bahamas project and other misuses, at least \$12 million in disaster relief funds were misallocated.

The drought this year is worse than last year. There was almost no harvest last fall. It's reflective of the UN's poor coordination that the Food and Agricultural Organization in Rome told the world the Sahel will be short 650,000 tons of grain this year when actually the total need is double that amount—1.2 million tons—to stave off famine threatening 200,000 people.

It is doubtful whether that much grain will ever be donated, to say nothing of the milk, vaccine, and other human and animal provisions—and then gotten to where it's needed.

Whether we can or will find the political will to prevent the tragic recurrence of the human devastation that plagued the Sahel last year is still very much of an open question.

In the Sahel, which is a forbidding land under the best of circumstances, emergency relief is wasteful without giving people the means to rehabilitate the land and salvage what remains of their once pastoral existence. For not only are people dying, but centuries of culture and nomadic way of life are being extinguished.

Meanwhile, the drought is spreading to Ethiopia and other parts of East Africa—putting the lie to the rationale of the AID technocrats who say that the people of the Sahel are responsible for their own fate because of cattle overgrazing and human overpopulation.

Meteorologists indicate that significant shifts have occurred in the weather patterns over Africa which may be cyclical, but perhaps permanent. The immediate reality, though, is that the drought could be one of mankind's greatest natural catastrophes.

GEORGIA FARMERS UNHAPPY
WITH MR. EARL BUTZ

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as many Members of this House know by now, flue-cured tobacco farmers in Georgia, and other tobacco-producing States, are suffering as a result of U.S. Department of Agriculture policy as

formulated and pronounced by one Earl Butz. Mr. Butz, despite warnings and pleas from tobacco growers and other leaders in several States, decided to listen to the large tobacco companies, and he issued an edict forcing tobacco growers to produce 10 percent more tobacco this year, 1974, than last. This action came on the heels of a 10 percent increase in 1973, in production over 1972. The result of these production increases has been to force prices to remain at or near the level paid to farmers last year, with higher prices being paid in only a very few instances. Production costs, meanwhile, have literally skyrocketed. One of the most authoritative sources in the field, Clemson University Extension Service, reports production costs up more than 40 percent this year alone.

Mr. Speaker, my farmers, and those from all flue-cured tobacco producing regions, simply cannot survive on these low prices. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINN) and I met with a large group of tobacco growers in Tifton, Ga., last Friday, and following that meeting, I called the Secretary of Agriculture to request he declare a "Sales Holiday" and that he meet with Mr. GINN, me, and other tobacco State Congressmen, as well as with a delegation of growers. Mr. Butz never returned my call, but three of his subordinates informed me that the Secretary did not have time to meet with me, or my group of tobacco producers. He has demonstrated again that he refuses to even afford them an audience in order that they might air legitimate complaints. I am sick of Mr. Butz and his high-handed arrogance. I enclose an editorial from the Daily Tifton Gazette, written by my dear friend Bob Morrell, and a telegram from the Honorable George Busbee, also my close friend, that also indicate their mild displeasure with this man who has set himself up as "Boss Butz."

[From the Daily Tifton Gazette, July 23, 1974]

BUTZ MUST GO

(By Bob Morrell)

If Georgia farmers (and those elsewhere too) had their way, they probably would advise Congress to forget about President Nixon and find a way to impeach Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz instead.

And rightly so, based on the record.

The latest outburst of anger, disgust and frustration with U.S. Department of Agriculture policy, of course, is over the extremely unsatisfactory prices which flue-cured tobacco is bringing—not only in Georgia but also in North and South Carolina where markets now are open.

Although prices rose slightly Monday over last Thursday's offerings, the bids being made on Georgia leaf are nowhere near what the farmer must realize from his 1974 crop in order to make a modest profit.

Growers, with justification, are tracing the cause for low prices back to Butz and his policy of excessive tobacco production for 1974—a move urged by tobacco companies and encouraged by the Secretary.

Butz' latest disaster (as far as farmers and agri-business are concerned) comes on the heels of other outright stupid steps which have seriously hurt American agriculture. These include:

The ridiculous wheat deal with the Soviet Union which cost both farmers and consumers.

Absurd new policies on peanuts which have hampered seriously the ability of growers to realize a living from their crops.

Allowing desperately needed fertilizers to be exported, an act which made the domestic availability critical and sent prices skyrocketing.

Supporting a six percent loan to build a fertilizer complex in the Soviet Union at a time when no American firm or farmer can get such favorable terms.

The bill of indictment against Mr. Butz could go on and on, but the point is made, as is his apparent desire to completely wreck the entire commodities system under which America has become the world's leader in agriculture production.

And on top of this all comes the crowning blow—Mr. Butz high-handed refusal to meet with a committee of tobacco growers from Georgia to discuss the situation and his refusal to converse about the matter with Representative Dawson Mathis, a member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Georgia and all other American farmers have enough problems without such intransigent politicians establishing and administering their agricultural policies.

If elected Republican leaders and other administration officials have any hope of ever again holding office, they would do well to move Mr. Butz back to wherever he was before he began destroying the nation's agricultural economy.

ALBANY, GA.,
July 24, 1974.

Cong. DAWSON MATHIS,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

I am asking you to use all the influence you have as I will do to provide a voice for the farmers of Georgia. I appreciate the service you have performed for our farmers in the past and know that you will continue to give your full attention to our agricultural needs. With this in mind there is a matter that I feel is of the utmost concern to our farmers. This is what appears to me to be a complete shutting of the door in Georgia farmers faces by Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz. To be more specific I feel Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz should be relieved of his duties by the President of the United States immediately and I respectfully ask that you take steps to insure that Mr. Butz is relieved at your earliest convenience. It is obvious that Mr. Butz is not responsive to farm problems in Georgia and certainly not to the tobacco problems we are experiencing in South Georgia. In fact his unwillingness to cooperate with our farmers is a good example of his evident disregard for Georgia's agricultural problems and needs. Thank you for your outstanding service to the farmers of our community.

GEORGE BUSBEE.

PIONEER DAY

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, on July 24, 127 years ago, one of the most difficult and trying journeys in American history was concluded as the first Mormon pioneers entered the Salt Lake Valley.

The pioneer trek westward, which ended in Utah and later initiated settlements in my own State of Idaho and in other neighboring States, began early in

February 1846 when the Mormons were driven out of Nauvoo, Ill. The first groups to leave reenacted a scene analogous to the early Israelites when they left Egypt to be led by a prophet to a promised land.

During the first week of exodus over 1,300 Mormon refugees from Illinois crossed the frozen Missouri River to escape persecution. Throughout the following year 15,000 Mormons left their homes to begin the long journey westward.

They sought a land which at the time no one else wanted, where they could worship, as our Constitution provides, in freedom.

During the journey prophetic lines were penned by the Mormon pioneer, William Clayton, words which are part of the now famous hymn "Come, Come Ye Saints."

We'll find a place which God for us prepared,
Far away in the West

Where none shall come to hurt or make afraid;
There the Saints will be blessed.

A year and a half after they set out, 60 pioneers and 18 wagons were led into the Salt Lake Valley by Brigham Young to inherit a promised land which, through the magic of irrigation, backed by unrelenting courage and toil they made to "blossom as a rose."

The civilization which sprang from the wilderness is a monument to those early pioneers, to their courage, their faith and perseverance.

In our remembrance of Pioneer Day, a holiday in many communities in my State, we pay tribute not only to the heritage which has had such an immense influence in the development of our region, but to the great personal achievements of those early settlers, many of them direct descendants of the original colonizers of America.

Looking back on the circumstances of the historic Mormon pilgrimage, one wonders what it was that sustained the pioneers through the hardships of their journey.

I think we must look inward for the answer, for something that in the hearts and minds of the Mormon pioneers was even more tangible than the mountains and deserts which stood between them and their promised land.

By their own fervent accounts amply provided in journals and other writings the participants in this endeavor witnessed that it was their belief that sustained them and carried them through, the first principle of that belief being faith.

More than the length of their journey or the obstacles in their path, it was their faith that determined their destiny.

So it has always been. One of the greatest needs we have for our present time and situation is faith, faith in ourselves and in our cause. We face new challenges and difficulties. Our ultimate success or failure in meeting these challenges is more often determined by the degree of faith and determination we can bring to the fore than by the particulars of the problem itself.

As we bring the experiences of our forebears into sharper focus by an ap-

appropriate remembrance of Pioneer Day, let us learn the lessons they can still teach us. Let us replace some of the despair and doubt in our country with hope and faith in the future. In that way we can help to make the great promise of America as true today as it was on July 24, over a century ago.

JOHN GRINER IS DEAD—LED AFGE TO GREATEST STATUS

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I have previously entered in the RECORD many tributes to John Griner, the recently deceased president emeritus of the American Federation of Government Employees.

I insert articles printed in the Government Standard at this point in the RECORD.

JOHN GRINER DEVELOPED THE TOOLS; IT IS UP TO US TO USE THEM WELL
(By Clyde M. Webber)

For more than a decade John Griner and AFGE were synonymous to the virtually millions of people affected by his life. But, each one of us saw John Griner through a different personal prism.

To the rank-and-file member of AFGE, he was a beacon amidst a morass of red tape. He led battles for many, he argued cases for one. He only insisted that the issue be one of principle and his Georgia-bred instinct of right and wrong would take over from there.

To all Federal workers he was an untiring advocate, promising only that unified action would guarantee them the right and the privilege to demand fair treatment on the job; a fair wage for work performed and their ration of dignity.

To the men and women of the labor movement, John Griner was an emissary for a new kind of unionism. His foresight ushered in a new era of public employee unionism.

To the Congress, where he spent long hours alternately persuading and demanding, codding and berating, John Griner was an articulate spokesman for organized labor.

To management John could be caustic or cordial. His demeanor was dictated by how well or badly AFGE's membership was being treated.

His credo—"let us disagree without being disagreeable"—preceded him in all his dealings and provided him entry to the highest levels of Federal management. He always drove a tough but fair bargain and he knew the complete meaning of the word "bargain."

John Griner died last month but the legacy of his toll remains, symbolized in the building we dedicated to him when he retired. But our indebtedness to him can never be retired.

Without the strength and resilience he carefully initiated and nurtured within AFGE, how would we be capable of defending the merit system from the special interests out to destroy it? Lacking the credibility AFGE established under his leadership would anyone listen if we argued that self-serving and avaricious contractors were out to undermine the taxpayers' investment in a strong, honest Civil Service?

There are now several important areas of concern to you and me that wait at this juncture and each problem will demand every ounce of resolve we can muster, using the strength and techniques he helped to

develop for us to make the lot of Federal employees a better one for themselves and their families.

The first of these concerns is the protection of the merit system.

In this time of deteriorating confidence in political institutions, every Federal employee should take the time to discuss their jobs with their families, neighbors and friends. Federal workers should feel a deep sense of pride knowing they are part of the overall mechanism that keeps Government running; that their position was secured on the basis of a competitive examination; that they compete with other qualified employees for every promotion; that their oath of office binds them to carry out their duties and responsibilities without favor to any person or special-interest group.

Unfortunately, there are very few Federal employees who realize how unique and important these facts are. Instead of taking pride in their work as civil servants, all too many Federal workers develop an inferiority complex because of the barrages of negative propaganda they face daily.

The second concern is the preservation and improvement of our input in the Federal wage-setting system, both General Schedule and Prevailing Rate.

Without constant attention to the precedent we've established for the union in setting wages comparable to those paid in the private sector our inroads could be trod under by the phoney sloganeering of anti-union spokesmen throughout the society.

We all learned an important lesson last year when, because of the bad advice he got from the Office of Management and Budget, the President found himself on the short end of a Senate vote to reject his plans postponing the pay raise legally due Federal employees.

That lesson combined with the experience we've accumulated in the wage survey system for Federal blue collar employees under the Wage Grade Act stands as convincing evidence that more intense union representation pays off in sound dollar-and-cents returns for all Federal workers—but more so for those with the foresight to join together under the AFGE banner.

Erosions in the size and composition of the Federal workforce represent yet another danger to dominate our concern.

The same anti-worker propaganda that attacks the pay-setting mechanisms for Federal workers is also steadily unleashed to cut the size of the workforce in absolute numbers. This is contrary to wisdom, reason, and fact; yet the notion finds its adherents in great numbers.

Despite the increases in population, dramatic increases in the size of the nation's overall workforce of better than 50 percent, and drastic shifts of the characteristics of the nation's working population, Federal employment has risen by only 14 percent over the past 20 years. At the same time the Federal role in our society has multiplied tenfold. That fact alone makes the Federal employee the most efficient and productive employee in the United States today.

Now, a record of efficiency like that is the envy of many a private-sector entrepreneur. But, the Government, ostensibly, operates without the profit motive, hence the drive by profitmogs to wrest this work out of the hand of public servants via the contracting-out route.

The kernel of this conflict lies not only in the threat of job losses increased contracting represents—although this is a primary consideration. The other side of that coin is our concern, as citizens and taxpayers, that the institution of Government, as an advocate of all the citizens, not to be turned into a haven for political cronyism and a sanctuary of the profiteers.

The element of public accountability is the cornerstone of Government. That account-

ability can only be subverted by corporate decisionmakers.

Take, for example the prospect of a private insurance firm running Social Security—a prospect which, until recently, the OMB and certain managers in HEW were actively considering—how well would Social Security beneficiaries fare with private-sector managers making decisions about pension payments and improved services?

Another primary and ongoing concern of AFGE is the low priority given to employee rights under safety and equal employment statutes. Federal managers, some by design, others because of insensitivity, frequently fail to translate the explicit commitment of the Government from words on paper to fundamental and continuing action. Suffice to say that the example of the highest levels of Federal management encourage non-performance in both of these areas, although they are careful to mouth the philosophy in public.

These concerns, with all the tentacles of ramification they hold, continue to dominate my interest, just as they monopolized the countless working hours John Griner spent for ten years before me.

None of these is a self-contained, unrelated problem. None will disappear overnight. But I am confident each of them will fall to our persistent and dedicated efforts using the example John set for us.

JOHN GRINER HAS BEEN UNDOUBTEDLY THE GREATEST NATIONAL PRESIDENT IN THE 40-YEAR HISTORY OF AFGE, AFL-CIO

The following statement was issued by unanimous vote of the National Executive Council on the motion of District 6 National Vice President A. K. Gardner after National President John F. Griner submitted his resignation for reasons of health in 1972.

"John Griner has been undoubtedly the greatest National President in the 40-year history of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO.

"In the short span of ten years, he has accomplished three major tasks, any one of which would have been a signal achievement in itself and would have entitled him to the deepest appreciation of the officers and members of this Union.

"First, under his determined and courageous leadership, this Union has gathered over 300,000 dues-paying members, which is well over three times the number it had on its roster when he was elected to the National Presidency in 1962.

"Second, Griner accomplished Congressional enactment and Presidential signing of Wage Grade legislation this Summer, climaxing an eight-year struggle by the Union for this landmark legislation which will end up bringing some 700,000 Wage Grade workers in the Federal Government literally millions of dollars in hitherto-denied pay, equity and justice.

"Third, under Griner's leadership, the AFGE has now established ownership of a National Office building in Washington, culminating a long-cherished dream of those who have been active in this Union since its beginning.

"John Griner will be sadly missed but his name will be remembered as long as the American Federation of Government Employees exists."

REMARKS OF CLYDE M. WEBBER

The following excerpts are from the remarks of National President Clyde M. Webber at the ceremony dedicating the National Office as the John F. Griner Building as a memorial to departing President Emeritus Griner.

"I believe that AFGE has in the past been blessed with especially dedicated, bold leadership on all levels.

"We who compose the present leadership

GRESSIONAL RECORD. Excerpts from some of have pledged ourselves to whatever dedication and hard work necessary to fill the shoes which we have inherited.

"We are pleased to be assembled in a building bearing John Griner's name.

"For all these reasons, it is most fitting that the name selected for the building is that of the man who was undoubtedly the greatest National President in the 40-year history of AFGE.

"During the 10 years John Griner held the office of National President, AFGE membership tripled and the number of Exclusive Recognitions multiplied. Under John Griner, AFGE made great inroads into the area of union participation on policy-making and advisory committees. . . .

"In 1972 when John Griner retired on the advice of his doctors, Federal employees were enjoying many advances in pay, benefits and working conditions which they hadn't had in 1962 when he took office.

"We intend to continue the legacy John Griner left us.

"We currently have a program expanding our range of activities; we hope in the near future to represent a million Federal employees.

"To reach this goal, we must take advantage of every opportunity available. This will require cooperation at every level in AFGE.

"As an inspiration helping us to achieve this, all members and officers will have before us the model of the tenacity, the patience, the willingness to sacrifice time and comfort which has been the role of John F. Griner in building the AFGE into the largest and best union Federal employees have ever had."

THIS HAS BEEN A LABOR OF LOVE, DOING SOMETHING FOR THE PEOPLE I LOVE

John F. Griner's last public utterances as a National Officer of AFGE illustrated typically and clearly two of the strongest forces underlying his conduct as the union's chief executive—his deep, abiding love of the people he represented, and his fierce pride in the Civil Service as a bulwark of the Government.

Griner's last official testimony as AFGE National President was before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and was a sharp rebuttal to certain aspects of a condemnation of the Civil Service by a Nader task force.

Griner's answer to aspersions on the performance of Civil Service employees was:

"I state frankly to you that the American people have every reason to be proud of the caliber and competence of Federal employees, as a whole.

"Without them, that vast modern enterprise called the United States of America could not function at all."

Then gaunt and aching with the ailment that was eventually to be the one antagonist he could not overcome, Griner rose at the farewell testimonial banquet tendered to him, and with a hoarse voice reiterated his affection for the members of the union for which he had, in the final analysis, sacrificed his health.

"When you said to me, 'God bless you,' you said the kindest words you could have said," Griner stated.

"This"—he said in referring to his career as National Vice President and National President—"has been a labor of love, doing something for the people I love."

"It is you," he said, in reviewing the union's growth and influence, "who did this, not John Griner."

"I just happened to be in the right place at the right time. You've come a long way, but you are just at the beginning."

"Finally," Griner concluded, "this is the last time I shall talk to the group of people

I love best, the finest group on God's green earth."

Typically, one of Griner's last requests was for some songs from one of his favorite singers, Timothy Green, a member of Local 916 at Tinker Air Force Base in Oklahoma City, who had come to the banquet.

Many members of Congress had found Griner a stubborn advocate and a canny negotiator on legislation, and a long list of management's top officials had discovered him to be a belligerent adversary on personnel policies that he felt denied Civil Service employees their rights, their equity, or simple justice.

This profound faith in the Civil Service, this complete identification with its employees, his devotion to AFGE, and finally, his cheerful willingness to give, ultimately, all he had to offer to his cause—these were the hallmarks of John F. Griner.

UNIONS ARE BUILT BY MEN LIKE JOHN GRINER, WHO OFFER A SPECIAL KIND OF TOUGH, SOLID LEADERSHIP

The following are excerpts from a statement made by AFL-CIO Secretary-Treasurer Lane Kirkland at a testimonial dinner tendered to retiring National President John F. Griner Jan. 27, 1973.

"Brother Griner serves with dedication and distinction, as a Vice President and a valued member of our (AFL-CIO) Executive Council. He has demonstrated there an uncommon talent for common sense, wise counsel and sound judgment. . . .

" . . . when other people were soapboxing about organizing the unorganized, John Griner was doing it—and doing it in one of the toughest fields, public employment. When John took over the reins of the union in 1962, it had under 100,000 members. . . . And within 10 years, under John's leadership, the membership tripled to over 300,000—and the union won representation rights for more than 600,000.

"But the union didn't just get bigger. It got smarter and more competent. You forged the instrumentalities a modern union needs to meet the complicated problems of public employment—to meet the complicated needs of a membership that is fifty-fifty blue collar and white collar.

"This is the stuff and substance of the labor movement. This is our day-to-day work. This is the core around which we build—and from which we reach out and place before society as a whole the large agenda of social and economic justice that is labor's program for America.

"This is not the stuff and substance of newspaper headlines. It won't get you on the 6 o'clock news—unless you go out on strike.

"But it is vitally important work—and it gets more important every day. It has to do with the quality of life—which is also to say the quantity of means—of millions of people. As life and work become more complex, the individual needs more than ever, not less, the protection of a strong and effective union.

"Such unions are built by men like John Griner, who offer a special kind of leadership. It's tough; it's solid; it's rooted in common sense. It solves problems. It's honest. It builds a record of achievement, not rhetoric.

"We need more of that leadership—not just in the labor movement but throughout American life."

MESSAGES OF CONDOLENCE

A flood of messages of condolence to President Emeritus John F. Griner's family and friends in AFGE was sent by members of the

Senate and House or published in the Congress and other messages follow:

Whereas, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the United States Senate is deeply appreciative of the contributions of John F. Griner to the formulation of legislation affecting the compensation, working conditions and benefits of Federal employees . . .

Resolved, that the Committee . . . does hereby express its condolences to the widow and family of, along with its unending appreciation for the contributions made by John F. Griner to the welfare of Government Employees.

Gale McGee, Chairman; Jennings Randolph, Quentin N. Burdick, Ernest F. Hollings, Frank E. Moss, Hiram L. Fong, Ted Stevens, Henry Bellmon and Robert J. Dole.

"John Griner was untiring in his efforts to better the lot of those whom he represented and to improve their working conditions and relationships. . . ."—John J. Flynn, Jr.

"His death will be deeply regretted by all Alaskans. I can only hope that John Griner's tradition of honest, strong representation of his constituents, and he had constituents in the same manner that we in Congress have constituents, will be remembered and continued. I shall miss him as a great American and as a good friend, and I extend my deepest sympathy to family."—Ted Stevens.

"I came to regard John Griner as a friend and adviser. I always found him to be a dedicated, fair and toughminded advocate for the well-being of all Civil Servants. Every Federal employee owes him a debt of gratitude for the many battles he led during his distinguished career. We will all miss him."—James M. Hanley.

"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 employees' interests."—Jerome R. Waldie.

"He was a devoted and dedicated leader who knew the value and necessity of effective representation for America's Civil Servants. 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."—Robert Dole.

"Even after John's retirement as President of the AFGE his presence was felt on the Hill 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 and better Government."—Quentin N. Burdick.

"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. . . . He was a man of courage who fought with all his heart and spirit for the principles in which he believed."—Jennings Randolph.

"The Government worker never had a more loyal friend or devoted servant than John Griner. Mrs. Daniels joins 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."—Dominick J. Daniels.

"John's unsurpassed effectiveness, dedication and loyalty protected the rights and enhanced the welfare of every employee of the

Government of the United States . . . Fortunately, John 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."—Carl Albert.

"Some of my earliest recollection of work on Federal employee legislation in the U.S. 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 POCS Committee were always appreciated."—Hiram L. Fong.

"It was with great sadness that I learned of the death of John Griner, who will long be remembered for his landmark accomplishments as the dedicated leader of the AFGE. His strength and dedication, his service and loyalty were admired by all who knew him. We on Capitol Hill will miss his wise counsel and vigorous leadership."—Hubert H. Humphrey.

"Few labor leaders have achieved the preeminence associated with John Griner's career. During his tenure as President, AFGE tripled its membership . . . His death is not only a profound loss to his friends, but an immense loss to hundreds of thousands of Civil Service employees who benefitted from his leadership."—Charles H. Wilson.

"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."—Frank E. Moss.

"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 AFGE and the Civil Service in general are the better for his service."—David N. Henderson.

POSSIBLE SHORTAGE OF NATURAL GAS

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, many of us heard Federal Energy Administrator, John C. Sawhill, remark on national television this past weekend that the United States faces a possible shortage of natural gas in the not-too-distant future. In that light, I would think it only logical that we do all we can to facilitate the delivery of this natural commodity, rather than impede it. The action of the Appropriations Committee in reducing the Department of the Interior's requested budget for environmental impact studies of natural gas pipelines from the Arctic Circle by \$1 million—from \$4.5 million to \$3.5 million—will unfortunately have that effect.

It has been estimated by the personnel within the Interior Department responsible for these studies that this cutback in funds could mean about a 3-month delay in the issuance of their reports. Now, to some this may not sound like an unreasonable amount of time—3 months—but this will have the resultant effect of postponing action by the Federal Power Commission which, after receiving these statements, must then decide who will build the pipeline network from Prudhoe Bay in Alaska to the lower 48, as many call the continental United States, and by what route this network will then travel.

As many of you may know, the Arctic gas consortium has already filed with the Federal Power Commission for permission to build a pipeline from Prudhoe

Bay, under which lie an estimated 26 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, to the Canadian-American border. This could link up with a proposed pipeline from the Mackenzie Delta in Canada which has approximately 7 trillion cubic feet of gas reserves. It is expected that the El Paso Co. will soon apply for a permit for the route from Prudhoe Bay but their plan involves gas liquefaction and transportation from Alaska through the Pacific Ocean to the west coast.

Well over 50 petitions to intervene in the FPC proceedings have been filed and accepted by that Agency. I personally joined with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BERGLAND), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FROELICH), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) in a petition to intervene. While I do not pretend to speak for the six others, I favor a route directly to the Midwest so that the citizens of those States are not shut off from needed gas supplies as may well be the case with the Alaskan oil which will go directly to the west coast.

But I would stress that a vote for this amendment to the Interior Department's appropriation would not have been construed as support for one route over the other. Rather, it would have been construed as a vote for an increased supply of natural gas when we may face severe shortages in the future. Speed is of the utmost importance. Any delay should be avoided in clearing the way for the delivery of this important gas. The \$1 million extra not appropriated this afternoon could have proved to be a valuable investment in our Nation's energy supplies. I am indeed sorry that the House of Representatives failed to so act. It was a serious mistake.

SENATE—Thursday, July 25, 1974

The Senate met at 10 a.m., and was called to order by Hon. LAWTON CHILES, a Senator from the State of Florida.

PRAYER

The Reverend B. Cortez Tipton, ACSW, executive director, Council of Churches of Greater Washington, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, enable us to know Thy mighty works. Help us to truly understand this great venture—our United States of America—as Your crucible of every national origin and faith. This honorable lawmaking body, the U.S. Senate, which is ever watchful of peace, freedom, and justice for this melting pot of human anticipation, is another example of Thy mighty works. Keep the Members thereof ever mindful of the rewards of their burdens.

Most Merciful Father, we are aware that the world awaits the finished product of our united efforts, the results of which will reveal the real worth and workings of freedom and progress. May we, as the constituency of Members of this Senate, be willing to undergird their

efforts, and demonstrate the responsibility that goes with this freedom we seek so diligently. For, indeed, we are thankful that this is in essence Your message to us who are privileged to work together for the improvement of the quality of man. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 25, 1974.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. LAWTON CHILES, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CHILES thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 24, 1974, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 367—NAMING DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, AND ITS CHAIRMAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the permission of the distinguished acting Republican leader, I would like at this time to send a resolution to the desk