By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 16152. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to permit the cumulation of amounts in controversy as between members of a class for the purposes of United States district court jurisdiction in class actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16153. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to increase the availability of the class action mechanism in Federal cases by permitting the creation of manageable subclasses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 16154. A bill to amend the Noise Control Act of 1972 and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall prescribe standards for the control and abatement of aircraft noise and sonic boom; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG (for himself and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.R. 16155. A bill to amend section 615 (a) of title 10, United States Code, relating to required service of members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. COLLINS of Illinois):

H.R. 16156. A bill to obtain adequate information essential to the decisions of the Congress; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 16157. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the interest on deposits in certain savings institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUKEN:

H.R. 16158. A bill to amend section 5051 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the Federal excise tax on beer); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. ABZUG, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 16160. A bill to limit the use of prison inmates in medical research; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 16161. A bill to provide tax incentives to encourage physicians, dentists, and optometrists to practice in physician shortage areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.J. Res. 1100. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the ratification of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRONIN (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. KYROS):

H.J. Res 1101. Joint resolution congratulating the Greek democracy on its efforts to achieve domestic peace and unity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Res. 1273. Resolution in support of continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H. Res. 1274. Resolution providing for radio and television broadcast coverage of proceedings in the Chamber of the House of Representatives on any resolution to impeach the President of the United States during the 93d Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CRONIN:

H. Res. 1275. 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. GUDE (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. ANDERSON OF Illinois, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. RIEGLE):

H. Res. 1276. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the U.S. Government should seek agreement with other members of the United Nations on prohibition of weather modification activity as a weapon of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. Res. 1277. 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. SHOUP:

H. Res. 1278. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. CONTE introduced a bill (H.R. 16162) for the relief of Smith College, Northhampton, Mass., which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

464. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Western Conference of the Council on State Governments, Salem, Oreg., relative to Federal-aid highways, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JAMES A. FARLEY

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week's issue of the Irish Echo offered its readers an interesting article regarding a special friend of mine—James A. Farley.

James Farley's life, as many of you know, has been a most rewarding one and certainly one which has brought much joy into the lives of those fortunate enough to call him a friend. He is always there with a kind word, a joke, and his tremendous insight into people and problems.

In light of the special qualities of James A. Farley, I would like to take this opportunity to include for the benefit of my colleagues the article which recently appeared in the Irish Echo—another fine tribute to a man who deserves special praise.

The article follows:

JAMES A. FARLEY: ELDER STATESMAN

(By Joe Murphy)

One of the nicer tints brightening the political spectrum during recent years is the universal admiration and affection exhibited toward James A. Farley, a professional who has been to the wars without losing his integrity or his self respect. Although he scrupulously shuns donning the toga of an Elder Statesman, audiences, especially those of a Democratic Party tinge, seem intent on communicating their vast esteem for him at every opportunity. He is still much too vigorous to hold still for the wise man role, but people seem dedicated to placing him in a niche removed from the less seemly facets of public life.

James Aloysius Farley was born in Grassy Point, New York, in 1888. Jim recalls that when he went to visit his father's people, in a town called Verplanck's Point, only a few miles away, he couldn't understand why all the Irish there were Republicans. He said: "I couldn't understand how an Irishman could be a Republican because in the community where I was born and raised all the Catholics were Democrats. As a matter of fact, in Grassy Point we had difficulty finding enough Republicans to man the election boards."

Jim says he eventually learned that a Peekskill politician was helping the Irish get jobs in the local brickyard and enrolling them in the Republican Party. As Jim says, the Irish largely voted as a bloc in the interests of self protection, but they also sought the protective coloration of the dominant party. "In Boston," Jim says, "they became Democrats because there were Democrats in Boston. But in Philadelphia politics was dominated by the Republicans, and in a large measure they became Republicans."

CAREER BEGINNINGS

Jim began his political career by getting himself elected district committeeman. Then, he was elected chairman, secretary and treasurer of the town committee, all three positions at once, when the other two members of the committee were at odds and couldn't agree, he recalls. "So I started from there and I was elected town clerk and served eight years. Finally, supervisor. Went to the New York State Assembly one year, and now you know the rest of it."

"The rest of it" is one of America's great success stories: Jim became head of the New York State Democratic Committee in 1930, and two years later successfully pushed the presidential nomination of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Becoming chairman of the National Committee, Farley managed F.D.R.'s presidential campaign with equal success and landed up in the cabinet as Postmaster General. He dropped out to mastermind Roosevelt's 1936 campaign after which he stepped back into his old cabinet job. By

1940, Jim had accumulated some presidential aspirations of his own, and when Roosevelt decided he wanted the job again, Farley dropped out of the cabinet and shed his party chairmanship. It took 20 years for someone else to bring to reality the dream Jim had nurtured: to become the first Irish Catholic President.

I count myself amongst the many privileged to be a friend of Jim for quite a few years. Once, I wrote to him incorrectly addressing his middle initial. In reply he reminded me: "Joseph, my middle initial is not J. but A. I know James J. too, and you probably do too." Largely by coincidence, this writer has many times been at affairs where the introduction of Jim Farley brought a heartfelt and spontaneous response. The standing ovation bit is the most overdone feature of the banquent circuit, a claque of about three stands up and the rest of the room is ashamed not to follow suit.

SINCERE TRIBUTE

But in the case of Big Jim the tribute strikes one as emanating from a deep desire to convey the audience's high regard for the man.

There is something heartening about all this: A feeling of events coming full circle to honor the man for his many contributions devoid of the sniping that marred the unhappy years. Deep down, I suspect Jim Farley believes he has never been given proper credit for the role he played in helping enact President Roosevelt's New Deal into law. Not too many years ago, critics dismissed him as a "conservative." This was in the days when one's attitude toward Soviet communism determined your classification as a "liberal" or a "conservative." Those who viewed communism tolerantly and believed the U.S. could accommodate itself to all things Russian automatically were designated "liberals." Others who, like Jim Farley, looked at Russia with suspicion, were branded "conservatives," although their support of liberal welfare measures had been a long standing commitment.

The former Postmaster General does some thinking about phoney liberalism. He said: "Today we are engaged in a great struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of totalitarianism. I hesitate to use the term forces of democracy, just as I hesitate to use the term liberal because both terms have been distorted by callous malice so that the most brutal of dictators claim to be the champions of democracy and the most intolerant of our fellowmen claim to be the only true liberals. Let me, then, say we seek freedom through a democratic form of government. Many Americans have risked their lives and given their lives to keep words like freedom and faith from being extinguished in a darkening world. And there are others ready to take the risk.

CANONS OF DECENCY

I'm not trying to adjust a halo on Big Jim's shiny pate, because he operated according to the rules of political warfare, which can be pretty r gged at times. What he has proven is that you can survive in this rough game and still abide by the canons of decency, respect for opponents and trust. He managed to do it, and it's a shame not enough of the new breed have pondered his example. Now he has come into the years of full recognition and his story reads very pleasantly over the long haul. Prestige wise, I would say he is ranked only by former Vice President Humphrey in the Democratic Party. Sen. Mansfield, Sen. Kennedy, Sen. Jackson and Sen. Byrd, to mention a few of the later generation, have years to go before they accumulate the record of public service, adherence to ideals and party loyalty built up by Jim for more than 40 years.

As I say, it's one of the nicer things I have seen recently, the spontaneous salute of admiration and affection showered on James A. Farley whenever people get the chance to demonstrate how they feel about him.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation lost a distinguished public servant this week when former Senator Wayne Morse passed away in Portland, Oreg., on Monday, July 22. Wayne Morse was in the midst of a vigorous campaign, attempting to regain the Senate seat he lost in 1968. His untimely death is a great loss to the people of Oregon, the Nation, and the U.S. Senate.

I wish to insert into the RECORD at this point, editorials and articles from the New York Times and the Washington Post memorializing his distinguished career:

[From the New York Times, July 23, 1974]

WAYNE MORSE DIES: A SENATOR 24 YEARS

(By Alden Whitman)

Former Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon, a strong early critic of the Vietnam war and a long-time Congressional liberal, died yesterday of kidney failure in Good Samaritan Hospital, Portland, Oreg. He was 73 years old.

Mr. Morse had entered the hospital last Wednesday in the midst of an arduous campaign in which his chances to regain the Senate seat he lost in 1968 were considered good. He had won the Democratic nomination in a primary two months ago and was opposing Senator Robert W. Packwood, the Republican incumbent.

A Populist in the tradition of George W. Norris, Robert M. La Follette and William Jennings Bryan, Wayne Lyman Morse spoke up for many transiently unpopular causes. He opposed American military involvement in Vietnam; he fought for trade unionism and for civil rights.

As a champion of the common people, he was often raspy and blunt, but he regarded himself as a man who refused to compromise his principles or mute his voice. Many of his critics, though, saw him as an opportunist and a threat to the Establishment.

At various times in his 24 turbulent years in the Senate, Mr. Morse was a Republican, an independent and a Democrat. Neither party was wholly pleased with him, nor was he ever wholly compatible with a party label. He was impartially scornful of both Democratic and Republican Presidents, upbraiding them with his rich talent for invective.

He described an address to Congress by President Harry S. Truman as "one of the cheapest exhibitions of ham acting I have ever seen"; he denounced President Dwight D. Eisenhower as a "hypocrite"; he accused President Lyndon B. Johnson of being "drunk with power." Nor did Mr. Morse spare his fellow Senators, once calling one of his corpulent colleagues "a tub of rancid ignorance."

CRUSTY CRITICS OF WAR

Mr. Morse entered the Senate in 1945 as a liberal Republican and left it in 1968 as a liberal Democrat. His last term was notable for his crusty criticism of President Johnson and the Vietnam war, which started with a succinct "nay" that recorded his opposition to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution of Aug. 7, 1964. Only one other Senator, the late Ernest Gruening of Alaska, voted against the measure, which President Johnson used as a functional declaration of war in Southeast Asia. Mr. Morse's intransigent opposition to the war was a factor in his defeat in 1968.

From 1964 until he left office, he voted against every measure, including appropriations, that had the effect of keeping American troops in Vietnam. He also carried his campaign against the war through the country in speeches, and he supported Senator Eugene J. McCarthy when the Minnesota Democrat sought the Presidency on an antiwar platform in 1968.

Once aroused, Mr. Morse could be a fiery, though prolix, speaker. His long-windedness did not sting nearly so much as his epithets; but he considered his outspokenness a virtue.

"It is true that I use language that people can understand," he remarked a couple of years ago. "And if I think a course of action is outlawry, I say so.

"If I say that the United States is the greatest threat to world peace, I say so simply because it is true. If the truth is intemperate, then I will continue to be intemperate."

Mr. Morse was so often in the minority and so frequently cutting in his remarks that he was known as "The Lone Ranger" or "The Tiger of the Senate." These views of him were softened yesterday as Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana, the Democratic leader, spoke of him as a "man of fierce independence" and Senator Mark O. Hatfield, Republican of Oregon, said that his "early prophecies and warnings about Vietnam were such that we all owe him a great debt."

Mr. Morse, who was a lean, trim man with a clipped mustache, sharp nose and bushy black eyebrows, was an extraordinarily hard-working Senator. He was accounted knowledgeable in labor and education matters, in conservation and in the farm problem. He was himself a breeder, raiser and trader of Devon cattle and a horseman who won many competitions.

Mr. Morse's Populism had its roots in Wisconsin, the home state of the LaFollettes, where he was born, a farmer's son, on Oct. 20, 1900. From his father, a livestock man, he learned a fear of debt and of hard times, when the cattle had to be fed on cornstalks and straw mixed with molasses. His father, Mr. Morse recalled, strongly counseled him on the evil of becoming beholden to others.

TAUGHT LAW AT COLUMBIA

The young man was educated at the University of Wisconsin and took law degrees from both the University of Minnesota and Columbia. He taught briefly at Columbia and the University of Oregon and then, in 1931, became dean of the Law School at Oregon. Because of his position he was often called upon to arbitrate labor disputes on the West Coast, establishing a reputation for settling controversies with dispatch and fairness.

His record commended him to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who named him a public member of the War Labor Board in 1942. He left in something of a storm in 1944 asserting that the board was too considerate of John L. Lewis, then head of the United Mine Workers.

In that year he was elected to the Senate as a Republican, but no sooner had he taken his seat in 1945 than he was jousting with party conservatives. One of his bêtes-noires was Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio, who was for Mr. Morse "a symbol of reaction and defeatism." Among other things, the Oregonian vociferously objected to the Taft-Hartley bill as hamstringing trade unions. He voted

against the bill, which became law in 1948 over President Truman's veto. (For most of his political life Mr. Morse enjoyed strong labor support. It diminished in 1968, when Vietnam was a critical issue.)

In the Republican jockeying in 1952, Mr. Morse swung to General Eisenhower in order to block Senator Taft's aspirations for the nomination. But he chilled toward the general when he designated Senator Richard M. Nixon of California as his running mate, and in the campaign he spoke for Adlai E. Stevenson, the Democratic candidate.

When the Senate convened in January, 1953, Mr. Morse announced that he had shucked the Republican party and was now an independent. With a pixie sense of humor he went into the Senate chamber with a folding chair and asked where he should sit. He was eventually assigned to the Republican side of the aisle, but was stripped of his committee posts.

Three years later, after having harried the Republicans over the Korean war settlement and cold-war brinkmanship, as well as over domestic matters, Mr. Morse became a Democrat and was handily reelected to the Senate in 1956. He still, however thrived on adversaries, including Democrats who failed to measure up to his principles.

And he did not neglect Republicans, notably Clare Booth Luce, whose confirmation as Ambassador to Brazil he fought unsuccessfully in 1959. Mr. Morse pronounced her unfit, and she retorted that her "difficulties go back some years and began when [Mr.] Morse was kicked in the head by a horse." She was alluding to an episode in 1951 when a horse broke the Senator's jaw with a kick. Mr. Morse won his contest with Mrs. Luce, however, for she resigned the Brazil post without serving.

In the early nineteen-fifties Mr. Morse was a strong supporter of civil rights legislation, and he continued to espouse liberal voting and other rights for blacks. He also supported increases in price-support payments to farmers and other agricultural legislation. Additionally, Federal support for education had his warm backing.

Mr. Morse irritated some of his fellow Senators by the length of his speeches. An hour for him was a mere warm-up—in one session his speeches covered 400 pages of The Congressional Record. Once, in 1953, he talked for 22 hours and 26 minutes against an offshore bill that gave title to coastal states. At the time his remarks were described as the longest continuous oration in the Senate's history.

His defeat by Mr. Packwood in 1968 was close, the margin being a little more than 3,000 votes. Mr. Morse essayed a comeback in 1971, but Mr. Hatfield was an easy winner. This year, despite his age, he was said to have a good chance of returning to the Senate for his last hurrah.

Mr. Morse was campaigning until last Wednesday, when he was stricken with an infection of the urinary tract. He had responded to antibiotic therapy until Sunday, when his condition worsened and he slipped into a coma.

Surviving are his widow, the former Mildred Downie; three daughters, Nancy Campbell, Judith Eaton and Amy Bilich; two brothers, a sister and six grandchildren.

[From the New York Times, July 23, 1974]

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 reelection as a Democrat. He did not disparage the party system as such; he just gave principle to 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 wrongheaded 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.

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1974]

WAYNE LYMAN MORSE

It is characteristic of the career of former Sen. Wayne Morse of Oregon, who died on Monday, that he should have been in the midst of a political battle right up to the end of his life. At the age of 73, he was doing what he had done through a half century of public service—he was waging vigorous combat. His most celebrated target was the war in Southeast Asia and he was the earliest and most outspoken opponent of that policy in the Senate, taking pride in the fact that he voted against every measure in support of that war that came before the Senate. On several occasions he was joined in that crusade by his friend from Alaska, Sen. Ernest H. Gruening, who died just a few weeks ago. After six terms in the Senate as a Republican, an independent and a Democrat, Sen. Morse was defeated in 1968 by a 3,000-vote margin.

He was in the midst of his second attempt at a come-back when his kidneys and heart failed him. Descriptive adjectives such as "maverick" and "combatative" were easy to apply to Wayne Morse. But the man did not lend himself that easily to labels. Born on a farm near Madison, Wis., Mr. Morse attended the University of Wisconsin for his undergraduate training, received a law degree from the University of Minnesota and went on to Columbia University for a doctorate in law. He made a major study of the grand jury system and it attracted the attention of officials of the University of Oregon. He was brought there as a professor and soon was made the dean, bypassing several older men to become the youngest law school dean in the nation at the age of 30.

His first national attention, typically, came as the result of a fight within the National War Labor Board, to which he had been appointed by President Roosevelt. Mr. Morse resigned from the Board after two years, in the midst of a loud policy disagreement. His loss to that body can be measured by the fact that he wrote more than half the board's opinions in the two years in which he served.

Although he had been a lifelong Republican, in 1952 he broke with his party and its leader, Dwight Eisenhower, and ran as an independent. He lost his committee assignments and languished in a no-man's land until he finally became a Democrat. One of his first contributions to his new-found party was to assist Richard Neuberger in becoming the first Democrat elected to the Senate from Oregon in 40 years. But soon, he and Neuberger were at war with each other in one of the Senate's most celebrated feuds.

He was cut from a mold that seems to fit few of our contemporary political leaders. It didn't bother him which way the wind was blowing. He would more likely go out and try to change its direction, unafraid to be the first to take a stand that might not be popular. He was prepared to disagree with his party or his President if he thought either to be wrong. He knew some of his positions would cost him votes, but he cared more about what he thought was right. Many a man who loses his office at 67 could be expected to retire to his farm. Wayne Morse was different. He loved the feel of movement and action, combat and discourse, and he set a standard of integrity and independence that will be difficult to match.

THE BICENTENNIAL

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial, WCBS–TV in New York intelligently addressed the issue of this Nation's 200th anniversary. Entitled "America's Birthday," it ably stated the management's view of what the Bicentennial celebration should be. It is now submitted for the thoughtful attention of my colleagues:

AMERICA'S BIRTHDAY

Two years from today America will observe its 200th birthday. It is the oldest democracy in the world and that's something to celebrate.

But what worries us is that the celebration may become an orgy of merchandising with everything from surfboards to sealing wax stamped with the word "Bicentennial." This event is too important to be left to the hucksters and souvenir salesmen. We think the money changers should be chased out of the temple and the sacred take precedence over the profane. What we'd like to see are communities all over the country participating in the bicentennial with projects that commemorate America's heritage, support its arts and enhance its future. The newly formed American Revolution Bicentennial Administration in Washington will be coordinating these activities and is encouraging local groups to come up with projects of special interest to their communities. Thousands of projects are already in the works—projects ranging from restoring a building, to planning a pocket park to running an essay contest. If your community has a project it would like to dedicate to the bicentennial you can contact the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, 777 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017. And find out how to get started, where to get help and even funds.

The Bicentennial is a kind of punctuation mark. Coming at the end of one of the most traumatic periods in American history when the ordeals of Vietnam and Watergate will blessedly be behind us, it will be a perfect opportunity for Americans to take stock, set goals and move ahead—not disillusioned because the system is imperfect but encouraged because the system has survived and served them as well as it has.

The bicentennial then should not be a birthday party but a rebirth.

Presented by Sue Cott, Editorial Associate, July 4, 1974 at 6:55 P.M.

NO ROOM LEFT FOR INDIVIDUAL MERIT?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have just come across an affirmative action plan prepared by the Bureau of Post-secondary Education in the Office of Education. The recommendations contained in this plan can only be described as outrageous.

The stated objective of the plan is—

To achieve a distribution of people in the professional grades which reflects the make-up of the total work-force according to sex, race and ethnic background.

It then proposes specific quotas for employment from grade 5 through grade 16.

Is the concept of individual merit to be discarded even by those who supposedly promote the cause of education? I sincerely hope that this will not be the case. Each individual seeking employment or promotion should be judged on his or her own merit and ability to do the job, not on sex, race, or ethnic background.

As the United States approaches its 200th anniversary, I think we would do well to remember that quota systems are basically collectivist and run counter to the principle of individual liberty. If we truly want to tear down the barriers of discrimination, we should talk about the character and qualities of the individual, not his or her group.

Following is the text of the third recommendation of the Bureau's affirmative action plan:

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN RECOMMENDATION 3—INCREASE NUMBER OF WOMEN AND MINORITIES IN PROFESSIONAL AND PARA-PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

SITUATION

At present there are only four Spanish-speaking and one Oriental American in the Bureau and no Indian Americans. Women are underrepresented in Grades 13 through 15 and blacks in Grades 12 and 15. In addition, black men are underrepresented in most professional grades compared with black women.

OBJECTIVE

Our objective is to achieve a distribution of people in the professional grades which reflects the make-up of the total work-force according to sex, race and ethnic background.

REMEDIAL ACTION

The following goals and actions are proposed to achieve the stated objective:

a. Recruitment for Grades GS–5 to GS–7 should reflect the make-up of the total work-force as regards sex, race and ethnic background. Vacancies above GS–7 should be filled by promoting from within the maximum extent possible. Only when it can be clearly shown that qualified Bureau or other OE personnel are not available to fill these vacancies is it permissable to recruit from the outside. The one exception to this requirement relates to recruitment of Spanish-speaking, Oriental and Indian Americans as indicated below under paragraph b.

b. Goals for filling vacant positions either by promotion from within or by outside recruitment:

1. GS–12: At least 33 percent must go to blacks.

GS–13: At least 67 percent must go to women and minorities. At least one-third of this percentage must go to minorities.

GS–14: At least 50 percent must go to women and minorities. At least one-third of this percentage must go to minorities.

GS–15: At least 50 percent must go to women and minorities. At least one-third of this percentage must go to minorities.

2. In the hiring of blacks in grades GS–5 to GS–12, preference should be given to hiring black men.

3. In grades GS–5 to GS–15, we should recruit 10 Spanish-speaking, 3 Oriental and 3 Indian Americans.

4. In recruiting clerical personnel, preference should be given to hiring Spanish-speaking Americans.

5. In filling GS–16 positions, preference should be given to women.

c. The Bureau Affirmative Action Officer should monitor all upgradings to ensure that they are being made in an equitable manner.

Title of responsible official: Bureau Affirmative Action Officer.

Target date: June 30, 1975.

EVALUATION/MONITORING

Monthly reports should be issued showing hires and promotions for the preceding month broken down by sex and racial/ethnic groups. A summary report for the preceding three months should be issued at the end of each quarter. If the quarterly summary shows substantial deviation from the affirmative action goals, the Divisions could be required to confine all hires and/or promotions to target groups affected by the shortfall until the Bureau is back on target. Exceptions to this requirement would have to be strongly justified by the Associate Commissioner seeking the exception and would have to be approved by the Deputy Commissioner.

A file should be kept on all applications from minorities and women. A record should also be maintained on all female and minority applicants who are interviewed for jobs in the Bureau, including interviewer's evaluation of applicant and reason for not selecting if applicant is not hired.

NOTE

The Office of Education Equal Employment Opportunity Office has informed us that the basis for determining adequate representation of minorities in the workforce at OE headquarters is as follows:

Grades 1 through 6 should reflect the racial/ethnic composition of the District of Columbia; Grades 7 through 12 should reflect the racial/ethnic composition of the Washington metropolitan area; Grades 13 through 18 should reflect the racial/ethnic composition of the nation. The relevant percentages for blacks, Spanish-speaking and American Indians are as follows:

District of Columbia: 72% Black, 2% Spanish-speaking, 1% Indian.

Washington Metropolitan area: 24% Black, 2.5% Spanish-speaking, 1% Indian.

Nation: 11% Black, 5% Spanish-speaking, 1.5% Indian.

No comparable percentages have yet been established for determining adequate representation of women in our workforce. However, it was the Committee's feeling that a 50–50 split in the professional grades should serve as the long-range goal.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT ISSUED

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, today I am issuing a report of my personal finances to my constituents and I want to share it—as well as the reasons for my action—with my colleagues.

Today, we find ourselves serving the people in a great period of distrust, of skepticism of the motives and acts of public officials.

This concerns me greatly, as I believe our Nation can only be strong if those of us in public service have the faith and trust of American citizens.

Members of Congress, in my view, have an opportunity, and a responsibility, to help dispel distrust and to encourage a renewed faith in our system of government and those who participate in it.

In the 1st session of the 93d Congress, I introduced H.R. 4623, which requires that all Members of Congress issue public personal financial statements.

This requirement, administered on an equitable across-the-board basis, would be a substantial step toward helping to establish a more open relationship between officeholder and constituent. It would help reduce, I am convinced, some of the skepticism that now exists.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am herewith including in the RECORD a statement of my personal assets and liabilities in the hope that this will, in some small way, help to achieve the goal that I have mentioned.

My financial statement follows:

COOPERS & LYBRAND,

Trenton, N.J., May 15, 1974.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. FORSYTHE: We have made an examination of the accompanying personal statement of assets and liabilities as of December 31, 1973.

The nature of personal accounts, with the absence of control over the creation and recording of personal liabilities, etc. makes an examination of any but recorded transactions impracticable. Therefore, our examination consisted of the following:

1. Confirmation of balances in bank accounts at December 31, 1973.

2. Examination of securities on hand or examination of evidential matter indicating ownership of securities at December 31, 1973.

3. Determination of fair market values of securities of publicly held corporations at December 31, 1973.

4. Examining data as to the tax or other basis of other securities.

5. Examining confirmations of cash surrender value of life insurance policies at December 31, 1973. Such confirmations were obtained directly by us.

6. Examining statement of account indicating the amount of funds in the U.S. government retirement program account.

7. Examination of real estate tax assessment notices to determine estimated fair market value of property.

8. Confirmation of mortgage payable with the mortgagee.

Due to the lack of marketability of other securities as referred to in Note, 1, we could not satisfy ourselves as to the proper valuation of such securities. However, we did de-

termine that such securities were recorded at the tax or other basis as indicated in Note 1. Due to the nature of the assets, we were also unable to determine the propriety of the amounts estimated as approximating current market value for the home furnishings, personal automobiles and office equipment as recorded in the personal statement of assets and liabilities and as referred to in Note 3.

In our opinion, subject to the above comments relating to the carrying values of other securities and of home furnishings, personal automobiles and office equipment and subject to the examination of only recorded transactions, the accompanying personal statement of assets and liabilities fairly present the assets and liabilities of Edwin B. and Mary McK. Forsythe as of December 31, 1973 on a cash basis.

(s) COOPERS & LYBRAND,
Certified Public Accountant.

EDWIN B. AND MARY MCK. FORSYTHE, PERSONAL STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES, DECEMBER 31, 1973

ASSETS

Cash on hand and in bank accounts	$23,327
Cash surrender value of life insurance	29,584
U.S. Government retirement program account	10,464
Securities of publicly held corporations at market value	27,146
Other securities (note 1)	66,045
Real estate—residence (note 2)	32,400
Home furnishings, personal automobiles and office equipment (note 3)	16,500
Total assets	205,466

LIABILITIES AND NET WORTH

Mortgage payable on home (note 2)	4,000
Net worth	201,466
Total liabilities and net worth	205,466

NOTES TO PERSONAL STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

1. Other securities consist of stock in closely held corporations and of a partnership interest for which market values could not be obtained due to the lack of a public market. These securities have been recorded at the tax or other basis (as indicated below) due to the absence of any independent source of market value. The securities involved and the nature of the applicable businesses are as follows:

Name and nature of business	Basis	Shares
D. G. Brown, Inc., common stock; dairy store	[1] $1,200	12
Locust Lane Farm Dairy, Inc., common stock; rental of building and dairy equipment, Moorestown, N. J.	[1] 53,600	536
J. B. VanSciver, class A preferred $100 par value; furniture store	[2] 100	1
Locust Lane Farm Dairy (a partnership); rental of trucks and equipment	[3] 11,145	(4)
Total	66,045	

[1] Represents tax basis.
[2] Represents par value.
[3] Represents amount of capital account at Dec. 31, 1971.
[4] 50 percent interest.

2. Real estate—residence—consists of land and a single family, three story residential dwelling at 265 West Second Street in Moorestown, New Jersey. The property is recorded at its assessed value.

The property is the personal dwelling of Mr. and Mrs. Forsythe. The property was purchased in 1940 for $4,500 and is subject to a mortgage of $4,000 as of December 31, 1971.

3. Home furnishings, personal automobiles and office equipment are recorded at amounts estimated by Mr. and Mrs. Forsythe to approximate fair market value.

Home furnishings	$10,000
Personal automobiles (1966 Chevrolet and 1973 Chrysler)	4,000
Office equipment	2,500
Total	16,500

SECURITIES OF PUBLICLY HELD CORPORATIONS AT MARKET VALUE

	Number of shares	Market value
Securities:		
Amtek	22	$275.00
A.T. & T.	6	300.75
American Express	90	4,050.00
Arizona Public Service	26	471.25
Atlantic City Electric	119	2,037.88
Bank of America	24	1,119.00
Chessie	5	355.78
Columbia Broadcasting	10	256.25
Continental Can Co	44	902.00
Exxon Corp	10	941.25
Investment Trust Boston	1,083.199	10,582.85
Massachusetts Investment Trust	38,540	467.30
Midlantic Bank Inc	41	1,148.00
Philadelphia Electric	10	540.00
Public Service Electric & Gas	25	459.38
Strawbridge & Clothier	10	217.50
Utah Power & Light	18	630.00
Warner Co	33	288.75
Wellington Fund	183.383	1,663.28
Total		26,706.22
Miscellaneous stocks: Corporations	75	440.14
Grand total		27,146.36

SECURITY AND COMMODITY TRANSACTIONS DURING 1973

Sold—58 shares, First National Bank of Moorestown, N.J., by Mrs. Forsythe—$2,465.

Purchased—1 share, Strawbridge & Clothier—$21.18, 3 shares, Philadelphia Electric Co.—$56.25 (both by Mr. Forsythe).

Received—111.147 shares, Investment Trust of Boston, mutual fund. Reinvestment of dividends and capital gains—$1227.27 (jointly owned).

1.763 shares, Massachusetts Investment Trust, mutual fund, reinvestment of dividends by Mr. Forsythe—$22.73.

3 shares, Midlantic Bank, Inc., stock dividend plus cash, by Mr. Forsythe—$29.52.

4.104 shares, Wellington Fund, mutual fund, reinvestment of capital gains—$44.32.

There were no commodity or real estate transactions during 1973.

INCOME

Salary	$42,500
Interest, dividends, gifts ($417) (no honorariums)	3,285
Gross income	45,785
Income tax paid 1973, joint return	10,527

PADEREWSKI—ARTIST AND STATESMAN

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 33d anniversary of the death of a great Pole and a great citizen of the world. Ignace Jan Paderewski, a great artist, statesman, humanitarian, died on June 29, 1941, in the United States, the country which adopted him as its own son.

Ignace Jan Paderewski will forever be remembered and honored as one of the greatest concert pianists and artists of all times. The Americans for whom he played mostly, and where he resided a great part of his life, will forever cherish his memory as an artist.

But Paderewski was also a great patriot and statesman. Poland and her independence were the second consuming love of his life. When World War I broke out in 1914, he canceled his concert tours and launched on a distinguished career of personal service to his homeland.

He devoted his time, talents, and money to the Polish cause. He is generally credited with having been greatly instrumental in convincing President Woodrow Wilson of the necessity of making free and independent Poland one of the conditions of the Versailles Treaty.

In 1918, this inspired patriot returned to Poland and on January 17, 1919, became acclaimed as the first premier of the new born republic. Truly it can be said that he had a dominant part in welding his beloved Poland into an autonomous and independent state.

After the German Army overran Poland in 1940, he again accepted the presidency of the Polish Parliament in exile. It is noteworthy to comment that the government in exile was the sole legitimate government of the people of Poland, ready to assume its rightful position when freedom and liberty would have been restored to Poland during those hectic war years.

Paderewski's body lies today in Arlington Cemetery, not as a permanent resting place, but only temporarily, until a free Poland is restored. It was always his wish and prayer that some day his body could be laid in permanent rest in a free Poland, which he loved so dearly.

It is my fond hope, and that of every advocate of freedom and justice in the entire world and the day may soon come when freedom will be restored to the people of Poland, the land of the great and immortal Ignace Jan Paderewski.

NORTH CAROLINA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION SUPPORTS LEGISLATION TO SAVE NEW RIVER

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, the North Carolina Farm Bureau has actively supported legislation which will provide that a portion of the New River in North Carolina and Virginia be studied for possible inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

If this river is not saved, agricultural land worth in the area of $8.5 million will be destroyed by the proposed Blue Ridge

power project. This very serious question was also addressed by Representative ROY TAYLOR, chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, when he said:

It is worth mentioning also that much of the 40,000 acres which would be flooded by construction of the dams is productive agricultural land. Our needs for power are currently a subject of much discussion. I wonder if our needs for food may someday be even more critical.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert the text of a letter I have received from Mr. B. C. Mangum, president of the North Carolina Farm Bureau Federation:

NORTH CAROLINA
FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Raleigh, N.C., July 25, 1974.

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

DEAR WILMER: This is to voice our support for your efforts to have the New River in Ashe and Alleghany counties added to the Scenic River System. This is important legislation for landowners of this particular section of the state.

You are no doubt aware of the vigorous support that we gave to legislation in the General Assembly (H. 1433) that would add New River to the North Carolina Scenic River System. This legislation was strongly supported by the Ashe and Alleghany County Farm Bureaus and was enacted by an overwhelming majority. That intense effort and support indicates our interest in this matter.

We congratulate you for your action and offer our assistance in any way you deem helpful in achieving a successful conclusion.

Warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

B. C. MANGUM,
President.

THE MILITARY OBLIGATION—IS 6 YEARS TOO LONG?

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, Congress decided last year to establish the military forces of this country on a voluntary basis and abolished the involuntary draft. The Marines, the Navy, and the Air Force were expected to be able to meet their manpower requirements, and, in fact, have done so. The Army was considered the most likely branch of the services to have difficulty in meeting its quotas.

Secretary of the Army Callaway has reported the Volunteer Army is doing its job.

But it is time to deal with another question raised by the abolition of the draft.

I refer to the present 6-year military obligation.

To rectify this situation I have introduced legislation to reduce the military obligation of armed service members from 6 to 3 years, unless they have voluntarily agreed to serve a longer period on active duty to repay the services for specialized training or for other considerations.

The National Guard should benefit especially from this bill, since it is becoming harder and harder to interest Americans in attending drills and training duty for a 6-year period. To ask an 18-year-old to commit a period of time longer than college, and amounting to a third of his age, is asking more than many devoted and patriotic young Americans feel they can commit. In a sense, a 6-year obligation asks for a long-term commitment without experience, without testing.

Our military forces should be dedicated enough, interesting enough, and good enough to attract young Americans without demanding a long-term commitment—sight unseen.

In addition, a shorter obligation could attract volunteers who are not willing to commit to a 6-year enlistment but who might change their mind after becoming members of the Armed Forces.

For these reasons, among others, Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this legislation.

ON IMPEACHMENT

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be interesting to my colleagues to include in the RECORD my opening remarks in the House Committee on the Judiciary on the subject of impeachment of the President.

My statement follows:

REMARKS OF HON. DAVID W. DENNIS ON IMPEACHMENT DELIBERATIONS

Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues of the Committee:

All of us are agreed that this is the most important vote any one of us is likely ever to cast as a member of the Congress. Only a vote on a declaration of war, I suppose, might be considered as of equal gravity. All of us, I think—while keenly aware of immediate political implications—would like, on this vote, to be right; to do right; and to be recorded as having been right in the long light of history.

This is an emotional matter we have before us, loaded with political overtones, and replete with both individual and national tragedy; yet I suggest that we will judge it best and most fairly, and with the most chance of arriving at our goal of being right, if we approach it dispassionately, and analyze it professionally as lawyers who are engaged in the preparation and in the assessment of a case.

In doing this, of course, we cannot approach or decide this important matter on the basis of whether we like or dislike President Nixon, whether we do or do not in general support his policies, or on the basis of whether we either in 1972 did, or now in 1974 would, vote for him for high office.

The question, rather, is whether or not proof exists—convincing proof of adequate weight and evidentiary competence—to establish that the President of the United States has been guilty of high crimes and misdemeanors within the meaning of the Constitution, so as to justify the radical action of his impeachment and removal in disgrace from the high office to which he was elected by the American people, and which he now holds by virtue of their vote.

Although many charges and allegations have been levied against the President before our Committee, and it has been difficult even to this late hour to determine exactly what Articles of Impeachment will finally be proposed, it is my understanding that the principal charges against the President with which we have to deal are divided into three general categories, and it is to these that I shall chiefly address my remarks in the brief time which is allotted.

These general categories are:

1. The obstruction of justice in the so-called Watergate cover-up;
2. Alleged abuse of Executive Power;
3. The failure of the President to comply with the subpoenas of this Committee.

All of these categories have sub-headings, and specific items of evidence, to which I shall address myself in the course of these remarks.

It is my judgment, for reasons which I hope, at least in part, to indicate, that only the first of these categories—the so-called Watergate cover-up—presents us with any really serious problem for our decision; I shall therefore address myself to the second and third categories—alleged abuse of power and non-compliance with subpoenas—in the first instance, and rather briefly, and shall use the balance of my time in a slightly more extensive analysis of the alleged Watergate cover-up—following, thereafter, with my conclusions as to the merits of the case.

Turning first to the matter of failure to observe or to comply with the subpoenas of the Committee on the Judiciary:

We have, of course, had a landmark decision of the Supreme Court of the United States just yesterday which has decided, for the first time, that a generalized and unlimited executive privilege cannot be exercised to over-ride specific subpoenas issued by a Special Prosecuting Attorney in furtherance of the prosecution of a criminal case.

This decision does not bear directly on nor, as a matter of law, does it enhance the power of this Committee to issue subpoenas in these impeachment proceedings against the President of the United States, because, very unfortunately, as I believe, this Committee has declined and refused to test and to determine its Constitutional powers in the Courts of this country, despite the well-known statement of Chief Justice Marshall in *Marbury* v. *Madison* that "It is emphatically the province and duty of the Judicial Department to say what the law is."

I believe, however, that the power of this Committee in respect to the issuance of subpoenas in impeachment proceedings is at least equal to—and is, in all probability, the superior of—the power of the Special Prosecuting Attorney.

This decision, therefore, although we are not a party to the litigation, and derive no actual rights therefrom, very well may—and, in my judgment in all probability will—result in the furnishing to this Committee of additional relevant and highly material evidence which, up to this time, we do not have.

It is my judgment that should it appear that such evidence will be available to us within a reasonably short period of time, then it will become our positive duty to delay a final vote in these important proceedings until we have examined this additional evidence.

In assessing the President's past treatment of the subpoenas of this Committee, however, we have no right whatever to consider yesterday's decision of the United States Supreme Court because, in addition to the fact that we are not a party to the cause, this decision, of course had not been handed down when our subpoenas were served, or when the President took his stand in respect thereto.

At that point the President simply asserted what he stoutly maintained to be a Constitutional right—and which he is, in fact, still legally free to assert to be a Constitutional right so far as this Committee is con-

cerned; and we, on the contrary, asserted a Constitutional right in opposition to the Presidential claim.

Such a conflict is properly one for resolution by the Courts, and absent a binding and definitive decision between the parties by the Judicial branch, it escapes me on what ground it can properly be asserted that a claim of Constitutional right is, in any sense, an abuse of power.

II. ALLEGED ABUSE OF POWER

Turning to further alleged abuses of power, I look to the proposed articles which we have before us.

In proposed Article II these abuses of power are alleged to be:

1. *Illegal Surveillance*, but the 17 wire-taps chiefly complained of under this heading were all instituted before the *Keith* decision, and were not only presumptively legal at that time, but are probably legal in large part also today since many, if not all of them, had international aspects, a situation in which the need for a court order was specifically not passed upon in the *Keith* decision.

2. Use of the executive power to unlawfully establish a special investigative unit "—to engage in unlawful covert activities—". But it was not unlawful, so far as I am advised, to establish the plumbers' unit; and I suggest that proof is lacking that the President intended for it to, or authorized it to, engage in unlawful covert activities. In like manner it is certainly not established as a fact that the purpose of the Fielding burglary was "to obtain information to be used by Richard M. Nixon in public defamation of Daniel Ellsberg", nor is there any substantial evidence that the President knew of or authorized this burglary before it took place. In fact when Dean told the President about the Fielding break-in on March 17, 1973, the President said, "What in the world—what in the name of God was Ehrlichman having—in the Ellsberg. . . . This is the first I ever heard of this."

3. *Alleged Abuse of the IRS.* Without going into detail I suggest that the evidence here—so far as the President is concerned—is one of talk only, and not of action; that the independent attempted actions of Dean, Haldeman, and Ehrlichman were unsuccessful and ineffective; and that the only direct evidence of an alleged Presidential order (in the Wallace case) is a hearsay statement of Clark Mollenhoff that Mr. Haldeman said to him that the President requested him to obtain a report—which is, of course, not competent proof of anything.

Other allegations of alleged misuse and abuse of the FBI and the CIA can, in the interests of time, be best considered under the heading of alleged obstruction of justice; and the matter of refusing to honor Judiciary Committee subpoenas has already been discussed.

III. ALLEGED OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE

The first specific action listed here, as implementing the President's alleged "policy", is "Making false and misleading statements to lawfully authorized investigative officers". It would be interesting to have the authors and backers of this allegation particularly plead and prove to whom, and when, the President was guilty of making such false statements; and it would be relevant to inquire whether these false statements, if any, were in fact made to an investigative officer when and while he was engaged in his investigative function.

If the President was guilty of "counseling witnesses to give false statements", again some specificity in pleading and proof are much to be desired. I do recall that he had everybody go up to the Senate and testify without immunity, and that he counseled John Dean (not very effectively it would appear) to always tell the truth—pointing out that Alger Hiss would never have gone to jail if he had done so.

Whether the President had a design to, or attempted to, interefere with or obstruct the Watergate investigation conducted by the FBI, by a phony attempt to enlist the possibility of CIA involvement, or whether he genuinely believed—due to the personnel concerned, the Mexican connection, and other circumstances—that there might well be a CIA or national security involvement, appears to me to be a debatable proposition; and, in any case, the CIA disavowed involvement and the delay caused by this episode was for a few days only.

I predict that the allegations respecting alleged corrupt offers or suggestions of executive clemency will, on the record of our hearings to date, fall far short in proof; and I believe that the testimony before us of Henry Petersen himself very adequately answers the allegation of wrongfully disseminating information received from the Department of Justice to subjects of the investigation.

The matter of the payment to E. Howard Hunt of $75,000, apparently on the evening of March 21, 1973, is probably the most dangerous single incident so far as the President is concerned, because there is no doubt that in the conversation of March 21, 1973 the President more than once stated, and in dramatic fashion, that in order to buy time, in the short run, a payment to Hunt was apparently necessary.

But in the same conversation the following exchange took place:

The President says: "But in the end, we are going to be bled to death. And in the end, it is all going to come out anyway. Then you get the worst of both worlds. We are going to lose, and people are going to—."

H: "And look like dopes!"

P: "And in effect, look like a cover-up. So that we can't do."

And John Dean told the Senators, "The money things was left hanging—nothing was resolved".

More importantly, the March 21 payment to Hunt was the last in a long series of such payments, engineered by Mitchell, Haldeman, Dean and Kleindienst, and later on LaRue, all so far as appears, without the President's knowledge or complicity. And as to the payment of March 21 the evidence appears to establish that it was set up and arranged for by conversations between Dean and LaRue and LaRue and Mitchell, before Dean talked to the President on the morning of the 21st of March. So that even if the President was willing, and even had he ordered it (as to which the proof falls short) it would appear that this payment was in train and would have gone forward, had Dean never talked to the President on March 21 at all. We need to remember, moreover, that despite my insistence and repeated request our Committee never bothered to call Howard Hunt, the reputed blackmailer, and a central figure in this case, at all.

And where cover-up is considered we need to remember that, after all, the President became fully aware and took charge on March 21 and by April 30 Haldeman, Ehrlichman, and Dean had all left the government for good, and now are dealing as they should with the strictures of the criminal law.

IV. CONCLUSION

Time does not permit a further analysis of the great mass of evidence involved. But, in conclusion, I would like to leave with you a few thoughts—the first again legal, and finally a more general word.

First, if we bring this case and carry it through the House and into the Senate we will have to prove it. We will have to prove it by competent evidence. The managers on the part of the House will have to make the case. At that point hearsay will not do. Inference upon inference will not do. *Ex parte* affidavits will not do. Memoranda will not do. Prior recorder testimony in other legal proceedings to which the President was not a party will not serve the purpose. The witnesses never called in our investigation—some of them never interviewed—will have to be called, and will have to be relied on. Someone will have to present this case in the cold light of a judicial day.

Unless the legally provable case is clearly there, we ought not to attempt it; we ought not to bring on this trauma, in justice to the President, in fairness to ourselves, and in consideration of the welfare of the country.

These, I submit, are serious reasons against the bringing of a probably unsuccessful prosecution.

For any prosecution will divide this country. It will tear asunder the Republican Party for many years to come—and this is bad for the country, which depends for its political health on a strong two-party system. And impeachment is radical surgery on the tip of a cancer which needs therapy at the roots.

I am as shocked as anyone by the misdeeds of Watergate. Richard Nixon has much to answer for, and he has even more to answer for to me—as a conservative Republican—than he does to my liberal-lining friends on the other side of the aisle. But I join in no political lynching where the hard proof fails as to this, or as to any other President; and I suggest this:

What is needed is moral and political reform in America. The Nixon administration is not the first to be guilty of shoddy practices which, if not established as grounds for impeachment, are nonetheless inconsistent with the better spirit of America.

Neither the catharsis of impeachment nor the trauma of a political trial will cure this illness of the spirit. We are all too likely to pass through this crisis and then forget reform for another 20 years. Our business here in the Congress is basically a legislative and not a judicial function. Lacking as we do a clear and convincing legal case which all reasonable Americans must and will accept, we would do better to retain the President we, in our judgment, elected to the office, for the balance of his term; and, in the meantime, place our energy and spend our time on such pressing matters as:

1. Real campaign reform;
2. A sound financial policy to control and contain inflation;
3. Energy and the environment;
4. War and peace;
5. Honesty throughout government;
6. The personal and economic rights and liberties of the individual citizen as against private agglomerations of power and the monolithic state.

There will be another Presidential election in 1976, and the United States of America can enter her 200th year without having discharged our collective frustrations and purged our individual sins by the political execution of the imperfect individual whom we put in office and who, in both his strength and in his weakness, perhaps represents us all too well.

HON. WAYNE MORSE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I join hundreds of my colleagues and millions of my fellow Americans in paying tribute to the late Wayne Morse:

A man who placed personal principles above petty, partisan politics.

A politician who refused to become part of the pack. From farm legislation to civil rights to his historic vote on the

Gulf of Tonkin resolution, Wayne Morse stood alone, above the mediocre.

As the New York Times wrote in an editorial:

At his death, he was in the thick of a fight to make a last comeback to the United States Senate. The Senate lost.

We all lost.

THE OIL CRISIS AND THE VALUE OF PROFITS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, many men in public life took the occasion of the oil shortage to teach the American people some economic "facts of life" which have no relationship whatever to economic reality.

The shortage of petroleum products was brought about, in large measure, because of Government policies. On the one hand, price controls on natural gas increased the demand for petroleum products and made it unprofitable to produce additional natural gas. On the other hand, Government-imposed import quotas kept the supply of petroleum artificially low. While Government increased the demand, Government also limited the supply. The result: long lines at gas stations throughout the country.

Yet, while Government itself was clearly to blame, many sought to blame business and industry instead. The oil companies, we were told, had artificially limited supplies in order to bolster profits. This was demonstrably untrue, for it had been the oil companies themselves who had warned for many years about the dangerous shortages ahead if Government interventionist policies were to continue.

Politicians and journalists picked on the easy target—big business—rather than the real culprit.

In his commentary on the Mutual Broadcasting Network for June 24, 1974, Robert F. Hurleigh points out that:

The entire increase in profits reported by the oil companies in the first quarter will not be sufficient to offset the additional cost of replacing the inventories which were brought before the cost of crude oil from overseas more than doubled in price. And it's conceivable that the oil companies will have a decline in profits in the very near future. Even so, industry is investing almost $3.5 billion here in the United States and $1.5 billion elsewhere in the first quarter of this year alone. And that expenditure in the United States is more than twice as large as the oil company profits.

These facts were presented by the senior oil analyst of the Chase Manhattan Bank, whose job it is to place facts before the investment community for decision. Mr. Hurleigh concludes that:

Any fair minded person must admit that the picture of the oil industry was forced out of focus by those who seized upon the energy crunch of a few months ago to make personal political capital out of an international economic crisis.

I wish to share Robert F. Hurleigh's thoughtful analysis with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

COMMENTARY BY ROBERT F. HURLEIGH

It was just a few months ago that most of us experienced the frustration of waiting in long lines at gas stations and then being told when we did reach the pump that we could only obtain a certain amount of gas. All these frustrations were duly recorded in all media, day after day for the several months during the energy crisis which followed the Arab states' use of the oil embargo as a weapon in the war with Israel, last year. A number of politicians, noting the discomfiture and growing anger of the consumer, began pointing the finger of blame at the oil industry, knowing they would be given national attention by the media. Some of the charges were based on sound information, but many, many more were in the form of sheer demagoguery. And when the oil companies began to report their annual profits, and their first quarter profits for this year, the political blame-casters thundered that the profits were "obscene". There is no doubt that the increases in revenues and profits were indeed extraordinary. But there were few to caution that the situation which brought the oil embargo, the oil crisis and the high profits were themselves most extraordinary.

But that abnormal gain in profits appears to be of short duration, because it is not forecast as a conservative estimate, that the entire increase in profits reported by the oil companies in the first quarter will not be sufficient to offset the additional cost of replacing the inventories which were bought before the cost of crude oil from overseas more than doubled in price. And it's conceivable that the oil companies will have a decline in profits in the very near future. Even so, industry is investing almost $3.5 billion here in the United States and $1.5 billion elsewhere in the first quarter of this year alone. And that expenditure in the United States is more than twice as large as the oil company profits! This is not information gathered from the oil industry—but hard facts presented by the senior oil analyst of the Chase Manhattan Bank, whose job it is to place the facts before the investment community for decision. Any fair-minded person must admit that the picture of the oil industry was forced out of focus by those who seized upon the energy crunch of a few months ago to make personal political capital out of an international economic crisis. The report on the "Petroleum Situation" by Chase Manhattan is for release today. You may want to keep an eye on the situation yourself, and just note how much coverage this situation report is given since the energy problem is still with us. You may be interested to see whether or not this decline in profits gets the same sort of attention in Congress and the media as the first quarter gains. So goes the world today.

STRIP MINING LETTERS

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have received so many hundreds of wonderful letters, phone calls, and telegrams within the past few days concerning the strip mining issue, that I want to share excerpts from a representative sample:

Huntsville, Alabama: "Please continue your good work in helping to stop this strip mining. I have had first-hand experience with strip mining, and it should be stopped. When will people wake up?"—Mrs. Mary G. Chasteen.

San Diego, California: "Stick to your guns. Don't let them wreck more land with strip mining."—Johanna Seeley.

Charleston, W. Va.: "The earth says thank you."—Virginia and Jim McIntyre.

New Paltz, N.Y.: "Success to you and all who love our land. Have asked our fine Representative Hamilton Fish to support your efforts."

Beckley, V. Va.: "My husband and I are with you all the way in your efforts to abolish once and for all time the strip mining of coal. It infuriates us to see the devastation it is doing to our lovely state."—Edward and Ruth Cresap.

Logan, W. Va.: "We know how hard you are working to get your admirable strip-mining bill passed. Can't you visualize what could happen to areas in the mid-west which would be disastrously stripped? Then what to do? Why, of course—spread concrete highways!"—Dr. and Mrs. Abraham Tow.

Bradley, V. Wa.: "I want to congratulate you on your firm stand against strip mining."—Dr. H. B. Wurst.

Hammond, Ind.: "I heard the views of all on strip mining, and do feel it is time to go deep and think of the longer-range plans for our country. This is what we have not been doing for too long. I heartily approve of your bill H.R. 15000."

Seekonk, Mass.: "I am all for H.R. 15000, your bill to stop strip mining and protect the land. Give 'em Hell!"—Geoffrey P. Allsup.

Lubbock, Texas: "I am totally in favor of H.R. 15000. The land has been plundered all too much by strip-mining exploitation."

New York, N.Y.: "I support your bill, H.R. 15000. Good luck! (We all need it.)"—William Stelling

Barnesville, Ohio: "I liked your remarks about strip mining. I feel as you do, that strip mining should be phased out and that Appalachia shouldn't have to suffer and sacrifice for the rest of America."

Medford, Oregon: "If you want to see and hear about strip mining, go to my sister, Lorene Eastep, Ridgeview, W. Va. The coal company dumped stuff all over the only place where she grew her garden, and now she has no place for a garden. Her water came out of the mountain by pipe, and when I was there they had ruined the water, and it tasted like sulphur. We could not drink it, and had to buy soda pop."—Mrs. Mary Hibbard

Catlin, Illinois: "We have a beautiful community here in Illinois that is faced with a strip mining problem. Amax Corporation has purchased 4,500 acres around our town of 2,500. Approximately 3,500 acres of the acquisition is prime agricultural land capable of the highest yields."—Harry W. Smith

Athens, Ohio: "We support H.R. 15000."—Pat Welling

San Rafael, Calif.: "I sincerely hope H.R. 15000 passes. Keep up the good work; you have my support."—Katherine Davis

Dickson City, Pa.: "You are so right in your views and your fight to preserve our environment. The coal companies have done no good for anyone."—Mrs. Frank Urban

Clarksburg, W. Va.: "I would like to see the destructive process of strip-mining eliminated. If it isn't, people are going to have to take pictures of the majestic scenery of West Virginia today, put it in a scrapbook for their children and grandchildren, and refer to our state as the land that used to be beautiful, until it was destroyed by strip-mining."—Juan C. Schmidt

Wisconsin Dells, Wis.: "Hope your bill passes. You have courage."—Damon Loomis

Canoga Park, Calif.: "Your bill H.R. 15000 has my support."—Estheranne Billings

Chicago, Ill.: "Your approach is the only realistic one—strip-mining must be phased out. It would be far wiser to devote efforts toward developing safe, efficient means for deep-mining coal."

Santa Monica, Calif. "I support your bill because it protects the land."—Margaret E. Dadian

Fairdale, W. Va.: "As a young adult living on a farm in rural West Virginia, every day from my home I view grotesque, unreclaimed highwalls of a nearby strip mine."—Eileen Covey

Staten Island, N.Y. "It's a shame what greed, selfishness and deception does to our country. Strip-mining is like an atomic bomb explosion on our land; one can't put it back again."—Mrs. Harry Bockhorn

Wheatland, Ind.: "These corporations care nothing for the land, its owners, nor the future of our country, but desire only their own gain. The coal companies are able to force the sale of lands to them, because they would be surrounded by devastated land, and the value of their holdings reduced greatly because of its location in a desolate, stripped area."—Mr. and Mrs. G. Winton Palmer

Sophia, W. Va.: "Around here, you can't say anything about the way the land is destroyed, because if your father works for a coal company he may be fired from his job."—B. M. Milam

Hickory Hills, Ill.: "You have the right idea in H.R. 15000. Keep pushin' "—David Harris.

Hixson, Tenn.: "Thank God that there are some elected representatives, such as you, who have guts to fight for the land. As a former resident of the southern coal fields of West Virginia, I know only too well the devastation that the strip miners have caused."—Mrs. Barbara Gwynn McMahan

Seattle, Wash.: "Your bill seems to be the only one that really does something about the way strip mining companies are raping the land."—Seattle, Wash.

Inkster, Mich.: "I've followed your fights against the over-powerful, over-greedy coal giants with great interest. End strip mining forever."—David E. Stauffer

Houston, Texas: "I listened to the debate on strip mining of television. I hope that your bill, H.R. 15000, will pass."—Percy Selden

Falls Church, Va.: "I would like to add my support to your strip mining bill."—Mrs. Thomas P. Myers

Sundial, W. Va.: "The residents of the particular stripped areas are the ones who suffer. This particular area used to be really pretty nice before the strippers moved in. Everything is destroyed; nothing is replaced. The bedrock is broken, streams are flowing dirty, or red with sulphur. Regulations do no good, because they are side-stepped."—Richard Bradford

Bluefield, W. Va.: "Greed sums up their motivation which they so cleverly try to cloak under altruism. The strip mine operators would have us believe they went into the business simply to supply our energy needs. Hundreds of acres are being torn up by stripping, and it's going on day after day after day. Then I read a West Virginia Conservation Magazine and realize what a two-faced, hypocritical tool of monied interests this Department of Natural Resources is."—Bob Connor

Ravencliff, W. Va.: "Thank you sincerely for the work you are doing to protect our state from the strippers and their lack of respect for our state."—Mrs. Evonda Morgan

Tustin, Calif.: "We sincerely feel that strip mining must and should be completely abolished. It is a short-term energy and capital investment, with long-term devastation to our land."—Mr. and Mrs. James F. Mapledoram

Chapmanville, W. Va.: "I was certainly pleased with your hard work concerning the strip mining bill. Thank you for trying so hard to make people see that strip mining is really destroying our beautiful state of West Virginia. What will it take to make the other leaders see this?"—Jerome Dingess, Jr.

Chambersburg, Pa.: "I applaud your stand on strip mining."—Joyce Schaff

Mullens, W. Va.: "I am currently employed in coal mining during the summers while I am attending W.V.U. in the winters. I think strip-mining should be completely banned on steep hillsides such as we have in southern West Virginia. There's no way they can reclaim steep slopes."—Dennis Phillips

Philadelphia, Pa.: "I am delighted to hear that you are taking an active part in efforts to stop or control strip mining in this country. It is one of the great needs of our time."—Wilmer Young

THE NATION PAYS TRIBUTE TO ERNEST GRUENING

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, before most of us knew the late Ernest Gruening as a Senator of undeterred principle, my distinguished and admired friend served as managing editor, and later as editor, of The Nation. He was responsible for much of the magazine's early success, and remained intimately associated with its work throughout his career. The publishers, editors, and staff of The Nation recently printed a tribute to the late Ernest Gruening, which includes statements from men who knew and admired the pioneer spirit of the former Senator. I insert this article in the RECORD.

ERNEST GRUENING

The persona never engulfed the self with Ernest Gruening. The public citizen and the private person were one and the same; he was always of one piece. He had an enormous zest for life and made it a practice never to be bored. His splendid autobiography is appropriately titled *Many Battles*, and it is clear that he enjoyed all of them. He was an intellectual—educated in private schools here and in Europe, Harvard College (Bachelor of Arts in science, 1907), and the Harvard Medical School, 1912 (although he never practiced)—who loved the rough-and-tumble of politics and the challenge and excitement of journalism. In Boston he worked on the *American*, the *Herald*, served as editor of the *Traveler* (at age 27), and later moved to the *Journal* as managing editor. He was business manager, for a time, of *La Prensa*, in New York. He helped found and for five years edited the Portland (Maine) *Evening News*. He was, briefly, managing editor of the New York *Tribune* and New York *Evening Post*, but left both papers for reasons that did him credit.

For most of his adult life Gruening was identified, in one way or another, and at different times, with *The Nation*. He joined the staff on May 15, 1921, as managing editor—*The Nation* of Villard, Kirchwey, Gannett, Lewisohn and the Van Dorens—and played a key role in the magazine's fourteen-year campaign to end the occupation of Haiti. In fact it was at *The Nation* that he first became interested in foreign policy when he campaigned against "gunboat diplomacy." He became one of the first American journalists to take an in-depth view of the Caribbean, Mexico and South America. He wrote what has been described as "the best book written by a non-Mexican" about Mexico, for which, years later, he received the Order of the Aztec Eagle. Roosevelt wisely tapped his expert first-hand knowledge and he became one of the architects of the Good Neighbor Policy, serving as adviser to the American delegation at the Montevideo Conference of 1933.

After his years in Portland, he again joined the staff of *The Nation* in 1932, this time as editor, and directed some of the magazine's more successful and important campaigns of the period, including the campaign to elect LaGuardia as Mayor of New York. But after a time he left to become the first director of the newly created Division of Territories and Island Possessions and also administrator of the Puerto Rican Reconstruction Administration. He also served, of course, for nearly fourteen years as territorial governor of Alaska, and, more than any one person, was responsible for the successful drive to acquire statehood first for Alaska and then for Hawaii.

In two terms as Senator from Alaska, he was in the thick of every good fight and gave as good as he got in each of them. On October 7, 1963, he delivered his first major speech critical of America's role in Vietnam and on March 10, 1964, demanded the withdrawal of U.S. troops. He cast one of the two Senate votes against the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, the other being cast by Wayne Morse. For these services *The Nation* set in motion the process by which a group of his colleagues later nominated him for the Nobel Peace Prize, which he richly deserved but did not receive. In February 1967, he participated in *The Nation's* conference in Los Angeles which gave definite momentum to political opposition to the war. At that conference, Senators McCarthy, Hatfield, McGovern and Gruening all spoke against the war, as did Martin Luther King, Jr.—his first public speech against further American involvement in Vietnam. Another participant at the conference, Eugene McCarthy, made history the next year when he entered the Democratic primary in New Hampshire, and four years later George McGovern carried on the same fight with the active support of Ernest Gruening.

In 1968, after Gruening was defeated for re-election to the Senate, his name was promptly added to our masthead as Editorial Associate and, let it be noted, he took the designation seriously. From Washington—or wherever he was at the moment—came a steady drumbeat of suggestions for articles and editorials, nor did he hesitate to offer criticism when he thought it was needed. As he was dying in a hospital in Washington, he was preoccupied with impeachment and worried about the outcome. In his view, the President should be impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, thrown out of office, then prosecuted as a citizen, convicted again and put in jail as a demonstration that American justice still lives. The postscript in *Many Battles* is a classic indictment of Richard Nixon; no better statement of the case for impeachment has been or will be issued.

Ernest Gruening was a man of culture. He had wit and humor. He possessed a wide range of knowledge in many fields and few Americans of his generation had a richer or more varied experience in public affairs. He liked people and loved life. He was a man of impeccable honor and integrity, indomitable spirit and extraordinary moral courage. No one had a more acute sense of when the slightest compromise on an issue of principle could be fatal; he never made the mistake of letting that moment slip by. He had tenderness and affection for those he loved. What he had to say in his autobiography about the

tragic deaths of Ernest, Jr., and Peter Gruening suggests, in its simplicity and directness, the depth of his feeling for them; so do his frequent references to his wife, Dorothy.

At *The Nation* we knew Ernest Gruening as a delightful and valued colleague and an ever loyal and helpful friend. His life spanned nearly a century and he was, by any reckoning, one of the most remarkable Americans of his time. Removing his name from the masthead, as we do with this issue, is a painful rite. But the conscience of a magazine that has been around as long as *The Nation* is necessarily made up of the dead as well as the living. No one familar with the editorships of Godkin, Villard and Gruening would say that their influence ceased when their lives ended. The spirit of Ernest Gruening will remain very much a part of *The Nation's* heritage.

CAREY MCWILLIAMS,
For the Publishers, Editors and staff of The Nation.

Here follow comments from men who knew, admired and indeed loved Ernest Gruening:

Ernest Gruening personified truthfulness, honesty, integrity and courage throughout his public service. He has been warning us for the past many years that these attributes of good character have been lacking in many high places in all three branches of our government.

He recognized and warned that if our government, through its policies, violates the moral and legal principles upon which our system of constitutional self-government was founded, American citizens, once they became convinced of such wrongdoing, would demand and obtain a return of their constitutional freedoms and rights. It was to this issue of honest government that Ernest Gruening dedicated much of his time for the past ten years.

Ernest Gruening was a very effective political evangelist in the cause of peace through enforceable Rules of International Law. He did not oppose but supported adequate national defense. But he did oppose vigorously undeclared wars by our country or any other country, military balance-of-power diplomacy, military intervention into the internal affairs of other nations even though it is done under the diplomatic guise of a détente.

He warned again and again that a nuclear proliferation and the leaving of nuclear war-making power, in the name of national security and sovereignty, to a few nations without complete international enforcement control increases the danger of a nuclear arms race ending in a worldwide catastrophic nuclear war.

History will record Ernest Gruening as being far ahead of his time. But above all else he will go down in history as a statesman in support of peace in our time through enforcement of world law.

When historians in the years ahead finish their documented evaluations of the public service record of Ernest Gruening, he is certain to be ranked among the list of greatest champions of the nation's welfare ever to serve in the United States Senate.—WAYNE MORSE.

My memory of Ernest Gruening will endure a lifetime. His many battles were of conscience and conviction, and the vision of the issue always became clear with time. He fought for his beliefs and he spoke his mind. He was a great man both for Alaska and the nation when we needed a great man.—WALTER J. HICKEL.

Of all the men I have ever known in public life, Ernest Gruening is the one whose life I most admire. He used to call me almost every morning, sometimes as early as 6:30 or 7:00, to tell me what I should do about this article or that editorial or chide me for not doing enough on this or that issue. He did this up until the end.

It was my privilege not only to serve with him in the U.S. Senate for a number of years but also to come to know him as a personal friend and to work with him very closely in the course of the 1972 campaign for the Presidency, and also during 1971 in the contest for the Democratic Presidential nomination.

I always will think of Senator Gruening as a man who brought great passion and personal commitment and a healthy sense of moral outrage to the problems that faced our country.

I arrived at the Doctors Hospital just a few minutes after Senator Gruening died, and Mrs. Gruening was still sitting there in the room with him. I stayed there and visited with her for about an hour in the presence of Senator Gruening, and we were talking without any tears at all about his marvelous life and the many things that he did.

Mrs. Gruening spent most of that time expressing her thanks and her gratitude and her joy that she had been permitted some sixty years with this remarkable man.—Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN.

It is a measure of Ernest Gruening's greatness that in the last decade of a long and productive life, he undertook to use his intelligence and influence to take on not one, but two, of the most controversial public issues—the war in Vietnam and the problems of curbing rapid population growth. In both instances he had to contend with an administration led by his own party—and in both instances, when the time came for action, it was Gruening's position which was vindicated. Between 1965 and 1968, Senator Gruening conducted a remarkable set of thirty-two Senate hearings on "the population crisis" which elicited the views of 120 scientists, public officials, religious leaders and citizens. The record of these hearings—in 6,800 pages—was rich and diverse, ranging from detailed monographs on the prospects for population growth to Gruening's expert lecturing of an indifferent John Gardner, then Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, on the inadequacy of the department's program. When the hearings were completed, the issues of family planning and population had been defused politically and the inherent inability or unwillingness to act of the government's administrative bureaucracies had been exposed. The Gruening hearings thus laid the groundwork for positive legislation in 1967–70 on both the domestic and international aspects of the population issue.

It was a classic example of legislative initiative and leadership, carried out by a virtuoso. Our nation and our world will sorely miss Ernest Gruening. They don't make them that way any more.—Frederick S. Jaffe, vice president, Planned Parenthood Federation of America and director, Center for Family Planning Program Development.

Back in 1929 when I was a senior at Hotchkiss, I read an article telling of the plight of a newspaper editor in Portland, Me., by the name of Ernest Gruening. In my innocence and arrogance I wrote him asking for a job, and to my amazement received an immediate answer saying that he would try me out. He said in his letter that he too had gone to Hotchkiss and couldn't imagine anybody there reading either *The Nation* or *The New Republic* or being interested enough to work on a Democratic paper in an archly conservative state.

The Portland *Evening News* was my home for two summers and I learned more than I can ever acknowledge about journalism, the civil rights movement and trade unionism from Ernest, and also got to meet his wonderful sister Martha who was one of the founders of the NAACP. Although my life has been mainly concerned with music, it was Ernest Gruening as editor of *The Nation* who sent me to Alabama in February 1933 to cover the Scottsboro case, and it was through that experience that I was soon to join the board of the NAACP and work actively in the civil rights movement for the rest of my life.

Last year I was present when Ernest and Wayne Morse got ACLU awards for being the two members of the U.S. Senate with the courage to oppose the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in 1964. And in the spring of this year Ernest made his first trip to Hotchkiss since his graduation in 1903. At my class reunion last month I found that Ernest completely captivated not only the entire student body but most of the townsfolk as well. He was supposed to spend only an evening, but wound up staying three days.

His humor and energy were unparalleled and he was certainly the nicest guy I ever worked for.—JOHN HAMMOND.

NAACP SUPPORTS RHODESIAN SANCTIONS BILL

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, next week the House is scheduled to vote on S. 1868, the bill to restore the United States to full compliance with United Nations sanctions against Southern Rhodesia by halting the importation of Rhodesian chrome. The NAACP, at its annual convention this year, adopted a resolution supporting this bill and urging its members to communicate that support to Members of the House.

The NAACP resolution notes that for 2½ years the United States has been in violation of its treaty obligation to comply with U.N. sanctions by allowing importation of certain "strategic and critical materials" from Rhodesia. We know now that there is enough chrome and ferrochrome in the national stockpile to meet defense needs for several decades of war, and that American industry can get high-quality chrome and ferrochrome at good prices from several countries other than Rhodesia. The time has come for our country to return to its commitment to stand firmly on the side of peaceful political change toward majority rule in Rhodesia.

I insert the NAACP resolution in the RECORD at this point.

NAACP RESOLUTION

Whereas, the 5½ million African people of Rhodesia are controlled by an illegal minority regime; and

Whereas, the United Nations has instituted a program of mandatory international economic sanction against the White Minority Rhodesia Regime, in order to exert pressures on the White regime to accept a settlement for majority rule; and

Whereas, the United States Government has allowed the importation of certain "strategic and critical materials" from Rhodesia since January 1972 in violation of a treaty obligation of the United States to comply with the United Nations Sanctions Program; and

Whereas, support of the United Nations Sanctions Program by the citizens and government of the U.S. will significantly support the struggle of the African people for majority rule and true independence of Zimbabwe (the African name for Rhodesia); and

Whereas, the Senate passed a bill on December 18, 1973 to restore full U.S. com-

pliance with sanctions against Rhodesia and the House Foreign Affairs Committee voted in support of this bill on June 27, 1974, and the bill is expected to come before the House of Representatives by the end of July; therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People support S. 1868, the bill to renew U.S. Compliance with United Nations sanction against the White Minority Rhodesian Regime, and encourage members of the NAACP to communicate this support to appropriate members of the House of Representatives.

H.R. 69

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday the House will consider the conference report on a bill which I consider to be the most important education authorization bill which the Congress has considered in this decade. The bill is H.R. 69, the Education Amendments of 1974. The bill reauthorizes virtually the entire series of Federal aid programs for elementary and secondary education. In addition, H.R. 69 contains amendments and extensions of a number of other programs.

There are three particular provisions in H.R. 69 to which I would like to draw the attention of the Members. I believe all of these are very important, and each on its own merit deserves the support of the House.

The first is section 105 of the act, which extends and amends programs for bilingual education. For those of us who come from States and districts with large numbers of limited English-speaking people, this section means an enormous amount to the education of the children of these people. I am pleased that the conferees have included a number of amendments to strengthen the provision of Federal support for bilingual education.

The section which is very important in this context is section 21(b)(3), which provides grants to State education agencies to assist them in providing coordination of technical assistance programs to school districts with bilingual education programs.

A second section of the bill of which I am particularly proud is section 401, which provides for the consolidation of a number of grant programs in elementary and secondary education. The consolidation of these programs was my first priority as ranking minority member of the General Education Subcommittee, which began considering this bill almost 20 months ago. I am very pleased that the conferees retained this extremely important section, bringing to fruition a goal sought by Republicans for almost the last decade. It should also be noted that this consolidation has the full support of all of the major education groups.

A final part of the bill to which I would draw your particular attention is section 825 which directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a full and complete investigation and study of problems of violence and crime in the elementary and secondary schools of this country. I come from a city which has had some particular problems in this area, problems severe enough that I believe the results of this study could provide valuable information upon which to base future congressional action in this area. I commend this section to the Members for their support.

The three sections I have enumerated are but a portion of a very major piece of legislation. As the ranking minority member of the subcommittee which originated the bill and as one of those who conferred for 18 days with our Senate colleagues, some sessions running more than 12 hours in length and concluding in the small hours of the morning, I can commend this legislation to you for your support. I urge you to vote yes on H.R. 69 on Wednesday.

COMMUNITY EDUCATION IN THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 69

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, prior to the time when the House considers the conference report on the Education Amendments of 1974, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to one of the programs which will be newly authorized by this legislation—the Community Schools Act.

Community education is using a school facility, after the regular school hours, to meet some of the educational, cultural, and recreational needs of a community. The emphasis is on what the community would like to see included in their program. For example, in Dade County, Fla., which I represent, archery, auto maintenance, knitting, gourmet cooking, first aid, drama, basketball, and senior citizen activities are some of the offerings of the community education program already begun there.

Community education is a program which makes sense. In most communities, the public schools are the single largest capital investment made by the community. Yet for the most part, these buildings and their facilities are used only 8 hours a day, and only by the schoolchildren.

What makes more sense, and what this portion of the bill would assist, is to open the schools after the regular school day to the rest of the community—the basketball and tennis courts, the shop rooms, the home economics kitchens and the classrooms, to parents, preschool children, and senior citizens.

The bill authorizes $15 million for each of the next 3 fiscal years in order to establish, expand, and improve community education programs. Fifty percent of the funds will be made available for grants to State educational agencies and the remainder to local educational agencies.

I urge the support of my colleagues for the conference report.

DUTCH ELM DISEASE UNDER CONTROL

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, since anyone can remember, Dutch elm disease has been ravaging giant, ancient elm trees throughout the country. My own home city of Syracuse used to have streets lined with stately elms until this disease took its toll.

But the days of the disease are numbered because scientists at the State University College of Forestry have made a major breakthrough that may lead to control of the disease.

This breakthrough was recently explained in an article by Richard Case that appeared in the Syracuse Herald-Journal on July 12. I would like to share that article with my colleagues:

FORESTRY SCIENTISTS FIND CONTROL FOR ELM DISEASE

Scientists at Syracuse's State College of Environmental Science and Forestry and the U.S. Forest Service today revealed what it believed to be a major breakthrough in the control of Dutch elm disease.

They have "broken the code" of chemicals used by the disease's principal carrier, the European elm bark beetle, for mating attraction.

By duplicating this mysterious "perfume" of the insect world, scientists feel they can trap the beetles before they infect trees. The artificial chemical is a female sex attractant.

A joint announcement by the college and the Forest Service's Northeastern Forest Experiment Station at Delaware, Ohio said the chemical has lured millions of the insect pests to their deaths in recent field tests.

The discovery—a product of several years of intensive investigation—not only offers the possibility of an effective control of a disease that has killed millions of Dutch elms but take scientists some distance down the road toward understanding chemical communication used by insects.

"After four years of work, it is very gratifying to achieve this measure of success," Dr. Edward Palmer, president of the college said today. "We consider this one of the breakthroughs in efforts to control Dutch elm disease."

Although the discovery is described as a team effort, a key figure in this Dutch elm task force is Dr. Robert F. Silverstein, a professor of chemistry at the college who came here in 1969 with an international reputation in his specialty of insect chemistry.

Silverstein, with graduate assistants Glenn Pearce and William Gore, isolated and identified a combination of three chemical substances used by virgin female beetles as an attraction for males.

This means scientists may now reproduce the substance—called an "aggregating pheromone"—apply it to insect traps, and "trick" beetles away from breeding sites in healthy elms to sticky deaths.

The college cautioned that although the chemistry of the attractant is now understood, the "perfume" won't be available for general use for a while. It must be further tested.

Silverstein noted that an important further step will involve establishing the effective-

ness of material "for reducing the actual incidence of disease in elms."

Then, a way of commercial production must be developed. Beyond that, it will have to satisfy safety standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency before registration for use.

"It appears to be environmentally sound," Silverstein explained.

A recent field trial in Charlotte, N.C. proved, the college said, that "an artificially reproduced mixture of the three compounds was as attractive to elm bark beetles as the natural bouquet."

A second field study is underway in Detroit, Mich., checking the usefulness of traps for beetle control in an area where most elms have been maintained by removing diseased trees.

Breaking that chemical code was the main objective of four years of research sponsored by the Forest Service, the Elm Research Institute and the college.

The ultimate objective, according to the college, is "to reduce the incidence of Dutch elm disease by trapping beetles before they transmit the fungal spores to healthy trees."

Control of the European elm bark beetle has been a difficult, expensive and controversial affair.

Spraying produces environmental problems and is termed only partially effective. Cutting diseased trees is useful only when the program is rigorously maintained. Some fungicides are effective, but only for individual trees.

The attractant-trapping method, on the other hand, attacks the problem before infection and allows control over a wide geographical area.

College experts suggest the likelihood of an integrated campaign, using several methods, including the traps.

Aside from the control potential, duplicating the beetles' perfume may also allow experts to further track distribution of the pests and to detect them in the new locations.

PUERTO RICO CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity for extending congratulations to the people of Puerto Rico on the occasion of the 22d anniversary of their becoming a commonwealth. Almost a quarter of a century ago, the Congress approved the constitution which was drawn up by the people of Puerto Rico. Status as a commonwealth has enabled the people of this beautiful island to enjoy the prospects of economic stability and political self-dependency which had previously been obscured in an atmosphere of struggle and the desire to attain autonomy.

The heritage of the Puerto Rican people has permeated many segments of life in the United States. The State of New York especially enjoys a high degree of cultural interactions with the over 800,000 members of the Puerto Rican community. Such a sharing of cultures in my 26th Congressional District serves to enhance America's image as the world's great melting pot.

The future holds many promises for the Puerto Rican nation. The people of that island can be proud of their status among independent nations. Twenty-two years since becoming a commonwealth, Puerto Rico sees that such promises have taken root and have encouraged the Puerto Rican people to establish themselves as a strong and growing nation.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in congratulating our Puerto Rican neighbors on the anniversary of their Constitution Day.

REPRESENTATIVE KEMP URGES FULL SUPPORT OF ETHNIC HERITAGE STUDIES PROGRAM

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, later this week, the House will be called upon to consider the conference report on H.R. 69, authorizing some $25 billion over a 4-year period for elementary-secondary education, and a variety of smaller education programs. Contained in the conference report is the Senate-passed amendment to extend the Ethnic Studies Act through fiscal year 1978.

I cannot stress strongly enough to my colleagues the need to continue the momentum already clearly established in the first year—fiscal year 1974—of this ethnic heritage studies program. Despite funding delays, and despite the very short time period that was available to implement this program and solicit applications, the Director received over 1,000 applications for the $2,375,000 allocated to the program. In fiscal year 1974, 42 grants were awarded for 39 projects in 27 States and the District of Columbia. The Office of Education has reported that the grant requests were received from a broad diversity of geographical locations—and reflect the enthusiasm of urban, suburban, and rural areas for the concepts embodied in this program. From all indications, the legislative intent of the Ethnic Studies Act—that is, the active participation by a variety of local ethnic and minority groups—is being successfully met.

Mr. Speaker, I represent an area rich in ethnic diversity. I have been consistently impressed with the desire of ethnic groups to stimulate the community consciousness of ethnicity. I emphatically believe that their fine efforts should be promoted and assisted on the Federal level—and I commend to the attention of my colleagues the provisions of the conference report on H.R. 69 which will extend the ethnic heritage studies program for 4 more years.

RHODESIAN CHROME AND THE JOB LOSS MYTH

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the misleading arguments set forth by supporters of continued chrome trade with Rhodesia is that Rhodesian chrome is necessary in providing jobs in our domestic steel industry. Quite the contrary, imports of Rhodesian chrome have seriously undermined our domestic ferrochrome industry and have resulted in the loss of hundreds of jobs.

The United Steelworkers have endorsed repeal of the Byrd amendment which allows the United States to violate United Nations sanctions against trade with Rhodesia, and the Steelworkers have spoken out strongly in favor of S. 1868 to repeal trade with Rhodesia. At this point I would like to submit in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the April 1974 Steel Labor magazine. As we approach floor consideration of repeal, I believe this message deserves wide circulation.

JOB LOSS SCARE IN CHROME

Perhaps one of the cruelest forms of intimidation toward working people is the ever-present threat of job loss, activated by large corporate interests who seek to improve their profit-making capacity by utilizing the specter of plant shutdowns. Unfortunately, a situation exists today in the United States where the worst of these scare tactics have been employed against members of the United Steelworkers and their families.

Some companies have made misleading statements that Steelworker jobs are endangered by the United Nations embargo on Rhodesian chrome. They have sought to use some members of our union in their efforts to have the U.S. ignore the sanctions imposed by the community of nations against Rhodesia, where slave labor conditions have understandably made this source of cheap labor and ore attractive to multinational investments.

Not only have these companies distorted the true facts surrounding the Rhodesian chrome situation, but they have ignored the existence of ample supplies from other countries and the government stockpile of chrome ore which would equal current imports from Rhodesia for 18 years.

The facts are that special steel jobs will not be lost but rather USWA ferrochrome jobs have been further jeopardized because of the new pressures from Rhodesian ferrochrome smelting sources. Last year the Ferroalloys Association declared that unless "aid is forthcoming soon it will only be a matter of time until almost all domestic production of ferrochrome and chromium metal will cease and the bulk of our country's requirements will be supplied from and dependent on foreign production."

The pressure of low-cost imports of ferrochrome from Rhodesia began to be felt only months after passage of the Byrd Amendment, which "sanctioned" the U.S. to violate our international obligations and deal with the rump government created by Rhodesian racists. Today seven USWA locals who once employed 2,800 workers in four companies in Ohio, West Virginia, South Carolina and Alabama now have a work force al-

most 30 per cent smaller—*directly attributed to ferrochrome imports of which Rhodesia is the largest source.*

Steelworkers who have been asked by company publications and mailings to support their lobbying efforts to continue this source of cheap ferrochrome may correctly ask if the motivation behind this concern is not American jobs, but rather multinational profits? Union Carbide and Foote Mineral are not coincidentally the most prominent lobbyists for Rhodesia—for they have multimillion dollar investments in that country and seek to protect their holdings.

When dealing with members of Congress, company spokesmen have never documented possible job loss due to any adherence to the Rhodesian boycott. The job loss scare is directed to the employes, as part of their game plan to use workers as pawns to influence Congressmen. They have not and cannot substantiate their attacks on USWA Congressional testimony that American steelworkers are not threatened by an embargo of imports from Rhodesia. Present and projected steel markets are strong and alternate sources of chrome exist.

Certain companies, whose history with their own employes do not substantiate an overconcern for people before profits, have attempted to confuse some USWA members for their purposes. The job loss tactics, applied in the past to union organization, pollution control, occupational health and safety and other challenges to corporate profits, will not hold up under careful scrutiny and honest investigation. Facts—and not job loss scares—will place the issue into true perspective.

LEHMAN SUPPORTS STRIP MINING LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of H.R. 11500, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act, to regulate strip mining.

This act will require the strip mining operator to restore the land to nearly its original condition. The act also contains other provisions to rehabilitate those lands which have already been strip mined and abandoned.

You have only to drive through or fly over large areas in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, and neighboring States to view the tragic results of strip mining. There are huge scars in the hills, mounts have been sheared away, and great heaps of slag rise next to what formerly were picturesque communities. You can only come away deeply saddened by this overwhelming evidence of the unthinking destructiveness of man.

I know we need coal for power, but the central question is whether we must permanently scar the land to get it. I believe we can have the coal and preserve our land as well.

I would like to point out that while nearly half of the coal produced in 1973 came from strip mines, only about 3 percent of the Nation's coal reserves can ultimately be recovered by strip mining.

There is no question that any long-term national dependency on domestic coal production will necessitate the expansion and rejuvenation of a more efficient deep mine coal industry. The proposed shift to western strippable coal ignores the fact that 80 billion tons of low-sulfur, deep minable coal lies in Appalachia.

In addition, western coal will aggravate rather than alleviate current air pollution problems. While western coal is thought to be low in sulfur content, it has about half the heat value of eastern bituminous coal. Therefore, since energy demands are measured by heat value, not tons, western coal will actually emit more sulfur per million Btu's than eastern coal of the same sulfur content.

We have no such strip mining in south Florida. Nevertheless, we are very concerned about the damage man has already caused to his environment. So we will join with our neighbors to the North and West to help them restore and preserve the land where they make their homes.

GILMAN SEEKS TO STIMULATE RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LENDING

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a measure excluding interest on savings deposits from an individual's gross income in computing income tax.

This legislation is intended to encourage savings thereby increasing the amount of moneys available for home mortgage lending.

With the tight rein on moneys causing interest rates to skyrocket, there is a real need to increase the supply of moneys available to homebuyers without creating additional strains on the Federal pocketbook. The legislation I am introducing allows depositors to save money, earning tax-free interest—limitations: $400 per year for single taxpayers and $800 per year for those filing joint returns—encouraging depositors to avail themselves of an assured return on their saved dollars, while at the same time loosening the flow of moneys for those institutions which lend to prospective homebuyers.

The easing of the tight mortgage money situation cannot be solved by any one panacea. With critical problems confronting the world's economy, a sound solution to our economic woes has not yet been determined. The myriad of factors contributing to worldwide inflation are interrelated and a direct cause of our mortgage money crunch.

The effects of tight money on our economy is significant. A recent report of the number of new housing units for which building permits were issued indicates that in the period of April 1973 to April 1974 housing starts in the county of Rockland, N.Y., alone were down by 54 percent. This threatening statistic means not only that those people wishing to purchase homes were unable to do so, but also that those individuals who are engaged in construction and building no longer have the security of their jobs.

While the measure I am introducing is only one step in the direction of easing the money crunch, it is, nevertheless, a feasible, practical step which would have relatively no adverse effect on the Federal Treasury. Accordingly, I urge the Ways and Means Committee to consider this worthy proposal in the preparation of their tax reform proposals and invite my colleagues to support this effort.

RONSON REMAINS AMERICAN

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions, I have brought to the attention of this Congress the valiant fight then being waged by the management of Ronson Corp. of New Jersey to prevent the company from being gobbled up by a dollar-rich foreign conglomerate.

Ronson, as most of us know, is a moderately sized American concern which over the years has gained a fine reputation in the field of consumer products, and which also produces rare earth metals, operates a helicopter service, and in other ways contributes to the industrial accomplishments of this Nation.

The attempt to take over Ronson by Liquifin Aktiengesellschaft, Liechtenstein, which initiated a tender offer for the company's stock on May 31, 1973, came as a surprise to Ronson management. Ronson elected to battle back and the contest soon became brisk and costly.

Today, I am happy to report to those who might have missed the news stories on the outcome. At a recent shareholders' meeting, the management slate of directors ran up an overwhelming margin over the Liquifin candidates.

Indeed, despite the fact that Liquifin had succeeded in obtaining 36.36 percent of Ronson stock, through the tender offer, only 8.18 percent of the remaining stockholders voted for Liquifin's candidates; 55.46 percent voted for the management slate of directors.

I have been particularly interested in the Ronson struggle because, in my mind, it demonstrated, in the case of one company, the danger which hangs over companies in this country which might appear attractive to overseas interests with their treasuries full of U.S. dollars gathered up from our spending sprees abroad. No company can know when the lightning may strike. Certainly, Ronson did not.

But what makes Ronson important to us is that the management gave battle with a skill and spirit which are commendable. The issue was clearly stated to the shareholders. Did they

want Ronson to remain American in ownership, control, and operation, or were they willing to have this enterprising firm pass into the hands of a foreign giant?

We now have the answer. The shareholders decided for American management and, in doing so, decided also for the best interests of this country. I congratulate them. They have shown in their case how the foreign takeover threat can be met.

In retrospect, however, but for the intensive investigation conducted by Ronson management and disclosure of its findings to its stockholders, it might well be that Liquifin would have obtained over 50 percent of the stock of Ronson and accordingly control the future of this company. This is indeed a disturbing thought when viewed in light of the following:

First, in June of this year, an administrative law judge of the Civil Aeronautics Board ruled that Liquigas—which wholly owns Liquifin—divest itself of its ownership in Ronson stock.

Second, the Securities and Exchange Commission has recently entered a formal order to investigate Liquifin and Liquigas with respect to possible violations of the Federal securities law.

Third, Mr. Michelle Sindona, a major figure in Liquigas and Liquifin, is the same Michelle Sindona who has been in the news recently in connection with the financial problems of Franklin National Bank, an institution in which Mr. Sindona has a substantial interest. Also, there have been recent news reports concerning problems between Mr. Sindona's Italian banks and the Italian Government.

But this successful action by Ronson's management did not come cheap. It is no easy job to win a proxy fight when the opposition is a big and dollar-mighty foreign concern. Ronson spent a great deal of money in combating Liquifin's maneuvers, while at the same time involving the efforts of its management in preventing its takeover, money and time which could have been well spent in furthering the company's progress.

I ask this question. How can this Government, through proper legislation, spare American companies the sudden necessity of running up such costs and expenditures of management effort in order to keep themselves free of foreign absorption? This is a matter which must be considered. I quote from a statement by Ronson's Mr. Aronson:

> It is unfortunate that Ronson had to incur large proxy contest expenses on top of the substantial cost associated with the Liquifin tender offer. It is our hope that Ronson's management will not have such distractions and diversions to contend with in the future.

As Congressmen, we bear a responsibility to see that Ronson and other U.S. companies—loyal parts of our country's industry—are protected from these distractions and diversions in the years ahead when American dollars stacked up abroad will continue as a threat to be exchanged for our most valuable national assets.

OUTSTANDING CAREER MAN SELECTED TO FAA POSITION

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted last week at the announcement that James E. Dow was nominated to be Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Jimmy Dow has had a long and illustrious career with the FAA, and I am most pleased to see that the President has recognized the achievements and knowledge of this man in nominating him to the No. 2 position in the agency.

Jimmy has been in the field of aviation safety and air traffic control since 1943, when he joined the Civil Aeronautics Administration, forerunner of the FAA, as an air traffic controller.

Thirteen years later, he became a supervisory air traffic control specialist. In that job, he saw his duties broadened to include planning and development projects dealing with the expansion and modernization of air traffic control systems—and, as an air traffic controller for the Army during World War II, the period when Jimmy first joined the CAA, I believe modernization is the key word here.

It was under his supervision that the Agency established its long-range radar program; introduced data processing equipment and radar bright displays at air traffic control facilities; and established new air traffic control center buildings to accommodate the new electronic equipment and give the vital controllers the space necessary to operate.

I have spent enough years as a professional pilot to know just how important these innovations have been in air safety.

In 1961, Dow became Assistant Chief, Systems Engineering Division, Systems Research and Development Service. In 1963, in recognition of outstanding work in that job he was promoted to Chief of the Division. There he was commended for bringing new concepts and procedures into the management of a complex research and development program.

Jimmy has proceeded through the toughest assignments the FAA could produce, and finally wound up in what may be, these days, the toughest of all—FAA Director of Budget.

Mr. Speaker, it is always a real pleasure to see a man who has worked his way upward through the ranks, and who has demonstrated outstanding ability and imagination at every level, appointed to such a high-level job.

And pilots everywhere are bound to applaud this decision to put Jimmy Dow right at the top in a complex field which he knows from the bottom up.

CHINA

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a most informative and I hope useful brief visit to the Republic of China on Taiwan. I was especially happy to see the significant economic progress made in recent years by one of America's oldest and most loyal allies. The Republic of China has made great strides by unleashing the creative energies of its highly skilled, hard-working people, and by providing a stable environment hospitable to foreign investment.

I should like to share with my colleagues a perceptive article by the well-known journalist, Ralph de Toledano, in the San Diego Union, for July 12, 1974, on the military position of the Republic of China. Mr. Toledano points out the importance of the island of Taiwan to our defense line in the Western Pacific. If Taiwan were to fall into hostile hands every free nation from Japan to Singapore as well as Australia and New Zealand would be threatened. It is a crucial fact that Japan mounted her conquest of that area in 1941–42 largely from her bases on Taiwan. I should like to insert Mr. Toledano's article in the RECORD at this time:

TAIWAN IS U.S. DEFENSE LINK

(By Ralph de Toledano)

TAIPEI, REPUBLIC OF CHINA.—It is one of the paradoxes of American thinking that many who are fully aware of the strategic considerations which govern our North Atlantic Treaty Organization policies develop a form of aphasia where our Pacific defenses are concerned.

Those who suffer from this ambivalence see the Pacific in terms of 19th Century strategy. Yet any breaching of our defense lines in the Western Pacific poses a serious threat to our national security.

A look at the map, however, demonstrates that America's first line of defense is the chain of islands and peninsulas in East Asia running from Singapore to Japan—the so-called Ess-Jay line.

On this line, Taiwan is the pivot point. With Taiwan in the hands of a potential enemy, the entire Ess-Jay line comes unstuck and the United States is compelled to fall back thousands of miles in its strategic planning.

As Chinese military leaders here in Taiwan see it, any important breach in the Ess-Jay line would leave America in the position where its only weapon of defense is the nuclear bomb, which the United States is determined not to use.

For the Japanese, Taiwan is the key to their western strategic flank along its "maritime safety line."

To Southeast Asia, Taiwan is, as one Chinese general put it, "the critical strategic point on the farthest northern edge, facing the direction of possible aggression where the attacker must pass and therefore the defender must hold."

When Japan launched its offensive against Southeast Asia during World War II, the Chinese military pointedly notes, Taiwan was the base for those operations.

The fall of Taiwan to hostile hands, they also point out, would isolate Australia and New Zealand.

The Southeast Asian countries of the Ess-Jay line, moreover, command the Malacca Strait and can deny the navy of a hostile power access to them.

If the Soviet Pacific fleet, based at Vladivostok, is to be contained, then Taiwan must be in the hands of a government allied to the United States.

Military leaders here give much more credence to the possibility of a Soviet attack on the Communist mainland than do our own military experts.

The Kremlin sees Red China as an increasing threat to its hegemony over the Communist world and the forces for revolution in the third world.

Should the Soviet Union turn on Communist China, Chinese strategists argue, they will be able to cut through to Peking in 10 to 15 days. Poised along the coast of the Chinese mainland, they will be far more dangerous to the free world than any Red Chinese regime.

At that point, the Ess-Jay line will be of even-more vital importance to the United States. To my mind, there is an invincible logic to the position of the Chinese on Taiwan.

Their view is shared by the Pentagon but not by the Congress which has tended to evade the facts.

With the departure of Sen. J. William Fulbright and the accession of Sen. John Sparkman to the chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee next January, the thinking in Congress will probably veer in the direction of strategic sanity.

The question then will be whether or not that shift in thinking will be strong enough to overcome the obdurate madness of those who claim that Taiwan is of no importance to America.

WPIX WINS BROADCASTERS AWARD

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to WPIX–TV which recently won the New York State Broadcasters Association Award for Outstanding Editorials for the fourth time in 5 years. WPIX–TV was recognized this year for a series of insightful editorials on gun control. I enclose the following article about WPIX which I think will be of interest to my colleagues:

WPIX TV WINS NEW YORK STATE BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING EDITORIALS

The New York State Broadcasters Association has recognized WPIX for excellence in editorializing on television for the fourth time in five years. The coveted "Outstanding Editorial" award for 1974 was accepted by WPIX Senior Vice President Richard N. Hughes, editorial spokesman for Channel 11, at the Association's annual summer conference in Cooperstown on Tuesday, July 16. WPIX TV won for a series of editorials on the controversial issue of gun control. In the course of its editorial campaign WPIX TV also presented Editorial Feedback, telecasts in which comments of the viewers concerning the issue were presented, and rebuttal telecasts from opposing points of view.

Commenting on the award, Mr. Hughes said, "We are particularly pleased to again win the New York State Broadcasters Association Award. As a result of the WPIX editorials, State Senator Caesar Trunzo of Suffolk County has introduced a bill in the New York Legislature which would protect the law abiding citizen's right to privacy and to bear arms; while at the same time, acting as a deterrent to those who would use a firearm to commit a felony." In 1970 WPIX won for its Editorial Feedback concept; in 1971 for a series of editorials urging the appointment of a Puerto Rican to the New York State Parole Board; and in 1973 for five editorials supporting the proposals of Governor Rockefeller for dealing with drug problems in the State.

H.R. 69—MORE THAN BUSING

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Senate has approved the conference report on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act amendments and I hope the House will do the same. This bill contains many far-reaching and innovative sections that are important to education. I am, however, disappointed that so much attention has been focused exclusively on the sections of H.R. 69 dealing with busing. H.R. 69 is more than a busing bill.

Among the innovative and important portions of this legislation is section 405 which, for the first time, places Congress on record as supporting the concept of community schools. Many school districts across the Nation already have a good start in this field. There now are more than 700 school districts with community school programs, and almost 1,000 educators hold degrees in community education. Six States have passed legislation and appropriated funds for community schools, and seven others are currently considering such legislation. I believe the time for community schools is here.

The community schools section of H.R. 69 is important legislation for two reasons. First, it focuses on the role of the school in developing a truly cohesive community. Since World War II, schools have become larger and hence less related to the immediate communities they serve. Yet, historically schools have been a vital core of communities in America.

They have served as town meeting halls, recreation centers, libraries, and in one case as a fire house. That is the part of America sadly lost when schools are locked up at night. It is a sad statement of where we are in our country when people in the community physically assault the one institution designed to help people. I believe a community schools program can turn this problem around.

In my view, one of the most important benefits we will find over the next few years is the potential of the community school to bring people together. It is necessary to involve people in the community in planning and developing the program. This is the very foundation of a community schools program without it there is not much chance of the program working. Communities which have adopted the community school concept frequently report a new spirit in the community and a marked decrease in vandalism of school facilities.

The second reason I support this legislation is that I think it will save communities money. If local agencies can cooperate in the delivery of services, I think we will realize better services at lower costs. If libraries, schools, recreation departments and possibly public health agencies and social welfare offices can share the same space, the cost should be lower for each of them and their availability to the community should improve. A significant factor making the cooperation reasonably possible is the declining enrollment in our public schools which means that there will be extra space available in those building in many communities. It is reasonable that other agencies whose mission complements the schools can and should be able to use that space with no disruption of the school program. A community school keeps its doors open far into the night for a wide range of programs. This allows the community to get much more return on its investment in a building.

If new schools are built, they should be designed to be used by a number of agencies during all hours of the day and night. The example of the Thomas Jefferson Junior High School in Arlington, Va., or the Martin Luther King School in Atlanta serves as a model for what can be done. As agencies become familiar with the programs of others, they should be able to find new ways to cooperate.

While H.R. 69 does not provide actual construction funds it does provide funds for the planning of community schools and funds for the implementation of community schools programs. It is a modest step in the right direction and in one sense I agree with this modesty. We should make a careful evaluation of this program becaunse it is a new role for the Federal Government. Also very important is the fact that responsibility is given to the State and local education agencies to design and administer the programs.

I think Wilbur Cohen, dean of the school of education at the University of Michigan and a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, put it well when he told us in our hearing that—

Community schools played an important role early in the century in helping immigrants learn English and American history. Now they can play an important role in appealing to the needs of the disadvantaged, the ethnic groups locked in the inner city as well as the person who aspires to greater knowledge and opportunity.

ANOTHER OKLAHOMAN JOINS THE "TODAY" SHOW

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great amount of pleasure

that I call my colleagues' attention to the fact that this morning's presentation of the "Today" show marked the first day on the job for Jim Hartz in his new role as anchorman and cohost of the highly touted news program.

Jim is following another outstanding Oklahoman, the late Frank McGee, who cohosted the "Today" show prior to his untimely death this past April.

My pleasure in seeing Jim ascend to this new position is based partially on our long personal friendship, and also because Jim's start in broadcasting came with radio station KRMG in Tulsa, Okla. He later became news director for KOTV television in Tulsa.

In 1964 Jim Hartz became affiliated with WNBC in New York. During the past 10 years Jim has covered every major space shot since the Apollo program began.

I wish to extend congratulations to Jim's father, Rev. Martin D. Hartz, and his two brothers Herbert Hartz, assistant chief of police of Tulsa, and Leon Hartz, financial director of Oral Roberts University in Tulsa.

Jim has demonstrated a great ability in the field of broadcast journalism, and I believe his addition to the "Today" show will mark an even higher level of excellence in reporting which the viewing public has come to expect from this news program. I want to wish Jim and his family the very best of success in this new endeavor.

REPRESENTATIVE HOGAN STATES HIS POSITION ON IMPEACHMENT

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, the House Committee on the Judiciary has entered the final phase of its consideration of articles of impeachment against President Nixon.

General debate on these articles began last Wednesday night before a national television and radio audience, and continued through Thursday evening before the committee began a more specific discussion of the language in which the articles were to be proposed, and whether or not these articles would be reported to the House for its consideration.

The opening remarks under general debate were intended to convey the historic importance of the decision the committee was asked to make, and to display in some detail the evidence.

For the benefit of my colleagues, who must soon make a similar decision, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD the text of the remarks delivered by the gentlemen from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN). His statement was a scholarly presentation of his position on this historic question. Members of the House, who must vote on the Judiciary Committee's recommendations, will benefit from a review of the following statement:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND

More than a century ago, in a time of great national trial, Abraham Lincoln told a troubled and bitterly divided nation, "We cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this Administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the last generation."

Today, we are again faced with a national trial. The American people are troubled and divided again, and my colleagues on this Committee know full well that we cannot escape history, that the decision we must jointly make will itself be tested and tried by our fellow citizens and by history itself.

The magnitude of our mission is awesome. There is no way to understate its importance, nor to mistake its meaning. We have unsheathed the strongest weapon in the arsenal of congressional power; we personally, members of this Committee, have felt its weight, and have perceived its dangers.

The framers of the Constitution, fearing an Executive too strong to be constrained from injustice or subject to reproof, arrayed the Congress with the power to bring the Executive into account, and into peril of removal, for acts of "treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors." Now, the first responsibility facing Members of this Committee was to try to define what impeachable offense is. The Constitution does not define it. The precedents, which are sparse, do not give us any real guidance as to what constitutes an impeachable offense. So each of us in our own conscience, in our own mind, in our own heart, after much study, had to decide for ourselves what constitutes an impeachable offense. Obviously, it must be something so grievous that it warrants the removal of the President of the United States from office. I do not agree with those that say impeachable offense is anything that Congress wants it to be and I do not agree with those who say that it must be an indictable criminal offense. But somewhere in between is the standard against which we must measure the President's conduct.

There are some who say that he should be impeached for the wrongdoing of his aides and associates. I do not concur in that. I think we must find personal wrongdoing on his part if we are going to justify his impeachment.

The President was elected by an overwhelming mandate from the American people to serve as their President for four years and we obviously must be very, very cautious as we attempt to overturn this mandate that is itself of historic proportions. After a Member decided what, to his mind, constitutes an impeachable offense he then had to decide what standard of proof he would use in trying to determine whether or not the President of the United States had committed an impeachable offense. Now, some have said that we are analogous to a grand jury, and a grand juror only need find probable cause that a criminal defendant had committed an offense in order to send the matter to trial. But because of the vast ramifications of this impeachment, I think we need to insist on a much higher standard. Our counsel recommended clear and convincing proof. That is really the standard for civil liability, that or a preponderance of the evidence, and I think we need a higher standard than that when the question is removing the President of the United States from office.

So I came down myself to the position that we can have no less a standard of proof than we insist on when a criminal trial is involved, where to deny an individual of his liberty we insist that the case against him be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. And I say that we can insist on no less when the matter is of such overriding import as this impeachment proceeding.

I started out with a presumption of innocence for the President because every citizen of this country is entitled to a presumption of innocence, and my fight for fairness on this Committee is obvious to my 37 friends and colleagues who I think will corroborate that I was as outspoken as any Member of this Committee in calling our very fine staff to task when I thought they were demonstrating bias against the President, when I thought they were leaving from the record parts of the evidence which were exonerating of the President. I fought with the Chairman and the Majority, with some of my colleagues on this side, insisting that every element of fairness be given to the President, that his counsel should sit in on deliberations and offer arguments and evidence and call witnesses and my friend from Alabama, Mr. Flowers, mentioned that earlier. But he will also have to confess that most of these concessions to fairness were made only *after* partisan dispute and debate, which is what our whole legislative process is about in the Congress.

So I do not concede to anyone on this Committee any position of fighting harder and stronger that the President get a fair hearing on the evidence and while I do have some individual specific objections to isolated incidents of unfairness, I think on the whole the proceeding has been fair.

Now, I am a Republican. But party loyalty and personal affection and precedents of the past must fall, I think, before the supreme arbiter of men's action, the law itself. No man, not even the President of the United States, is above the law. For our system of justice and our system of Government to survive, we must pledge our highest allegiance to the strength of the law and not to the common frailties of men.

Now, a few days ago, after having heard and read all the evidence and all the witnesses and the arguments by our own staff and the President's lawyer, I came to a conclusion, and I felt that the debates which we began last night were more or less pro forma and I think they have so far indicated that. I feel that most of my colleagues before this debate began had made up their minds on the evidence, and I did, so I saw no reason to wait before announcing the way I felt and how I was going to vote.

I read and reread and sifted and tested the mass of information and then I came to my conclusion, that Richard Nixon has beyond a reasonable doubt committed impeachable offenses which, in my judgment, are of sufficient magnitude that he should be removed from office.

Now, that announcement was met with a great deal of criticism from friends, from Government officials, from colleagues in Congress. I was accused of making a political decision. If I had decided to vote against impeachment, I venture to say that I would also have been criticized for making a political decision. One of the unfortunate things about being in politics is that everything you do is given evil or political motives. My friend from Alabama, Mr. Flowers, said that the decision that we make is one that we are going to have to live with the rest of our lives. And for anyone to think that this decision could be made on a political basis with so much at stake is something that I personally resent.

It is not easy for me to align myself against the President, to whom I gave my enthusiastic support in three Presidential campaigns, on whose side I have stood in many a legislative battle, whose accomplishments in foreign and domestic affairs I have consistently applauded.

But it is impossible for me to condone or ignore the long train of abuses to which he has subjected the Presidency and the people of this country. The Constitution and my own oath of office demand that I "bear true faith and allegiance" to the principles of law and justice upon which this nation was founded, and I cannot, in good conscience, turn away from the evidence of evil that is to me so clear and compelling.

My friend from Iowa, Mr. Mayne, detailed some of the allegations against prior Administrations and I do not in any way question that. I agree with him that there was wrongdoing on the part of previous Presidents, maybe all Presidents, but I was not in a position where I had to take a stand, where I approve or disapprove of blatant wrongdoing. I am in such a position now.

My friend from New Jersey, Mr. Sandman, said last night he wants to see direct proof and some of my other friends on this side of the aisle have said the same thing, but I submit that what they are looking for is an arrow to the heart and we do not find in the evidence an arrow to the heart. We find a virus that is—that creeps up on you slowly and gradually until its obviousness is so overwhelming to you.

Now, he has asked for direct proof. I think it is a mistake for any of us to begin looking for one sentence or one word or one document which compels us to vote for or against impeachment. It is like looking at a mosaic and going down and focusing in on one single tile in the mosaic and saying I see nothing wrong in that one little piece of this mosaic. We have to step back and we have to look at the whole picture and when you look at the whole mosaic of the evidence that has come before us, to me it is overwhelming beyond a reasonable doubt.

Let us look at the President's own words. He uses the words "cover-up" and "cap on the bottle" and "the plan" and "containment" and he is concerned about what witnesses have said and what they will say. He is concerned about where the investigation is going.

Now, let us focus in on the thing that everybody talked about, the Hunt payment. Let us look at this as reasonable and prudent men. What did Mr. Hunt intend? His payments and demands had been relayed through his wife before her death. After his wife he had to make them directly. So what did he do? He called Colson to make demands and we have a transcript of what he said and I want to quote: 'This is a long haul thing and the stakes are very, very high and I thought that you would want to know that this thing must not break apart for foolish reasons. We are protecting the guys who are really responsible but at the same time, this is a two-way street, and as I said before, we think that now is the time when a move should be made and surely the cheapest commodity available is money."

And then he went and he talked to Colson's lawyer, Bittman, and to Bittman he told him the same thing, that commitments were made and he would blow the lid off the whole thing unless the money was paid to him.

And then he went and saw O'Brien, the attorney for the Committee to Re-Elect the President, and he said to him that he had to have $60,000 for legal fees and $75,000 for family support. He said if he did not get it, he would reveal a number of seamy things that he had done for the White House and if things did not happen soon, he would have to review his options.

The man that was making those demands had over $200,000 in the bank that he had collected from his wife's insurance. So I ask my colleagues on the Committee, what would the reasonable and prudent man assume that he had in mind? It is obvious. He intended to blackmail the White House.

Well, now, let us go inside the White House and let us see what they say. They talk about this. Can we raise a million dollars? You know, is this the way to go? Will there be other demands from him? How were the payments made in the past? These are the President's own words. He says, well, can we handle it through the Cuban Committee the way we handled it before, indicating he already knew about the previous payments made. These are his own words. And then he says wasn't that handled through the Cuban Committee and John Dean says, well, no, not exactly. That is not the way it was. And the President says, well, that is the way it is going to have to be.

Is this an urging to conceal the truth or is it not? So the payment was made to Hunt and it doesn't matter to me whether the President approved it before it was made. A conspirator, as all we lawyers know, can get in on a conspiracy at any point, even after the fact, so it is immaterial whether or not at the point in time he said whether or not I approve it, you pay it. The fact is and the thing that is so appalling to me is that the President when this whole idea was suggested to him didn't in righteous indignation rise up and say get out here. You are in the office of the President of the United States. How can you talk about blackmail and bribery and keeping witnesses silent. This is the Presidency of the United States, and throw them out of his office and pick up the phone and call the Department of Justice and tell them there is obstruction of justice going on. Someone is trying to buy the silence of a witness.

But my President didn't do that. He sat there and he worked and worked to try to cover this thing up so it wouldn't come to light.

And the FBI is conducting an investigation. He says publicly, I want to cooperate with the investigation and the prosecution but privately all his words compel the contrary conclusion. He didn't cooperate with the investigation or the prosecution. And it has already been said by some that Henry Petersen called and the President said, initially in the conversation, something to the effect:

"Well, it is not going to go any further. I know I have got to keep it secret." He no sooner hung up phone than he was telling the defendants about whom this damaging information was made what they could do to counteract the case that the prosecution had against them.

Well, I could go on and on and on. I am surprised that some of my colleagues—the telephone call from Pat Gray. Pat Gray was a man who did many things wrong. He was loyal to his leader. But at some point his conscience bothered him and he wanted to tell the President of the United States that his aides were destroying the Presidency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. I will give the gentleman an opportunity to finish his sentence and his thought.

Mr. HOGAN. I appreciate the chairman.

Pat Gray called the President to tell him that his aides were destroying the Presidency and instead of the President saying, well, give me more information about this, I want to know if my aides are doing anything wrong, I want to know, and Pat Gray says in his testimony there was a perceptible pause and the President said, "Pat, you just continue to conduct your aggressive and thorough investigation."

He didn't have to know because he already knew and he consistently tried to cover up the evidence and obstruct justice and as much as it pains me to say it, he should be impeached and removed from office.

THINKING ABOUT DEPRESSION

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the worries of another economic depression are before us again. According to Mr. Herman Kahn, there is one chance in three that we will suffer from a depression before 1980. I wish to insert the following article from the Wall Street Journal for the information of my colleagues:

THINKING ABOUT DEPRESSION

Up to a year ago, the idea that President Nixon would be removed from office through impeachment proceedings was an "unthinkable" one. Now it is not. So too, it is now no longer beyond the realm of possibility that the United States might soon have to endure a severe economic depression.

Herman Kahn, the physicist and thinker who runs the Hudson Institute, believes there is one chance in six of a depression in 1974–75, and if it doesn't occur in this period, one chance in six that it will occur in 1976–80. In other words, he sees one chance in three that in this decade we will experience depression, by which he means a 10% unemployment rate lasting at least 18 months. There are those who believe Mr. Kahn is being a pessimist; there also are some we talk to who think the chances are higher.

Those who dismiss such talk as being unrealistic generally do so by arguing that "the government will not permit it to happen." During the past quarter-century of global prosperity, the idea has taken root that governments know enough about the manipulation of monetary and fiscal policies to prevent serious economic disruptions of the kind experienced in the 1930s. Certainly, as Paul McCracken explains nearby, they know more now than they did then.

This thought is comforting, but not that comforting if it merely means that the Federal Reserve will gun the money supply to counter every conceivable deflationary pressure that might be arrayed against it. For what Mr. Kahn imagines, a short piece down the road, is a U.S. government faced with choosing between a depression of his definition, and an annual inflation rate of 30% or 40%. At some point, he argues, a government will have to pick the depression.

We see no reason why a future U.S. government has to be faced with that kind of choice. With a nation as educated and, at least at the grass roots, as sensible as ours, there still should be will enough to make the corrections before the collapse, and thus avoid it. The key to this is for policy-makers to recognize, as Mr. Kahn does so clearly, that the current fears and risks of depression tomorrow are created by the inflation today. Depression will come only if inflation and inflationary expectations are so high they can be cured in no other way.

In other words, the way to head off depression is to get inflation under control. This in turn means slowing monetary growth. And realistically this cannot be done until monetary policy is freed of the burden of government borrowing and government deficits. So

to get the correction under way now, while there is still time to avoid depression, it is clear what must be done.

Government spending at all levels must be reduced and the federal government has to lead the way. Government spending is draining the productive base of the economy of the resources it needs to renew itself. What is truly frightening are the budget projections for the future, based on promises the politicians have been making in the past. Unless there are sharp reductions in the $305 billion budget, of the kind proposed by Treasury Secretary Simon, the budget next year will be wildly uncontrollable and heading to $1 trillion by the 1980s. It will never again be as "easy" for Congress and the administration to get the budget under control as it is right now.

Instead, both Congress and the White House, Democrats and Republicans, are jockeying for position so each will be able to blame the other. At the same time, Washington is mesmerized by the increasing flow of tax revenues into the Treasury. Corporations are paying ever higher taxes on mythical inventory profits; wage earners are paying ever higher taxes as the progressive tax structure pushes them into higher tax brackets with no real increase in earnings.

But if the Fed maintains any kind of restraint in money growth, the profit illusion will evaporate and unemployment will climb rapidly. Tax revenues, of course, will plummet in that case. We can easily imagine a $25 billion deficit in the current fiscal year end-next June, and the government forced to propose either a huge tax increase or a $50 billion deficit for fiscal 1976 in order to meet existing government obligations.

President Nixon, who is scheduled to make an economic address to the nation this week, must at least attempt to lay out the alternatives to the people who elected him. Not by complaining about congressional spending. But by beseeching the people and their representatives to work out a joint effort to do what has to be done. Just as it is no longer unthinkable that a President may be impeached, no longer unthinkable we may be hit with an economic depression, it should no longer be unthinkable that the federal budget should be cut.

THE GREAT PAYCHECK RAID

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to continue the series, The Great Paycheck Raid, by Bill Duncliffe of the Boston Herald-American, with a fourth article describing the need for reform of the social security financing system. At present, the low- and middle-income taxpayer must pay almost 6 percent of his or her wages in social security taxes on top of all of the other levies encountered daily. This person cannot bear it, and it is now getting to the point where this system of financing from the payroll tax is itself becoming fiscally unsound. We must find a better way to finance the social security system, and it is to this end that my Massachusetts colleague, JAMES BURKE, and at least 133 cosponsors are proposing legislation to restructure the existing system.

In considering this matter, I think it instructive for my colleagues to read the following work of Mr. Duncliffe, which appeared in the July 11 Boston Herald-American.

The text follows:

THE GREAT PAYCHECK RAID: SOCIAL SECURITY TAX SEEN BLATANT INJUSTICE

(Each week your livelihood—and that of every other person in Massachusetts—is being picked apart by a multitude of national, state, and local taxes.

(But while everyone is aware of how much is taken in withholding and Social Security taxes, few realize how large a slice of their income is being consumed by the many other levies to which they are subjected.

(Two typical wage earners opened up their financial records and family budgets to the Herald American in order to explore just how these indirect and hidden taxes hurt them.

(What was found—and what it all means, to you as well as to them, is told in his series, "The Great Paycheck Raid.")

(By Bill Duncliffe)

One of the financial facts of life that infuriates a hard-pressed Boston factory worker is that the government—after making some small allowance for his having to support a wife and five children on a paycheck of just $201 a week—still nicks him for nearly $7 of that in Federal income taxes.

What burns him even more is that the same government—making no allowance at all for his family size or needs—then takes another $10 from the same shrinking paycheck for Social Security taxes.

Thus, the factory hand's earnings are raided for more in SS "contributions" than in withholding taxes, and his case is far from unusual—because more than half of the working population of the nation is in the same undesirable fix.

That is, in the eyes of many economists and at least 133 Congressmen, a blatant and indefensible injustice, but up to now their fight to correct it has been a losing one. One of the leaders of that fight is Rep. James A. Burke of Milton, who is second only to Rep. Wilbur Mills of Arkansas in the ranking of Democrats on the House Ways and Means Committee.

Burke is one of the authors of a bill that would give low-income wage earners a cut of at least $136.50 a year in Social Security taxes.

He would do that by reducing the rate of taxation now charged to employe and employer alike from its present 5.85 percent to 3.90 percent. He would also force the government to pay one-third of the cost from general revenue, and he would extend the maximum salary limit on which the tax can be charged from the current $13,200 to $25,000.

That way, Burke said, those in the lower pay bracket would get some tax relief, those in the higher salary ranges would be made to pay a fairer share of their income to the SS fund, the burden of SS costs would be borne in part by a government that now contributes nothing to them—and domestic industry would get a badly-needed boost in its constant battle against foreign competition.

No less than 132 of Burke's colleagues thought enough of his idea to sign their names to it as co-sponsors—but despite his high position on Ways and Means he is still three or four votes short of what he needs to force that Committee to send his bill to the floor for debate.

His hope now is wangle a change in rules so that it can be placed before the House as an amendment to some other measure. If that ever happens, he said, he's sure it will sail through with little or no trouble at all.

But even if that unlikely series of events occurs there is virtually no chance that the Senate will okay rewriting of the SS tax law this year—because even the mills of the gods grind with greater speed than those of government in making changes in the status quo.

Yet Burke is convinced that his idea is one whose time is coming, and while he has no quarrel with a system that seeks to provide benefits for the elderly, the disabled, and the survivors of deceased wage earners, he is by no means enchanted with the method that has been devised to finance them.

"The tax is the most regressive one we have in that the person who earns $100,000 a year pays no more than the one who earns $13,200. Both pay the same—$772.20—and what is even worse is that a worker making from $7000 to $10,000 a year has a proportionately greater cut taken from his earnings than does a person in the higher salary ranges.

"Social Security is this government's major spending program, affecting more people directly than any other. It is high time that the burdens of that program were spread more evenly among the American people."

Ways and Means has, for several months now, been groping through the tangle of American tax laws in an effort to reform them and make them more equitable. There has been talk that the Committee is thinking seriously of eliminating "little man" tax loopholes such as the deduction for state gas taxes, medical insurance premiums, and the like.

Both Burke and House Majority Leader Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., of Cambridge insist that reforms of that nature don't have a ghost of a chance of being approved, that what the Committee will very probably go after are the tax breaks now enjoyed by Big Business.

But as important as it is to correct other inequities, Burke said, measures to do that would be largely meaningless unless the Social Security tax is made fairer for all.

That, he insisted, is basic; it touches the lives of all, and results in injustice where none should exist.

Social Security is, in some ways, a good idea that time and events have caused to turn a bit sour.

When it first became law in 1937, the tax rate was one percent of the first $3000 earned—or $30 a year. It stayed that way until 1950, when people who had been middle-aged when the program began reached their retirement years.

Then the Social Security fund began to be drained, and in order to keep it solvent both the rate and the salary limits were gradually raised. In 1950, for example, the rate was increased to 1.50 percent, and in the following year the maximum salary was jumped to $3600.

As more and more people claimed benefits, the bite that was taken out of paychecks became ever greater, especially from 1960 to now. Fifteen years ago, three percent of the first $4800 earned was taken, for a maximum contribution of $144 by the worker. His employer threw in another $144, for a total contribution of $288.

In 1973 each was touched for $631.80—or 5.85 percent of $10,800. This year's tab is $722.20, and unless something is done soon there's no guarantee that by this time next year Social Security won't be making an even more damaging assault on the paychecks of American workers than it does now.

"Anyone who earns $13,200 in 1974 will pay $140.40 more than he did last year," Burke said. "How long can wage earners accept a Social Security tax that is heavier for 50 percent of the work force than personal income taxes?

"For businessmen, reducing the employer's contribution to one-third instead of the present one-half would reduce his cost of doing business and make American goods more competitive abroad. And thousands of small businessmen, some of them on the verge of bankruptcy, would be able to invest money in new machinery and production techniques in an attempt to gain a competitive foothold.

"A three-way split of the payroll tax isn't an untried idea. Many European countries have used this system for years. And the use of some general revenues instead of only the payroll tax has been recommended at regular intervals since Social Security began."

Although Congress may fiddle and fumble its way into 1975 without making up its mind on Social Security reform, there is growing pressure for it outside of Washington.

Locally, Frank Manning of the Legislative Council for Older Americans is convinced that criticism of the tax—though well founded—unintentionally gives senior citizens a bad rap.

He maintained that they aren't the ones primarily responsible for the drain on the SS Fund, since there are approximately 7,000,000 people under the age of 62 who are collecting benefits.

And because the payroll tax is now the only source of SS money, he said, a large portion of the public is escaping its obligation to support the program. For that reason, he said, he believes Burke's bill is a good one and wants to see the government tap other tax sources for its proposed one-third contribution to the SS Fund.

While Manning's prime concern is the senior citizen, Sen. Frederick W. Schlosstein, Jr., (D) of Warren insists that the SS tax is doing a job on young taxpayers too.

Schlosstein is chairman of the Legislature's Committee on Taxation, and he is firm in his belief that changes must be made.

"The Social Security tax is the most sheltered one we have because everyone takes it for granted," he said. "And it's probably the one that is figuratively getting away with murder.

"I'm in my fifties now, and I've got five kids. We find it tough to get by, but we manage. If we were just starting out, I'd really be discouraged.

"A person who began paying the tax in '37 and who retired last year didn't contribute more than $5200 to it. But take a young worker today, either with a skilled trade or a college degree.

"He's probably making at least $13,200 a year, and so he's being taxed for the full amount of $722.20. At his age he can probably expect to be in the work force for at least 30 years—and if the rate and the salary limits remain as they are now he will have paid $21,166 into the Fund when he retires.

"But he could work longer than that and almost certainly the rate and/or the maximum taxable earnings will be raised—and so he'll get hit for even more. Okay, it's true that if he lives five or six years after retirement he'll get back whatever he paid in—but if he had been able to invest that kind of money at eight percent, he'd get a lot larger return on it.

"If I were young I don't know how I'd look at this system. I think I'd get mighty discouraged trying to plan my future. Something has got to be done about it, because while we've lowered the federal income tax over the years we're still jacking up the SS rate that hits low-income people on the first dollar earned and which doesn't take the number of their children, or other deductions, into account.

"There has to be a change made so that the income tax bears a bigger share of financing the Social Security program. We used to call it insurance but it isn't that at all; it's a tax on a social program, and if something isn't done it's going to get completely out of hand."

AGITATION AND EXPLOITATION OF PRISON ISSUES BY SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATIONS

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the 1973 hearings by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Internal Security with respect to the exploitation of inmates of American penal institutions by revolutionary groups and organizations has had a widespread impact on law enforcement and prison officials.

In the committee's December 1973 report entitled "Revolutionary Target: The American Penal System" the committee summed up its findings and recommended, among other things, that the FBI and the U.S. Bureau of Prisons help prison administrators become better informed about revolutionary and subversive activities aimed at the prison population.

I am pleased to report to this House that this recommendation was heeded, and the FBI has just recently concluded a symposium for correctional officers at the FBI Academy based upon the findings and recommendations made by the Internal Security Committee. The subcommittee which conducted the investigation consisted of Congressmen MENDEL DAVIS of South Carolina and TENNYSON GUYER of Ohio with myself as chairman.

FBI Director Clarence M. Kelley has very thoughtfully acknowledged the Internal Security Committee's contribution in a letter to me dated July 11, 1974, which is indeed both satisfying and encouraging. Among other things he asserts that the FBI will assist correctional systems in the training of staff personnel regarding the activities of revolutionary groups. I insert Director Kelley's letter in the RECORD together with an FBI summation of the symposium highlights.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1974.

Hon. RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Chairman, House Committee on Internal Security, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ICHORD: With further reference to our recent National Symposium on the American Penal System as a Revolutionary Target, I am enclosing for your information a memorandum which sets forth details of events at the Symposium.

As indicated in this memorandum, the Symposium was based on the excellent study done by the Committee on Internal Security of the House of Representatives concerning efforts by revolutionary groups to disrupt prison systems. Attendees at the Symposium were in agreement with the recommendation of your Committee that correctional staffs should receive additional training regarding the activities of revolutionary groups. I want you to know that the FBI will assist correctional systems in this training.

We also intend to improve our liaison with all correctional systems to the end that mutual problems are better understood and mutual assistance is more effective.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE M. KELLEY,
Director.

NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON THE AMERICAN PENAL SYSTEM AS A REVOLUTIONARY TARGET, FBI ACADEMY, QUANTICO, VA., JUNE 19–21, 1974

This Symposium was sponsored by the FBI in response to a suggestion by the Committee on Internal Security of the House of Representatives (HCIS), which had studied the efforts of revolutionary groups to disrupt prison systems. The HCIS report on its study entitled "Revolutionary Target: The American Penal System," released on December 18, 1973, stated the need for correctional officers to have available more information on revolutionary groups and recommended that the FBI assist in this regard. In accordance with that recommendation, Director Clarence M. Kelley of the FBI proposed this Symposium.

Approximately 100 correctional officers, primarily wardens, superintendents, senior administrators, or their deputies, attended this Symposium which opened on June 19, 1974, at the FBI Academy, Quantico, Virginia. In his opening remarks Director Kelley stated that the FBI intended to provide assistance to correctional officers whenever and wherever such assistance was possible and appropriate.

Congressman Richard H. Ichord of Missouri, Chairman, HCIS, addressed the Symposium on opening day. He discussed the work of HCIS generally, and particularly explained the investigation of HCIS into allegations that revolutionary groups are attempting to disrupt the American penal system. On the point of "issue exploitation" by revolutionaries, Chairman Ichord recalled that the antiwar movement had previously been used by persons "trying to drive a wedge between the people and the government." When the antiwar movement waned, prison reform was, Chairman Ichord said, a "ready-made issue for exploitation by revolutionary groups."

The principal problems identified by HCIS in its study were summarized by Chairman Ichord as those involving the influx of revolutionary literature into the prisons, inflammatory correspondence between inmates and known revolutionaries, and personal contacts with inmates by members of revolutionary groups under the guise of attorney-client relationships. Basic to these, Congressman Ichord said, was the problem of educating correctional officers concerning subversive activities. He emphasized that HCIS by no means concluded that all prison problems could be attributed to revolutionaries and said, "All we are saying is that this is just one in a whole series of problems connected with the work you do, but it is one which seems to have been neglected, possibly because it was outside the experience of most correctional officers."

On the afternoon of opening day, the Symposium was addressed by the Honorable Norman A. Carlson, Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons. Director Carlson noted in his address the problem posed to prison authorities by self-styled "political prisoners," who are influenced by revolutionary groups outside the prisons. Director Carlson stated that only a very small percentage of the total inmate population becomes involved with revolutionary groups, but this small percentage of prisoners requires a tremendous and disproportionate investment of resource allocation from prison administrators. In response to this problem prison administrators, Director Carlson said, should assure that training is afforded correctional staffs so that these staffs will understand what the revolutionary agitators are trying to do. He noted further that prison authorities can always expect criticism. Rather than seeking excuses or placing blame for prison problems on agitators, the courts, or the press, he asked that correctional officials increase contact with the courts, the press, and the public at large, to explain the job and goals of cor-

rectional systems. There must also be, Director Carlson said, a willingness to change policies and procedures when deficiencies are found.

Following Director Carlson, Warden John Norton of the Federal Correctional Institute in Danbury, Connecticut, and Warden Loren Daggitt of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas, spoke on specific problems of interest at their institutions relative to the subject matter of the Symposium. Presentations were also made during the Symposium concerning prison problems by Correctional Sergeant William E. Hankins, California State Prison at San Quentin, California, and by Detective Lieutenant Inspector William A. Miller, Massachusetts State Police, who reported relevant results of investigation into protracted disturbances at the Massachusetts Correctional Institute, Walpole, Massachusetts.

Extensive information was made available to members of the Symposium by representatives of the FBI on the origin and tactics of urban guerrilla warfare, and on the history and activities of a number of revolutionary and violence-prone groups which have attempted to exploit the legitimate issue of prison reform. Detailed information was furnished to correctional officers on such groups as the Black Liberation Army, the Symbionese Liberation Army, the Black Panther Party, the Nation of Islam, the Weatherman, the Communist Party, USA, the National Lawyers Guild, and Trotskyist-Communist groups. Literature originating from these groups which was aimed at prison population was identified and exhibited. Instances were related where individual leaders and members of some of these organizations had been convicted and committed to prison for crimes of violence. Such instances were of particular interest to members of the Symposium since some inmates, previously trained by outside revolutionary groups in tactics of disruption, have continued efforts to employ these tactics inside the prisons.

An evening session of the Symposium was devoted to workshops of 10 to 12 participants each. Each workshop was concerned with a separate question, such as the handling by prison officials of revolutionary literature directed toward prison inmates, the question of casual relationship between words of incitement and action, additional training of correctional staff, the handling of self-styled "political prisoners," and the development of intelligence information in the prisons. On the final morning of the Symposium an elected representative of each workshop reported on the results of discussion on these questions.

Among the conclusions and recommendations developed in the workshops were: A training program is necessary to enable correctional staffs to intelligently and effectively cope with the challenge posed by revolutionary activists outside the prisons and their inmate allies inside. Coordination between prison authorities and law enforcement should be increased and maintained through regular liaison. Based on experience of prison administrators, there is a definite casual relationship between words of incitement directed at inmates by revolutionaries and subsequent riotous action by these inmates. Legal counsel trained in prison problems must be readily available to prison administrators. A continuing public relations campaign is needed by prison systems to better acquaint the public and specifically bar associations, judges, chambers of commerce, and civic groups with prison procedures, problems, and achievements.

Mr. W. R. Wannall, Assistant Director of the FBI, delivered closing remarks to the Symposium on June 21, 1974. He stated that the FBI intended to be of every possible assistance to correctional officials, consistent with the jurisdiction and capability of the FBI, and thanked all attending for their hard work and great interest in making the Symposium a success.

HISTORIC SUPREME COURT DECISION VOIDS RACIAL BUSING PLAN

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Supreme Court handed down an historic decision in ringing support of the integrity of local school districts. In Milliken versus Bradley the court overturned a circuit order that children in the Detroit metropolitan area be bused in and out of the suburbs across school district lines for purposes of desegregating the city schools. No evidence had ever been presented to show that the suburban districts practiced segregation or that the school district lines had been drawn in a discriminatory manner. The court therefore insisted on the tradition of local control of the schools.

In addition, the Supreme Court noted that the district court would have to become first a legislative authority to solve the operational, administrative and financing of the cross-district busing plan and then act as a school superintendent for the entire metropolitan area. The decision wisely held that judges are not normally qualified to perform these roles.

In a similar case the court vacated a lower court order that the schools of Louisville, Ky., be merged with those of the surrounding suburbs.

I strongly support and applaud these far-reaching decisions of the court. For the benefit of other Members of Congress and for the public at large, I include at this point in the RECORD the headnote prepared by the Reporter of Decisions of the Supreme Court which abstracts the case from the full 37-page decision:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MILLIKEN, GOVERNOR OF MICHIGAN, ET AL. VERSUS BRADLEY ET. AL.

CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

No. 73-434. Argued February 27, 1974—Decided July 25, 1974 [1]

Respondents brought this class action, alleging that the Detroit public school system is racially segregated as a result of the official policies and actions of petitioner state and city officials, and seeking implementation of a plan to eliminate the segregation and establish a unitary nonracial school system. The District Court, after concluding that various acts by the petitioner Detroit Board of Education had created and perpetuated school segregation in Detroit, and that the acts of the Board, as a subordinate entity of the State, were attributable to the State, ordered the Board to submit Detroit-only desegregation plans. The court also ordered the state officials to submit desegregation plans encompassing the three-county metropolitan area, despite the fact that the 85 school districts in these three counties were not parties to the action and there was no claim that they had committed constitutional violations. Subsequently, the outlying school districts were allowed to intervene, but were not permitted to assert any claim or defense on issues previously adjudicated or to reopen any issue previously decided, but were allowed merely to advise the court as to the propriety of a metropolitan plan and to submit any objections, modifications, or alternatives to any such plan. Thereafter, the District Court ruled that it was proper to consider metropolitan plans, that a Detroit-only plan submitted by the Board and respondents was inadequate to accomplish desegregation, that therefore it would seek a solution beyond the limits of the Detroit school district and concluded that "[s]chool district lines are simply matters of political convenience and may not be used to deny constitutional rights." Without having evidence that the suburban school districts had committed acts of *de jure* segregation, the court appointed a panel to submit a plan for the Detroit schools that would encompass an entire designated desegregation area consisting of 53 of the 85 suburban school districts plus Detroit, and ordered the Detroit Board to acquire at least 295 school buses to provide transportation under an interim plan to be developed for the 1972–1973 school year. The Court of Appeals, affirming in part, held that the record supported the District Court's finding as to the constitutional violations committed by the Detroit Board and the state officials; that therefore the District Court was authorized and required to take effective measures to desegregate the Detroit school system; and that a metropolitan area plan embracing the 53 outlying districts was the only feasible solution and was within the District Court's equity powers. But the court remanded so that all suburban school districts that might be affected by a metropolitan remedy could be made parties and have an opportunity to be heard as to the scope and implementation of such a remedy, and vacated the order as to the bus acquisitions, subject to its reimposition at an appropriate time. *Held:* The relief ordered by the District Court and affirmed by the Court of Appeals was based upon erroneous standards and was unsupported by record evidence that acts of the outlying districts had any impact on the discrimination found to exist in the Detroit schools. A federal court may not impose a multi-district, areawide remedy for single-district *de jure* school segregation violations, where there is no finding that the other included school districts have failed to operate unitary school systems or have committed acts that effected segregation within the other districts, and there is no claim or finding that the school district boundary lines were established with the purpose of fostering racial segregation, and where there is no meaningful opportunity for the included neighboring school districts to present evidence or be heard on the propriety of a multi-district remedy or on the question of constitutional violations by those districts. Pp. 17–33.

(a) The District Court erred in using as a standard the declared objective of development of a metropolitan area plan which, upon implementation, would leave "no school, grade, or classroom . . . substantially disproportionate to the overall pupil racial

[1] Together with No. 73-435, *Allen Park Public Schools et al.* v. *Bradley et al.*, and No. 73-436, *Grosse Pointe Public School System* v. *Bradley et al.*, also on certiorari to the same court.

composition" of the metropolitan area as a whole. The clear import of *Swann* v. *Board of Education*, 402 U.S. 1, is that desegregation, in the sense of dismantling a dual school system, does not require any particular racial balance. Pp. 20–21.

(b) While boundary lines may be bridged in circumstances where there has been a constitutional violation calling for inter-district relief, school district lines may not be casually ignored or treated as a mere administrative convenience; substantial local control of public education in this country is a deeply rooted tradition. Pp. 21–22.

(c) The inter-district remedy could extensively disrupt and alter the structure of public education in Michigan, since that remedy would require, in effect, consolidation of 54 independent school districts historically administered as separate governmental units into a vast new super school district, and, since, entirely apart from the logistical problems attending large-scale transportation of students, the consolidation would generate other problems in the administration, financing, and operation of this new school system. Pp. 22–23.

(d) From the scope of the inter-district plan itself, absent a complete restructuring of the Michigan school district laws, the District Court would become, first, a *de facto* "legislative authority" to resolve the complex operational problems involved and thereafter a "school superintendent" for the entire area, a task which few, if any, judges are qualified to perform and one which would deprive the people of local control of schools through elected school boards. P. 24.

(e) Before the boundaries of separate and autonomous school districts may be set aside by consolidating the separate units for remedial purposes or by imposing a cross-district remedy, it must be first shown that there has been a constitutional violation within one district that produces a significant segregative effect in another district; *i.e.*, specifically, it must be shown that racially discriminatory acts of the state or local school districts, or of a single school district have been a substantial cause of inter-district segregation. P. 25.

(f) With no showing of significant violation by the 53 outlying school districts and no evidence of any inter-district violation or effect, the District Court transcended the original theory of the case as framed by the pleadings, and mandated a metropolitan area remedy, the approval of which would impose on the outlying districts, not shown to have committed any constitutional violation, a standard not previously hinted at in any holding of this Court. Pp. 25–26.

(g) Assuming *arguendo*, that the State was derivatively responsible for Detroit's segregated school conditions, it does not follow that an inter-district remedy is constitutionally justified or required, since there has been virtually no showing that either the State or any of the 85 outlying districts engaged in any activity that had a cross-district effect. Pp. 28–29.

(h) An isolated instance of a possible segregative effect as between two of the school districts involved would not justify the broad metropolitan-wide remedy contemplated, particularly since that remedy embraced 52 districts having no responsibility for the arrangement and potentially involved 503,000 pupils in addition to Detroit's 276,000 pupils. Pp. 29–30.

484 F. 2d 215, reversed and remanded.

Burger, C. J., delivered the opinion of the Court, in which Stewart, Blackmun, Powell, and Rehnquist, JJ., joined. Stewart, J., filed a concurring opinion. Douglas, J., filed a dissenting opinion. White, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which Douglas, Brennan, and Marshall, JJ., joined. Marshall, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which Douglas, Brennan, and White, JJ., joined.

RESOLUTIONS OF SONS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be a member of the Sons of the American Revolution and am happy at their request to include herein the resolutions passed by this organization at its 84th annual congress at Baltimore, Md.:

THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

RESOLUTION NO. 1

Whereas, under the 1903 Treaty with Panama, the United States obtained the grant in perpetuity of the use, occupation and control of the Canal Zone territory with all sovereign rights, power and authority to the entire exclusion of the exercise by Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority as well as the ownership of all privately held land and property in the Zone by purchase from individual owners; and

Whereas, the United States has an overriding national security interest in maintaining undiluted control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, and solemn obligations under its treaties with Great Britain and Colombia for the efficient operation of the Canal; and

Whereas, the United States Government is currently engaged in negotiations with the Government of Panama to surrender United States sovereign rights to Panama both in the Canal Zone and with respect to the Canal itself without authorization of the Congress, which will diminish, if not absolutely abrogate, the present U.S. treaty-based sovereignty and ownership of the Zone; and

Whereas, these negotiations are being utilized by the United States Government in an effort to get Panama to grant an option for the construction of a "sea-level" canal eventually to replace the present canal, and to authorize the major modernization of the existing canal, which project is already authorized under existing treaty provisions; and by the Panamanian government in an attempt to gain sovereign control and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and effective control over the operation of the Canal itself; and

Whereas, similar concessional negotiations by the United States in 1967 resulted in three draft treaties that were frustrated by the will of the Congress of the United States because they would have gravely weakened United States control over the Canal and the Canal Zone; and by the people of Panama because that country did not obtain full control; and

Whereas, the American people have consistently opposed further concessions to any Panamanian government that would further weaken United States control over either the Canal Zone or Canal; and

Whereas, many scientists have demonstrated the probability that the removal of natural ecological barriers between the Pacific and Atlantic oceans entailed in the opening of a sea-level canal could lead to ecological hazards which the advocates of the sea-level canal have ignored in their plans; and

Whereas, the Sons of the American Revolution believes that treaties are solemn obligations binding on the parties and has consistently opposed the abrogation, modification or weakening of the Treaty of 1903;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution in its 84th Annual Congress assembled, opposes the construction of a new sea-level canal and approves Senate Resolution 301 introduced by Senator Strom Thurmond and 34 additional Senators, to maintain and preserve the sovereign control of the United States over the Canal Zone.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas, the strength and stability of the economic and monetary system of the United States is vital to the defense of the country, and

Whereas, the fiscal and monetary policies of the Congress and Administration, present and past, have led to the devaluation of the dollar, double digit inflation, and the current economic crisis in the United States, and

Whereas, double digit inflation within is as great a threat, if not a greater threat, to the liberty and freedom and well-being of this country as the threat from our enemies without, and

Whereas, the basic cause of the rampant inflation is the deficit spending of the United States Congress, and

Whereas, under the Constitution of the United States, Congress is charged with the responsibility for all federal appropriations, and

Whereas, it is the urgent duty of the United States Congress to limit federal spending to the revenues of the Federal Government,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution in its 84th Annual Congress assembled, urges the Congress to balance the federal budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

Whereas, it was the national policy of the United States of America to intervene in Vietnam and prevent a Communist takeover of that country, and

Whereas, it is the duty of every American citizen to bear arms in support of the national policies of the United States, and

Whereas, a citizen of the United States is called upon to share the burdens of citizenship in order to insure its benefits for all citizens, and

Whereas, 40,000 young Americans fled to foreign countries to evade the military obligations of United States citizenship,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution at its 84th Annual Congress assembled, is opposed to any granting of amnesty to those who refused to bear arms for their country and instead, fled to foreign countries to evade their military obligations.

RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas, this country was founded by God-fearing men and women and conceived in liberty, and

Whereas, men of all countries have been moved by the eloquence and high spiritual qualities of the Declaration of Independence, and

Whereas, the Bicentennial will be a focal point for a nation-wide review, and reaffirmation of the values upon which this Nation was founded, and

Whereas, all businesses and private citizens should display the United States Flag daily during daylight hours except during inclement weather, and

Whereas, it is fitting for patriots to celebrate each Fourth of July with prayer, music, fireworks and other expressions of joy and cheer, and

Whereas, it is the duty of every citizen and local community to take the initiative in planning a suitable commemoration of the Bicentennial.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution at its 84th Annual Congress assembled, urges its members and all citizens to fly flags daily, to ring bells and blow automobile horns on the Fourth of July at a time to

be set by each community as a suitable prelude to the Bicentennial.

RESOLUTION NO. 5

Whereas, we believe the Federal Government has entered upon a movement to eliminate basic rights and powers guaranteed to the states by the 10th Amendment to the Constitution, in particular the control of education and public schools, the control of land, the extension of jurisdiction of the federal judiciary, the weakening of state criminal law enforcement by the imposition of untenable federal standards that result in interminable trials and sheer technicalities that often show more concern for the criminal than for the innocent victim and the long-suffering public, to name a few,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution at its 84th Annual Congress assembled, recommends that our state governors and legislators resist these federal encroachments upon state sovereignty and oppose the extension of federal grants and Supreme Court decisions.

RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas, hostile foreign nations desire to obtain advanced American technology during a period of our history entitled "detente," and

Whereas, the sharing of our technology with unfriendly foreign powers will weaken this country's power and protection of the free world, and

Whereas, the joint exploration of space with any foreign nation will result in the release of technical information vital to the defense of this nation, and

Whereas no foreign power has been successful in its man-in-space program.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, in its 84th Annual Congress assembled, opposes in general the sharing of any of our technology with unfriendly foreign nations and in particular the sharing of our man-in-space capability with any foreign power, and recommends that all federal agencies should intensify efforts to prevent the dissemination of critical technology to any foreign power.

RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas, the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution supports proper commemoration and celebration of the American War for Independence which gained the 13 Original Colonies their freedom; and

Whereas, the Battle of Cowpens, fought in South Carolina near the present village of Cowpens was a major victory for loyal Americans in their fight for liberty; and

Whereas, the Federal Government has appropriated certain funds for the improvement and enhancement of the Cowpens Battleground site; and

Whereas, the effect of monies spent will be much more effective and widespread, and of longer duration, if a permanent annual celebration is held at the Battleground;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution in its 84th Annual Congress assembled, favors allocation of an adequate portion of available funds for the construction of amphitheater which will be made available for the production of an annual outdoor drama based upon the Battle of Cowpens and surrounding events, so that the people of America will have a better opportunity to become more conversant with the great deeds of our illustrious ancestors.

RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas, Professional Standards Review Organization (PSRO) was established as a rider attached to the Social Security Law of 1972 without public hearings or proper consideration; and

Whereas, confidential medical records of every patient under any of the numerous government-sponsored health care programs will be open to PSRO inspectors; and

Whereas, "norms" set by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, after examination of all patient records, will change the concept of health care, nullifying doctor-patient privacy preventing full use of the doctor's knowledge, experience and training; and

Whereas, PSRO can overrule a doctor's decision in prescribing, hospitalization, or operating under penalty of fine and suspension from medical practice;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution at its 84th Annual Congress assembled, supports the adoption of H.R. 9375, or similar resolutions, which would repeal the provisions of the Social Security Act which violate the confidentiality of the doctor-patient relationship which would be contrary to numerous state statutes, contrary to professional ethics, and which would lead to federal control of medicine.

RESOLUTION NO. 9

Whereas, there is pending in the United States Congress a resolution sponsored by Senator Harry Flood Byrd, Jr. of Virginia in which Senator William Scott of Virginia has also joined as a co-sponsor, to restore the citizenship of General Robert E. Lee.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution at its 84th Annual Congress assembled, joins in with the purpose and spirit of this pending Congressional resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. 10

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution in its 84th Annual Congress assembled, reiterates and reaffirms that all previous resolutions adopted at prior Congresses be reaffirmed.

RESOLUTION NO. 11

Whereas, the 84th Annual Congress of the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution has been successful in every respect, and

Whereas, that success has been due to the efforts of those who planned and took part in the program.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, that it hereby expresses its gratitude and deep appreciation:

1. to the President General for his able leadership,

2. to the officers, chairmen and members of their committees,

3. to the loyal headquarters staff for their constant effort in providing an efficient operation,

4. to the speakers, Compatriot (Dr.) Norman Vincent Peale and the Honorable J. William Middendorf, II, Secretary of the Navy, for their inspiring addresses,

5. to the United States Navy; Joint Armed Forces (Pentagon); Colonial Guard, 175th Infantry; United States Marine Corps and the Commander-in-Chief's Guard Colors, U.S. Army, for furnishing color guards.

6. to the United States Marine Band, the United States Army Soldiers' Chorus, the Chorus of the Chesapeake, and the U.S. Navy Sea Chanters for furnishing music and entertainment.

7. to the press, radio and television for their coverage of the Congress.

8. to the Maryland Society for its contribution to a successful 84th Annual Congress.

9. to all individuals who contributed to the success of this Congress.

DÉTENTE, HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE U.S.S.R.

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a precise and quite challenging testimony on détente and human rights in the U.S.S.R. was delivered last week by Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University before the Subcommittees on International Organizations and Movements and on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The professor's analysis of détente in terms of the non-Russian nations' problem in the U.S.S.R. and his treatment of our prospective dilemma in our economic relations with Moscow deserve studied consideration by our Members.

One observation alone should intrigue every Member and others who support détente:

In view of the U.S.S.R.'s great hunger for capital and time, the emigration concession is a pithy initial price to ask for.

Similar insights and perspectives abound in the testimony, which is supported by extensive documentary material that was submitted. The testimony in full text is as follows:

DÉTENTE, HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE U.S.S.R.

(Testimony by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics, Georgetown University, president, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, chairman, National Captive Nations Committee)

Mr. Chairman and Distinguished Members, it is always a pleasure and intellectual treat to appear before this Committee, and I'm grateful for the opportunity to discuss with you the vital subject of detente and human rights. With application to the Soviet Union, the necessary linkage of detente and human rights assumes far greater significance and practical import than it could possibly anywhere else in the world. And this is for several reasons. One is the continual and unremitting threat posed by Moscow to our national security and that of other significant parts of the Free World. Two is the unique and peculiar composition of this contrived state, a land empire-state which, with the exception of the lower-scaled Peoples' Republic of China, has no comparability anywhere. And the third essential reason resides in Moscow's long and continuous record of the cruel suppression of human and national rights, which, taken in toto, far exceeds in magnitude and extent the totalitarian records of Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and others.

Just a few weeks ago I appeared on the *Today Show* in New York, discussing detente and the USSR. I mention this because of the characteristic obscurantism of the interviewer who, after being told the rudimentary facts about the various nations in the Soviet Union, continued on his own merry preconceptual and fallacious way to lump all the various distinct and different nations and peoples in the USSR as either "Russians" or "the Soviet people." This type of obscurantism is, unfortunately, widespread throughout the media and is also found at the highest levels of our government. Needless to say, no matter how one defines "detente," if the object of the term is falsely and poorly understood, the content of the rela-

tionship can scarcely be maximally beneficial to us. The perpetuation of conceptual errors with regard to the USSR can only insure some error in judgment, policy and deed, and certainly forecloses the seizure of opportunities contributory to the advancement of our interests.

Before considering the nature of detente and human rights in the USSR, let me emphasize, too, that the essential ideas and observations set forth here stem from a fundamental captive nations genetico-analysis founded in the empirical evolution of Soviet Russia and then the Soviet Union from 1927 to the present. What is of poignant significance is the striking parallelism that has evolved in the current period between the salient thoughts and messages of Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn, Andrei Sakharov and other Russian and non-Russian intellectuals and the content and conclusions of the long-established captive nations structure of analysis.

As I pointed out elsewhere, "In calling for the withdrawal of Russian power to the national borders of Russia and the renunciation of Marxism-Leninism, they, and countless behind them in the USSR, are in essence calling for the freedom of the crucial non-Russian nations in the USSR, the surcease of Russian imperio-colonialism, and the open admission of the bankruptcy of Marxist philosophy in the whole area of the captive nations." [1] In fitting tribute to the two Russian intellectuals, it should also be emphasized that it has been many decades since any leading Russian voice expressed itself in behalf of the national self-determination and freedom of the non-Russian nations and peoples in the USSR. Kerensky went to his grave muttering the old Holy Mother Russian Empire complex.

THE NATURE OF DÉTENTE

The growing discussion on "detente" reveals considerable confusion as to its nature and intent, so much so that all sorts of characterizations are assigned to it, ranging from "fraud" to "our last hope for peace." The word is certainly another addition in the long succession of foreign policy slogans. However, the views expressed on our side appear to fall into three categories: (1) the dictionary definition of relaxation of tensions, (2) the subjectivist view, as given by General Abrams and others, or reactions, euphoric or otherwise, to objective circumstances, and (3) the instrumentalist view of Secretary of State Kissinger and others, interpreting detente purely as a process.

Placing aside the psychosomatic notions of detente, it is not unreasonable to accept some qualification the definition of Dr. Kissinger: "Detente is a process of managing relations with a potentially hostile country in order to preserve peace." As a point of departure, the acceptance invites a number of observations that are fundamental to the efficacy of the process itself. One, of course, is how does the opposing party view the same process. The evidence is more than abundant to show that Moscow views "detente" as an important conduit for its fixed policy of "peaceful coexistence" which, unmistakably and unequivocally, means systemic ideo-political warfare against American "capitalism," "imperialism" and the rest of it.[2]

It is noteworthy that Moscow's apologists, such as Boris N. Ponomarev, who recently headed the so-called parliamentarians of the USSR in a visit here, always coupled "peaceful coexistence" with "detente." Detente may be purely a process of management and negotiation for us—non-ethical, non-ideologic and pragmatic—but if we fail to comprehend Moscow's conception of it, we may find ourselves in a progressively insecure position both within and without.

Viewed in terms of the overall development of US–USSR relations the past 25 years, detente as a process is a technique advocated in the old policy of liberation but without statements of objectives and intentions other than "peace" and "building a structure of peace." It can also be validly interpreted as a forthright follow-up on early and long extended Soviet gestures of disarmament leading to the SALT talks, the balanced reduction of forces, all-European security, trade and cultural exchange. These gestures by Moscow were pushed in the 50's.

In the so-called era of negotiations, not confrontation, detente as a process turns into a diplomatic offensive and confrontation on all of these Soviet-initiated fronts, necessarily adjusted to our domestic circumstances and conditions. If one overwhelming advantage at minimum cost might be realized by the process, it is the prospect of a purgative effect concerning much of the content of the process itself. It can be maintained that, so far, the pursuit of detente in Asia and in Eastern Europe hasn't violated any basic principle to which we as a nation subscribe.

Nevertheless, any process or movement in whatever sphere, logically presupposes certain conceptual assumptions, an existential framework for the execution of the process, alternative selected means for the process itself, and worthy objectives in addition to "peace." As concerns the USSR, it is in this area that detente as presently pursued is subject to serious question and examination. Taking the full course of Russian political history, both in its Soviet Russian and USSR phases, a future account may well identify this period as a crucial zig-zag in Moscow's ascendancy to the status of prime global power. For, up till now, all of detente's contributions have been relatively minor, with scarcely any benefits of substance to us, and the basic issues are the same of a generation ago. Certainly, our ruling misconceptions of the USSR and its nature and drives have not changed in this period.

THE NEED FOR A REAL CONCEPTUAL BREAK-THROUGH

In the recent period we have heard a great deal about the need for a conceptual break-through in nuclear arms control. A more fundamental conceptual break-through is needed in our understanding of the Soviet Union. The illusion that the USSR is a nation-state, similar to ours, still persists. Although many others clinging to this illusion can be cited, suffice it to mention that our Secretary of State subscribes to this illusion, which would indicate an unfamiliarity with the origin and growth of this empire-state, not to mention its present multinational composition and pressures.[3] This vital point can be extensively documented, and in this vein I should like to append two short chapters from my latest work to substantiate it.[4]

When we're considering human rights in the USSR, the subject is not entirely parallel to that of civil rights and personal liberties which we enjoy in our country. This is shown in the three levels of dissidence in the USSR, namely civil rights and personal liberty across the Russian/non-Russian complex, the rights of Jews, Russians, Ukrainians and other different nationals to emigrate, and also the national rights of Lithuanians, Byelorussians, Ukrainians, Georgians and others to their own cultures, language, religion and other national expressions. Over half of the population in the USSR is non-Russian, and most of this part is divided into compact, distinctive nations. Ukraine, with close to 50 million, is the largest non-Russian nation not only in the USSR but also Eastern Europe. Thus, to speak of a "Soviet nation," "Soviet people," "national minorities" or "ethnic groups" is to distort the multinational pattern of the USSR, as well as the real developments and aspirations of its numerous nations.

If the process of detente is pursued without a keen awareness of this multinational complexion of the USSR, we may find ourselves by virtue of our economic contributions guaranteeing the permanent captivity of the many nations in the USSR, in the end to our own disadvantage. The foundation of Moscow's power and world-wide ambitions rests in these captive nations within the USSR. Its domination over the captive nations in Central Europe is insured by this foundation being intact and solidified. The fundamental issue facing us is to what extent and degree will our economic aid abet this solidification without exacting an increasing price aimed at an irreversible transformation of human and national rights' conditions and circumstances in this empire-state.

For nations that had been subverted, militarily conquered, and forcibly incorporated into the USSR from 1918 on, the current injection of the "noninterference in internal affairs" theory serves as a crude mockery to human/national rights. On this, as background material, permit me to append to this testimony a chapter on "Historical Outlines of Soviet Russian Aggression" from an earlier work of mine.[5] The abuse of this theory is an old Russian technique which Stalin, Vishinsky, Khrushchev and Brezhnev have frequently employed not only for the empire-state of USSR but also, as the Brezhnev doctrine confirms, for its imperial extensions in Central Europe. If Moscow's domain were extended to the Atlantic, the same cry of non-interference would be raised.

The detente process has generated a number of other myths that must be dissipated if the process is to work for our benefit, too. One is the fantastic notion that the external policy of a state can be somehow divorced from its internal, imperial policies. In a statement to this committee in full, 1951, Dean Acheson stressed the institutional nexus that has existed between Russia's political institutions and its imperialist expansionism over 500 years.[6] That classic statement holds today, for Moscow's external policy has always been fed by the oppressive internal policy of the empire. In addition, the euphoric notion that Moscow interprets detente as a sort of live-and-let-live policy has also been furthered by the current process, and is thoroughly discredited by Moscow's meaning of "peaceful coexistence."

Moreover, as further fantasies generated by current detente, the notions that communist ideology as a tool of penetration has waned in power and that the Kremlin totalitarians are humanized, de-Stalinized types seeking genuine peace are blatantly contradicted by evidences of intensified ideological activity both within the empire and without and the hyper-KGB activity in the USSR with swelling numbers of arrests and prison camps. In connection with Ukraine alone, over 560 known Ukrainian intellectuals have been incarcerated since 1970, and for the record in detailing some of this, I request that this pamphlet on *Ukrainian Intellectuals In Shackles*, the appeal in the June 21, 1974 issue of *The Washington Post*, and the

[1] *The illusions of Detent*. Remarks of Hon. Edward J. Derwinski, USGPO, 1974, p. 1.

[2] See witness' testimony *The Theory and Practice of Communism* Part 4, Hearings, Committee on Internal Security USGPO, 1974, pp. 2422–2423.

[3] Associated Press, March 25, 1974.

[4] Chapter 4 "Nation's, Peoples and Countries in the USSR" and Chapter 5 "The ABC's On Russia and the USSR" in *USA and The Soviet Myth*, Old Greenwich, Conn. 1971.

[5] *The Vulnerable Russians*, New York, 1967.

[6] *The Mutual Security Program*. Committee on Foreign Affairs, 1951, pp. 11–12.

letters of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America to Secretary General Waldheim and President Nixon be incorporated as parts of my testimony.

THE ECONOMIC HOPE AND REAL DILEMMA

Plainly, it is in the area of trade, long-term joint projects, and gradually enhanced economic involvements leading to a generalized economic interdependence that leverage is sought by the present detente process to curb Moscow's aggression by proxy in the Free World and to induce liberalizing tendencies with irreversible movement within the Soviet Union. It is even hoped that this purely tangible, materialist process will by sheer complex involvement on the economic front lead to a redirection and reallocation of resources from Moscow's steady military build-up and development. Increasing business contacts would persumably provide the pragmatic, cultural rub-off abetting internal liberalization, and long-term contractual commitments and projects-in-process would form our basis for threats to cut-off in the event Moscow fails to behave itself in Free World areas. In short, despite the strategicity of the trade deals (Kama River Truck complex, computer production, jumbo plane production—all to be the largest in the world, etc.), the suction of economic interdependence would, so to speak, lock in the Soviet Union in a "structure of peace" for a decade or more.

Any analyst conversant with the USSR economy can only view this theory of economic interdependence with the gravest doubt. First of all, if lessons of history are to be heeded, our trade with and investments in totalitarian powers with even more open societies in the past, such as Japan and Nazi Germany, failed to produce permanent amity. Second, the planned nature of the USSR economy, the widespread KGB controls, the extensive CP surveillance, and the tightening-up processes already in vogue will undoubtedly produce systematic containment of our "business infiltrators" while the benefits of our advanced technology and know-how, not to mention margin interim financing of all this, will accrue to the Kremlin's maintenance of its top priorities, with emphasis on the military, and its lagging needs to overcome deficiencies in other sectors of the economy. On these and other relevant aspects, including Moscow's economic strategy, may I, Mr. Chairman, also include as part of this testimony the background material contained in another chapter of my last book.[7]

Briefly, the dilemma of our position is in the timing of all this. Should we follow the simple mechanistic course of the present detente process and, hopefully, let "evolution" bring about the unstated or low-keyed objectives of our foreign policy; [8] or, in the nature of a poltrade policy that would minimize our risks and avoid the expenditure of billions of dollars in beefing up an essentially technocratic, militaristic, and truly imperialistic economy, should we exact increasing prices for this economic aid with human and national rights concessions consonant with our own principles and civilized values? With nothing substantially changed in the imperio-totalitarian framework of the USSR, prudence and historical common sense would dictate necessarily the latter course.

In view of the USSR's great hunger for capital and time, the emigration concession is a pithy, initial price to ask for. As in part I recommended before the Senate Finance Committee last spring, to this should be added: [9]

(1) the reunion of families and the elimination of extortionate Soviet duty taxes on relief packages;

(2) in the spirit of religious freedom, the resurrection of the major Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches, which were genocided by Stalin. This Committee could assist greatly in this by affording hearings on pending resolutions calling for this;

(3) as advanced by many prominent American scholars, the beginning of direct diplomatic relations with the national republics, Byelorussia and Ukraine, for example. The recent Summit agreement for the opening of a consulate in Kiev is a blunderous error that should be investigated by this Committee;

(4) the surcease of psychiatric and labor camp incarceration of dissidents; and

(5) to implement these recommendations and pave new avenues of thought and action, the establishment of a subcommittee in the Foreign Affairs Committee on the nations in the USSR. With concentration on these nations in the area of our chief threat, the work of such a subcommittee would be of inestimable educational as well as legislative worth as the dilemma of present detente surrounds us.

In conclusion, let us not forget that our past errors of concept and misdirected action in the region of the USSR saved Lenin's tyrannical regime, contributed to the demise of the independent non-Russian republics, provided for the industrial foundations of the USSR, rescued this empire-state from destruction, and enabled it to extend its empire in Central Europe and Asia. The perpetuation and repetition of such errors, as evidenced in the present detente process, could lead to our own subordination and destruction.

[7] Chapter 9, "The Russian Trade Trap" in *U.S.A. and The Soviet Myth*, 1971.

[8] See President Richard Nixon, *Captive Nations Week, 1974, A Proclamation*, July 12, 1974.

[9] "The Empire-State of USSR—Chief Object of Poltrade", Testimony on The Trade Reform Act, April 4, 1974.

THE CENSUS BUREAU METHODOLOGY NEEDS CORRECTION

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, persons of Spanish-speaking background in this country have undergone tremendous social and economic hardships as have other minority groups. A basic factor in the continuance of a discriminatory attitude against them and other minority groups in the areas of housing, education, employment, health care, and general welfare is an improper representation of their numbers by the Bureau of the Census.

While efforts were made to identify better the black population in the 1970 census, the methodology used to count Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Cubans, and other Spanish-speaking people remains an inadequate, inconsistent, confusing, and meaningless compilation of findings. For us as legislators to accept, without arousal, the entitling of the 1974 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights' Report as "Counting the Forgotten" would be more of a tragedy than the actual misrepresentation of the Nation's second largest minority population. Thus, a dire need exists for us to analyze the Bureau's methodology and data collection for population counts of the Spanish-speaking, low-income persons of Hispanic ancestry, and all other low-income people of this country. For the plight of minorities is part-and-parcel with the census "undercount" phenomenon, and therefore, the lack of Federal assistance to them.

First among the inadequacies of the Census Bureau's methodology are its field collection techniques for gathering census information. The 1970 census questionnaires were completed by a mail-out/mailback procedure, which was developed in preference to a door-to-door enumeration system used in past census taking. Yet the possibility of an undercount remains high since a number of areas in the Southwest have Spanish-speaking persons who live in substandard housing to which mail is not delivered. Migrant workers, of which a significant portion are Mexican-Americans, do not generally reside in any one location long enough to establish a mailing address.

Similarly, mail delivery is often poor in inner city barrios. These places would tend to be missed by the address registers. Moreover, many respondents need the assistance which would have been provided by door-to-door bilingual enumerators had the conventional procedures been used. Thus, the plan for distribution and collection of questionnaires in 1970 is likely to have missed many families of Spanish-speaking background.

Most Spanish-speaking people also do not have easy access to a Spanish translation of the census form. The Bureau of the Census did not provide a Spanish or bilingual questionnaire for any of its respondents to complete in the 1970 census. The Bureau obviously recognized the need to provide assistance to non-English-speaking populations when it spent thousands of Federal dollars on producing sample questionnaires and instruction sheets in Spanish for the 1970 census. Still those Spanish speakers who benefited from such aids also would have found it helpful if the regular questionnaire they had been given for completion were in Spanish or bilingual. Not only the Bureau's count of the number of persons of Spanish origin but also its tabulation of their characteristics, including housing, employment, and education may be in error because of the possibility that non-English-speaking persons filled out their 1970 census questionnaires inaccurately as a result of misunderstanding the questions asked.

Also there was no question on the basic census questionnaire which could be used to identify persons of Spanish-speaking background. The Bureau's Spanish surname data were obtained by manually tabulating some of the census questionnaires and comparing the surnames to those on its Spanish surname list. Of course, a Spanish surname count produces exactly what its name implies: a count of persons with Spanish surnames. But it is not accurate to say that a surname count is equivalent to a count of persons of Spanish-speaking background. This count excludes persons of Spanish-speaking background who do not have surnames which are on the Bureau of the Census' list and includes

non-Spanish-speaking background persons who have Spanish surnames.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights' report noted that in another sample survey used in the 1970 census:

All persons were asked "What language, other than English, was spoken in the person's house when he (or she) was a child?" Where there was an answer of Spanish for either the household head or the wife, all members of the current household were counted as members of the Spanish language group regardless of whether, in fact, they spoke Spanish.

The report goes on to say:

Clearly this count is not an accurate measure of the Spanish origin population in the country. It included some persons who did not consider themselves to be of Spanish origin, and it included a large number of individuals whose mother tongue was not Spanish. Finally, even a tabulation of persons whose "mother tongue" is Spanish is not a good substitute for a count of persons whose primary language is Spanish. A true count of those persons in the United States whose primary language is Spanish is important to Federal, State, and local agencies concerned with bilingual/bicultural education programs and other services to the Spanish-speaking community and to the Bureau of the Census, itself, in determining the need for bilingual census forms. The 1970 census Spanish language count, however, does not fill this need.

The Bureau of the Census undertakes work of a technical nature. It is essential for their reputation, as well as for those who are not familiar with scientific methodology and place their trust in the Bureau's accuracy, to not become insensitive to the misrepresentation of Hispanic people. Even today the Bureau has taken few affirmative steps to publicly clarify the 1970 census data on persons of Spanish-speaking background and explain its numerical subtleties in methodology, data collection, and many independent reports and surveys.

The experience of the 1970 census must not be repeated. Federal agencies, State, and local governments, private organizations, and individuals use the census count for important decisions, including the protection of voting rights, the administration of Federal and other public social programs, and the assurance of equal employment opportunity. And indeed, for another equally important reason, the undercounting of Spanish-speaking people should not become a perpetuating disregard for minorities, which is unfortunately characteristic of so many public institutions in this country.

POLICE ASSOCIATION ENDORSES BELL BILL

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the widespread response to my bill H.R. 15505, which would reimburse local police agencies for assistance provided at the request of the U.S. Secret Service, continues to grow, pointing to the need for speedy passage of this legislation. This bill now has the endorsement of the 150,000-member International Conference of Police Associations. I respectfully call to the attention of my colleagues the letter I received last week from Robert D. Gordon, executive director of this organization. The complete text of his letter follows:

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF POLICE ASSOCIATIONS,
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1794.

Hon. ALPHONZO BELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BELL: Please be advised that the International Conference of Police Associations, representing over 170 police associations with a membership of over 150,000 police officers, unanimously endorses H.R. 15505.

Literally thousands of our members have been forced to work extra time while protecting the President of the United States, Presidential candidates, diplomats and representatives of Congress. While we realize that protection of the public and dignitaries is part of the police function, many of our members perform this duty without compensation or reimbursement from the various cities and states. This is due to the lack of available funds within their budgets.

You are to be commended for introducing this legislation and we will urge our member associations to contact their representatives to vote favorably for this legislation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. GORDON,
Executive Director.

THE IMPORTANCE TO HANDICAPPED CHILDREN OF THE BILL, H.R. 69, TO EXTEND THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to give their unequivocal support to the conference report on the bill extending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, H.R. 69, upon which we will be voting on Wednesday.

I do so, Mr. Speaker, because I am confident that this measure will be seen, in the years ahead, to be landmark legislation for education in our society. Clearly the other body agreed with that assessment Mr. Speaker, when it approved the conference report on H.R. 69 by the overwhelming vote of 81 to 15 last week.

Let me touch briefly, Mr. Speaker, on the major provisions of the bill, before turning my attention to the importance of this measure to the 7 million handicapped children in the United States.

First, I must point out that H.R. 69 reaffirms the Federal committment to equalizing educational opportunity for what we might term the "vulnerable" among our young children—the poor, the disabled, and the handicapped preschooler.

The bill provides, as well, for a significant consolidation program, to be phased in over several years, which will, we hope, make easier the obtaining of Federal funds on the part of local school districts.

Let me point out also, Mr. Speaker, that the bill mandates a study to be conducted by the National Institute of Education, of the best means of allocating title I funds for disadvantaged youngsters, as well, as for a White House Conference on Education. I believe that these provisions will be seen as seminal with respect to the Federal role in education in the years ahead.

But, Mr. Speaker, the bill to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will be landmark legislation for 7 million special children in our society.

They are children who make up a significant minority group many of whom have been specifically denied the educational services they need, and, indeed, some of whom have been denied any education at all.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the 7 million youngsters in our society who suffer from physical, mental, or emotional handicaps.

Fully 1 million of these children, Mr. Speaker, receive no education at all, and only 40 percent of them receive the special services they need.

Mr. Speaker, two provisions of H.R. 69 will be particularly important to the handicapped.

First, title VI of part B of H.R. 69 extends the Education of the Handicapped Act—Public Law 91-230—for 3 years. For fiscal year 1975, an authorization of approximately $630 million in State grant programs for the education of handicapped children.

That is an impressive increase, Mr. Speaker, over the $47.5 million being spent in fiscal year 1974.

Before my colleagues question if such an increase is justified, let me assure them that it is.

The conferees were persuaded to approve such a large increase for several reasons.

First, we were mindful of the shocking statistics to which I have already referred: Fully 60 percent of the handicapped youngsters in our society are not receiving the educational services they need.

Second, it costs, on the average, twice as much to educate a handicapped child as it does to educate a nonhandicapped child.

Third, court decisions all across the land have held in the last 2 years that handicapped children are entitled to the special educational services they need. Mr. Speaker, obviously the States will require assistance in order to implement the court decrees.

So in order to help the States implement these court orders, Mr. Speaker, the conferees have prudently decided on a large 1-year increase in funding for special education.

Mr. Speaker, the second provision contained in H.R. 69 which means a great deal to the handicapped children of America, extends Public Law 89-313, which amended title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide grants for State agencies serving handicapped children in State supported or State operated institutions.

EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT

Mr. Speaker, let me say just a word about the importance of each of these programs for the handicapped children of America.

In 1966, Mr. Speaker, Congress recognized the special needs of America's then 5.5 million handicapped children and added a new title VI to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provided a program of grants to States for the education of handicapped children, established a National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, and created within the Office of Education a Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

In 1970, Mr. Speaker, Congress, realizing that handicapped children deserved greater visibility in the Federal legislative process, repealed title VI effective July 1, 1971, and created a separate Education of the Handicapped Act.

PROVISIONS OF THE 1970 EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT

The 1970 act, Mr. Speaker, continued to provide for the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped and for the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children.

And it continued, as well, the authorization of grants to States and outlying areas to assist them initiating, expanding, and improving programs for the education of handicapped children.

But I want to speak briefly of other programs to better the services available for the education of disabled children funded under the Education of the Handicapped Act.

Part C authorizes grants for regional resource centers, centers for deaf-blind children, experimental preschool and early education programs, as well as research, innovation, and training and dissemination with respect to these activities.

In fiscal 1974, $7,243,000 were spent for regional resource centers under part C and approximately 40,000 handicapped children received comprehensive services from the centers which also provided training to 200 State education agency personnel and 6,000 local education agency personnel.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, under part C, $14,795,000 will be spent in fiscal 1974 on deaf-blind children, and $12 million will be spent on early childhood education.

Indeed I should tell my colleagues that approximately 3,500 deaf-blind children and 3,000 of their parents are receiving assistance under these provisions, and that an estimated 7,500,000 other children have received since 1970 comprehensive services early in their childhood years under part C.

Mr. Speaker, the Education of the Handicapped Act also authorized under part D grants to institutions of higher education for the recruitment and training of special education personnel, including physical education personnel; $42,400,000 was spent for the manpower training provisions of part D in 1974 to support 6,300 students full time, 19,500 part time, and possibly another 56,700 students indirectly.

Recruitment and information services under part D, which received $500,000 in fiscal 1973 unfortunately received no funds in fiscal 1974.

The 1970 amendments also expanded research into education of the handicapped and, last year, $9,916,000 were spent for this purpose.

I should tell my colleagues as well that in 1974 we spent $13 million for media services and captioned films to make available video, tapes, records, and captioned films to the handicapped under part F of the Education of the Handicapped Act.

Finally, under part G of the act, $3,250,000 were spent to provide for children with special learning disabilities. Part G now assists 8,500 children directly, and possibly another 58,000 children with special learning disabilities receive education benefits through the impact of teacher training, curriculum development, and other programs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT

We are speaking then, Mr. Speaker, of an act which provided over $152 million in fiscal 1974 for a wide variety of programs and services to better the lives of handicapped children.

But, Mr. Speaker, because the majority of handicapped youngsters are not receiving the services they need, and because the courts are increasingly ruling that handicapped children are entitled to appropriate educational services, the conferees agreed that much more needs to be done.

Therefore, for fiscal 1975 only, the conferees have agreed to change the formula by which assistance grants to the States under part B of the act are made.

In place of the existing allotment formula, Mr. Speaker, the conferees agreed that in 1975 alone, the formula would be based on an entitlement grant to each State of $8.75 per child between the ages of 3 and 21.

Our estimates indicate that this entitlement approach would make available in fiscal 1975 $630 million to States for the education of handicapped children. We hope, in particular, Mr. Speaker, that these moneys will enable States, which are required by State law or State constitutions to provide full educational opportunities to the handicapped, to make greater progress in complying with such requirements in order to meet court orders, or to avoid possible litigation.

In 1976 and 1977, Mr. Speaker, the existing allotment formula would be continued with appropriations authorized of $100 million and $110 million, respectively.

BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Let me say just a word, too, Mr. Speaker, about a problem which distressed the members of the Committee on Education and Labor, as well as the Senate conferees, with respect to the implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, first created in 1966, and headed by an Associate Commissioner of Education, has been downgraded within the Office of Education.

It was the intent of Congress when considering this legislation in 1966 and in 1970 that the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped serve as a focal point for handicapped youngsters within the Office of Education. The Associate Commissioner directing the Bureau, Mr. Speaker, was intended to be involved in the highest policy decisions in the Office of Education affecting the handicapped.

Yet although the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has been cited repeatedly to the Committee on Education and Labor as showing leadership and effective administration with respect to improving the lives of handicapped children, I regret to tell my colleagues that the administration, defying the intent of Congress, has gradually weakened the strength of the Bureau.

I recall in this respect, Mr. Speaker, that our distinguished former colleague who is now a Member of the other body, the gentleman from South Dakota, Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK, earlier this year commented upon what he termed "Operation Mangle" now being conducted by the administration.

And he meant to imply by this colorful term that the current administration appears to be intent on mangling good programs by suffocating them in redtape, regionalization, and, if all else fails, bureaucratic reorganization.

And the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped appears to be a case in point.

For, notwithstanding the excellent record of this Bureau, the administration attempted to interpose a layer of bureaucracy between the Commissioner of Education and the Associate Commissioner for Education of the Handicapped, and, consequently, removed the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped from the top policymaking level of the Office of Education.

The Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. Speaker, has insisted that the original design for the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped remain intact; namely, that the principal officer of the Bureau report directly to the Commissioner of Education without interference.

That is why Mr. Speaker, the conferees on H.R. 69 have agreed to create a new Deputy Commissioner to direct the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped—a Deputy Commissioner directly responsible to the Commissioner of Education.

TITLE I "SETASIDE" FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. Speaker, let me now turn my attention to another program continued by H.R. 69 which also means a great deal for the education of handicapped children.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to what is commonly termed the "Title I Setaside for the Handicapped" in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Public Law 89-313, enacted in 1965, extended title I authority to include handicapped children attending State-supported schools.

And the 89th Congress took that action, Mr. Speaker, because we realized that, although the Education of the Handicapped Act and title I did an ex-

cellent job of providing financial support for disadvantaged and handicapped children attending local schools—which received the title I moneys—that title I funds were not, as the law was originally written, available for handicapped children attending State-supported institutions.

The 90th Congress, Mr. Speaker, went a step further and approved a perfecting amendment under Public Law 90–247 which guaranteed the full funding of the earlier provisions of Public Law 89–313.

And we took that action because we knew that it costs far more to provide educational services to those children so severely handicapped that local educational agencies are often unable to meet their needs, than it does to educate a handicapped or nonhandicapped child attending a local school.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 69 continues the full setaside for handicapped children in State-operated or State-supported schools, which the 89th, and then the 90th, Congress endorsed.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues that we are discussing the funding of programs for those children with the most severe and tragic physical, mental, and emotional problems.

And the educational services required by these children do not always focus on reading, writing and arithmetic.

In some instances, the services require, first, that the child be taught to speak.

In others, he must be taught to walk, or to bathe himself.

Mr. Speaker, these kinds of programs require enormous expense, frequently involving costly equipment and one-to-one teacher-student ratios.

Indeed, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Mr. Speaker, estimates that it costs at least $2,000 annually to provide the services these children need.

And some States are reporting expenditures as high as $6,000.

Mr. Speaker, reasonable men may differ in how best to provide funding for those children with the most severe handicaps in State-supported institutions.

The committee has stressed its conviction that Public Laws 89–313 and 90–247 have well and effectively served children and parents, as well as State and Federal governments.

Let us not now abandon this program to assist the mentally retarded and other severely handicapped children in State institutions.

It is a well-conceived program endorsed by our predecessors in both the 89th and the 90th Congresses.

It is a program that we in the 93d should support.

LANDMARK LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, to reiterate, passage of H.R. 69 will be seen in the years ahead as landmark legislation.

H.R. 69 reaffirms the Federal commitment to equalizing education opportunity for poor and other "vulnerable" children.

It provides for a significant consolidation program to make easier the obtaining of Federal funds on the part of local school districts.

It provides, also, for a study of the best means of allocating title I funds for disadvantaged youngsters, as well as for a White House Conference on Education.

But in stressing today, Mr. Speaker, the provisions to assist handicapped youngsters contained in H.R. 69, I do so because only 40 percent of the 7 million handicapped children in America are receiving the special educational services they need.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is time the Federal Government helped make good for handicapped children the rich promise of the American dream: that each individual will be able to achieve to the full extent of his or her abilities.

Because H.R. 69 will help us make that dream a reality, I urge my colleagues to join with me in enthusiastically supporting the conference report on H.R. 69 when it comes before us for adoption.

A TRAVEL REPORT BY KATHE WHITE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Kathe E. White, of Arlington, Va., and under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following report into the RECORD:

HOTEL NORD—BUCARESTI

(A travel report by Kathe White)

Here we were—all sorts of people—thrown together from all over the world, speaking in all tongues. I must say even though upon arrival, the Hotel Nord appeared to be a center of confusion; the personnel managed very well to answer all questions in so many languages. Most of us were there to receive the famous Gerovitol treatment which seems to be the hopes and dreams of health and youth for all mankind.

On my first day I met a New Yorker, retired, 75 years old. He used to be a longshoreman. He told me that he is on Social Security and that this is his fourth time receiving the Gerovitol injections. He looked amazingly young and vital and said the Gerovitol had changed his life. He was an alcoholic and on drugs and had cured himself completely.

On my second day I was happy to meet a California medical doctor and his charming wife who suffered from arthritis. I believe they were both in their sixties. After a few treatments she found her fingers no longer swollen and could remove her rings which she was unable to do for the last ten year. She said that she gave all her jewelry away.

On my third day I met a charming American professor and his equally charming wife (Univ. of Michigan), now retired. He was probably 70 years of age and she looked like in her sixties. We had a few wonderful days together and both told me that some of their ailments are definitely improved. Arthritis seems to be a major medical problem as we are getting on in years.

On my fourth day I met a charming American couple. (Husband was almost totally blind.) He was probably in his early seventies and she in her early fifties. He personally told me that now after almost completing his 15-day treatments he can see a shadow of me. His wife had learned to give him the injections; and when I met them again on the day they left, they were so happy that they came that I also felt happy for them.

On my fifth day I met a beautiful Brasilian lady who spoke with a charming English accent. She was 54 years old and I spent much of my time with her; and she admitted that her arthritis in the neck is so much better, so definitely improved that she hoped it would be cured completely. Her greatest wish was to remain looking young and beautiful.

On my sixth day I met one of the most charming and interesting American couples I ever met. They were from New Jersey—he was a professor at Princeton before his retirement. Even though he was 66 years old, his vitality was that of a man of 40 years. He lived, and I mean really lived. He was the first on the dance floor—everybody joined us in dancing. The Polish tourists kissed us and the Rumanians cheered us, this was my best day and night in Bucharest.

On my seventh day I met one of the most distinguished and travelled gentleman with a great yearning for youth. He was a former professor at Harvard University and had travelled all over the world. He told me that the treatments have improved his vitality considerably and he is no longer so tired as he used to be. He was 60 years old.

On my 8th day I finally was able to get more frequently together with my New York friends—a businessman and his wife who also seemed by now more alive than in the earlier days of their arrival. Ann was one of the first to be able to do her own injections; and we were all very proud of her. They are, I believe, in their early sixties.

By now time seemed to fly and we formed so our little "Bucharest group" to go on excursions. The ballet "Sleeping Beauty" performed at the Opera was an outstanding performance. The Opera is one of the most beautiful buildings in Bucharest and should be visited, if at all possible.

On my ninth day I met a 71-year old lady from New York City who is on Medicare. I asked her whether she felt better now after some of the Gerovitol treatments and she told me, "Yes, because all my headaches are gone."

The rest of the six days were flying, and all of us felt better and better every day. We were instructed how to do our own injections and most of us succeeded. The Rumanian medical team was very happy when we were able to do it and told us, "Now your coming, here, was successful."

Everyday now one of my new friends had to depart for a new destination. I enjoyed seeing those shining eyes with so much happiness telling me, "Oh, I am so glad I came and stayed all these 15 days—it was an unforgettable experience."

IMPEACHMENT ON TV

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all becoming involved in the impeachment issue. We are aware of the views of the Judiciary Committee members because of the television coverage. The charges against the President will be made more clear to all television viewers. For the interest of my colleagues I wish to insert the following articles from the Chicago Tribune and Wall Street Journal in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 24, 1974]

TELEVISING IMPEACHMENT

Starting today, the impeachment proceedings before the House Judiciary Committee will be open to live television coverage. We welcome the move.

The proceedings—particularly the debate later this week and the vote expected next week—are as vital a business as has ever come before any congressional committee in our history. The committee members will be making their decisions [we hope] on the basis of the evidence and their own judgment. But as this is a majority-rule, representative democracy, the influence of public opinion will be greatly felt.

The public must have the fullest possible access to what is going on. The television newscasts are inherently superficial, there is no substitute for live, continuous coverage if the public is to be fully aware of what is transpiring.

The danger in television coverage is that committee members may yield to the temptation to debase the proceedings with election-year rhetoric and grandstand plays to the cameras. As it is, each of the 38 committee members is to be given 15 minutes in which to make a political speech—a presentation which we fear could resemble the endless platform hearings that so tediously prolonged the sessions of the 1972 Democratic convention.

The members can contribute to the dignity of the hearings by confining their remarks to these allotted periods and restrain themselves at all other times. The broadcast media can do the same by making the telecasts as non-commercial as possible and keeping them free of the show biz that has intruded upon conventions and congressional hearings in the past.

If conducted responsibly, this television coverage can make a valuable contribution to the public's understanding of the impeachment issue and assist in the orderly resolution of it. It should certainly be extended to all impeachment proceedings on the House floor if the committee recommends in favor of impeachment.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 24, 1974]

DEFINING THE CHARGES

With the start of the House Judiciary Committee's televised debates today, we will arrive at a crucial stage of the impeachment proceedings, the narrowing and defining of charges. After the committee has framed a definite set of charges to put before the House and perhaps ultimately the Senate, the debate over impeachment can begin to focus.

Even in ordinary criminal law, one of the textbook functions of a grand jury is to assist the defense by giving notice of what charges to defend against. It's almost impossible, after all, to construct a legal defense until you know the nature of the crime with which you are charged.

Mr. Nixon has certainly suffered from this problem in the swirl of the impeachment debate. Every time he would try to refute one charge, he would be met not with a head-on confrontation over that charge, but another charge from another direction. The President probably had much of this coming, but the process did little to deepen public understanding of any of the issues.

Now the list of charges has already begun to sort itself out. The impoundment of congressional appropriations and the bombing of Cambodia were omitted from Committee Counsel John Doar's summary of charges; after all, the public had occasion to redress either of these offenses in the 1972 election. A hard look at the evidence on the ITT and milk fund cases, as Carol H. Falk and Jerry Landauer reported in this newspaper Monday, discloses a lot of motives other than bribery for the governmental decisions.

Other issues seem to be increasing in importance. The matter of the President's taxes passed rather quickly from the forefront of attention when he said he would abide by the IRS ruling. Rather too quickly, we thought; how many people know that the gift of Franklin D. Roosevelt's public papers was adjudicated in a case strikingly similar to Mr. Nixon's, and that the verdict upheld the validity of the gift? Perhaps this will now be debated at further length, since Mr. Doar includes tax fraud in his list of charges.

The heart of the debate will probably consist of three matters, the Watergate cover-up, abuse of the IRS and other government agencies and contempt of Congress in refusing to honor subpoenas. In each case there is much for which Mr. Nixon and his administration can be called to account. The question before Congress is whether the offenses are great enough, and clear enough, to call for the ultimate sanction of impeachment and conviction.

Our understanding of an impeachable offense is that while it need not be specifically criminal it must be a serious wrong that subverts the governmental process. We would look askance at an impeachment on the procedural grounds of contempt of Congress when Congress is refusing to ask help from the courts in enforcing its subpoenas. But using the tax system to harass opponents or obstructing justice in a substantial case seem to us perfect examples of what an impeachable offense ought to be, though of course the charges must be clearly proved.

The danger at this stage is that the committee and the House will not really do their job of narrowing the issues. For all the sordidness in the presidential transcripts, when the issues are forced into a narrow legalistic framework it is not easy to prove clearly that Mr. Nixon is guilty of anything specific. The evidence remains circumstantial. This will create the temptation for the committee to broaden the issue rather than narrow it, to advocate impeachment not for specific offenses but for an unsavory atmosphere.

Removing a President on such grounds, it seems to us, would be the gravest possible damage to our political system that could possibly come out of Watergate. The extraordinary stability of the American political system is an invaluable asset to the nation and the world, and surely this stability is at stake in any impeachment. Surely it is rooted in the principle of fixed terms, and in the instinct that the verdict of the last election should not be lightly set aside. These principles would be undermined, and the system decisively changed, if a President is impeached on vague grounds such as failing to faithfully execute his office.

The debate starting today is important not only in helping to decide Mr. Nixon's fate, but even more so in establishing a precedent about what circumstances call for the removal of a duly-elected President. The committee needs to narrow and sharpen the charges not only in fairness to the current President, but even more importantly, so that future Presidents will know by what standard their conduct will be judged.

ASPIN PRAISES PENTAGON

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, for too many years the Pentagon was been top heavy with too many high-ranking officers and too many individuals devoted to administrative and support functions. Compared to many of our allies and our adversaries the U.S. military has had too much tail and too little teeth.

Secretary of Defense Schlesinger and Army Chief of Staff Abrams have begun an impressive program to reverse this trend. Both Dr. Schlesinger and General Abrams are trying to strengthen our tooth and shorten our tail. Although I have been very very critical of our Military Establishment for a variety of reasons on a number of occasions, I believe Dr. Schlesinger and General Abrams should be praised for their efforts.

As an incentive to reduce our tail-to-tooth ratio the military service when they cut support activities by one man, are allowed to retain a billet for a combat position. In fiscal year 1975 the Army will create three brigades of nine maneuver battalions, five artillery battalions, and two ranger battalions by reducing support troops. Army combat forces are being increased by 5,900 men while other force including an auxiliary force and support troops are being reduced by a like number. In order to achieve its goal of increasing combat strength the Army later this year will reduce its support and auxiliary troops by an addition of 2,600 or a total of 8,500 men this fiscal year.

Eventually, the Army hopes to increase its combat troops strength of 13⅓ divisions to 16 divisions without reducing its total manpower strength of 785,000. This conversion of support and auxiliary troops into combat troops is precisely the kind of action that many critics of the Pentagon have been urging for many years. Reducing auxiliary and support troops is an excellent way to cut fat in the defense budget. At the same time we are making our forces "leaner and meaner" by increasing the number of combat troops in relationship to support troops.

In addition, the Army plans to reduce the number of general officers by 24 between fiscal year 1974 and fiscal year 1975.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Schlesinger and General Abrams have taken an important first step. But, much more needs to be done. I hope that the other Services will follow their example and that the Army will continue to find ways of reducing unnecessary and extremely costly central support and auxiliary troops converting those troops into combat ready forces able to defend the country. This kind of program eliminates fat in the defense budget and ultimately will enable us to defend the Nation more efficiently and at a much lower cost.

MEDICAL DOCTORS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would provide a tax incentive for phy-

sicians, dentists, and optometrists to establish their practices in areas which have a shortage of health professionals.

Over the years our Nation has been making significant advances toward correcting the general shortage of health manpower. However, we have been far less successful in our efforts to correct the maldistribution factor. The inequity in the distribution of professional health manpower is one of the most serious problems confronting the Nation's health care delivery system. The following facts are an indication of the general situation—the national average of non-Federal dentists per 100,000 population is 47, but New York State's ratio is 68 to 100,000 while in Texas the ratio is 37 to 100,000. However, my greatest concern is for communities which have few, if indeed any, medical doctors, dentists, or optometrists practicing.

There are eight counties in the congressional district I represent which have no medical doctor practicing within it. These eight are among 24 such counties in Texas. In addition, there are 11 counties in the 13th District with no dentist.

The counties with no medical doctor are as follows: Briscoe, Carson, Hartley, King, Lipscomb, Oldham, Roberts and Sherman. Archer, Armstrong, Briscoe, Dickens, Foard, Hartley, King, Lipscomb, Motley, Oldham and Roberts have no dentist.

New doctors prepared to begin practice tend to select locations where their work loads will be manageable, where there will be good medical support services, where they will be able to specialize and where they can expect to earn a good income. The prospect of being the only doctor in the county; where a general practice is required, often without full nursing assistance, and where long hours and low income can be expected, often tends to discourage doctors from locating in rural areas.

If we are going to deal with the maldistribution of doctors, we are going to have to offer new doctors, or doctors willing to move their practice, some real incentives to encourage them to locate in shortage areas where the prospect will be long hours, often at low pay, because they will be the only medical doctor in the area, and with little if any nursing or paramedical assistance.

The legislation I am introducing today would provide that incentive. My legislation would empower the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to designate "physician shortage" areas in which doctors, as well as dentists and optometrists, would be offered incentives to locate practices. The incentives would take the form of Federal income tax deductions—up to $20,000 the first year if the doctor earned that much income. The maximum allowable deductions would decline over a 5-year period: $15,000 the second year, $10,000 the third, $7,500 the fourth and $5,000 the fifth. A doctor would have to practice in the same location for at least 2 years. Furthermore, no deductions would be allowed after the practice had been established for 5 years.

As small town doctors retire or die, fewer and fewer young physicians are willing to replace them. I sincerely believe that this "voluntary" system is perhaps the best incentive to encourage physicians into shortage areas as opposed to any law which might require new doctors to locate practices in such areas.

SOLAR ENERGY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION ACT OF 1974

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to announce that 27 members of the Science and Astronautics Committee have joined Chairman TEAGUE and me in sponsoring H.R. 15612, the Solar Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Act of 1974.

This is the third energy research, development and demonstration bill that the committee has submitted to the Congress for enactment this year. The first was the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act of 1974, and the second was the Geothermal Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Act of 1974. Both of these bills are in conference.

Our third bill, H.R. 15612, would establish a management project for long range research, development and demonstration in all aspects of solar energy, including: The direct use of solar heat; the conversion of solar heat to electricity; the direct conversion of sunlight to electricity, photovoltaics; the use of wind and ocean thermal gradients, both indirect forms of solar energy; to generate electricity, photosynthesis, and other bioconversion processes, those which produce fuels directly from solar energy; and the incineration of organic materials to produce fuels or electricity.

Companion legislation for H.R. 15612 has been sponsored in the Senate by Senator HUMPHREY and cosponsored by many other Members of that body. Technical hearings on H.R. 15612 have already been completed. It is anticipated that hearings on administrative portions of the bill will be completed by August 1, and that mark-up will come soon thereafter. This is just one more example of the Congress taking the initiative to create positive realistic programs and policies to help solve the energy crisis.

This congressional initiative—to enact specific legislation in areas which have not been adequately considered—is working well, and we are proud of our accomplishments. If a Federal agency is established to coordinate energy-related research, development and demonstration, the management project established in H.R. 15612 will automatically be absorbed by that agency. In the meantime, congressional initiative will have saved priceless time in getting these programs underway.

Adequate investigation of the possibilities of solar energy requires a long-range broad-based program of concentrated research. Such a program must aim to bring the various solar technologies to commercial development as rapidly as technical barriers to commercialization. We must also insure speedy dissemination of research results.

The success of such a program depends in large part on how effectively it is managed. Tasks must be allocated so as to make optimum use of available expertise and to avoid duplication of effort. A single management body should be able to oversee the whole program in all of its stages so as to coordinate parallel activities and provide management continuity from initial research through to the demonstration phase.

Until now, Federal research activities in solar energy have been limited in scope and have not been well integrated. We have had no organizational or program capability to allow us to move to the commercial demonstration stage. Several agencies have undertaken modest research activities, but there has been inadequate interagency coordination and long-range planning to guide these efforts. This has been the case in rapid strides by the National Science Foundation in its role as the lead Federal agency for the support of solar energy R. & D.

H.R. 15612, the Solar Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974, will provide the long-range management coordination which we urgently need. It sets up a solar energy coordination and management project to direct all Federal solar energy work until such time as a comprehensive Federal energy research, development, and demonstration agency may be established.

At that time, the functions of the project would be transferred to the new agency, and the management interactions initiated by the project would serve as a firm basis for the new agency's responsibilities in the solar field.

The project is designed to draw upon existing expertise and yet be independent of the special interests of individual agencies. Its composition, moreover, reflects the importance of both research and rapid commercialization. The chairman of the project will be the Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration, and other members will be as follows: An Assistant Director of the National Science Foundation, an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, a member of the Federal Power Commission, an Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission. NSF, NASA, and AEC are selected because these three agencies are currently involved in solar energy research. HUD and the FPC are the Federal agencies concerned with the two main commercial uses or end products of solar energy: Heating and cooling of buildings and the production of electricity and synthetic fuels.

The project will have full management authority to initiate and direct a comprehensive solar energy program with specified objectives in three areas: Resource determination and assessment; research and development; and demonstration. One of the research goals spelled out in the bill is to improve our technical capability to predict and deal

with the environmental impacts of large scale exploitation of solar energy resources. This is an area which I feel we must not overlook, even though solar energy appears, at first glance, to be very attractive environmentally.

Because solar energy research requires close integration among many scientists—each with a specific competence—and a considerable amount of specially designed equipment, the country needs a national laboratory devoted to solar energy R. & D. problems. In this laboratory, we would be able to draw together a critical mass of the required scientists and their specialized equipment. Provisions for a solar energy research institute, therefore, are included in the bill. This laboratory would be analogous to the AEC labs devoted to nuclear research and might be located at any new or existing Federal laboratory.

Two major provisions of the bill are aimed at insuring rapid commercial application of solar energy technologies. First, the project will establish and operate a solar energy information data Bank to collect and disseminate research results and other information on solar energy technologies. This is a logical extension of the solar heating and cooling data bank established by H.R. 11864. The project will also be responsible for coordinating solar energy technology utilization activities with all other technology utilization programs within the Federal Government.

Second, the project will select a solar energy incentives task force to advise the President and the Congress as to the economic incentives required to accelerate commercial application of solar energy technology. This body will investigate and seek to eliminate barriers inhibiting private industry from performing solar energy R. & D. and marketing solar energy products.

Recognizing the importance of a sufficient number of qualified personnel, the bill authorizes NSF to support relevant scientific and technical education programs. Funds transferred to NSF from the project would supplement NSF's own funds in this area.

While there have been numerous studies of the magnitude of the effort required to make solar energy economically viable—notably those done by AEC Chairman Dr. Dixy Lee Ray, by NSF, and by OMB—there has to date been no systematic program definition. This is a necessary prerequisite to a rationally funded, well-thought-out program. H.R. 15612 therefore authorizes $2 million for a program definition to be carried out during fiscal year 1975 by the project. Funding for future years will then be based on the results of this program definition.

One point should be emphasized with regard to how H.R. 15612 will affect the proposed Energy Research and Development Administration. As passed by the House of Representatives, ERDA would have authority in the solar R. & D. field only over solar heating and cooling. Thus, if ERDA is established as proposed, management of solar energy research would be fragmented among ERDA, NSF, and other agencies. It would not be integrated as it should be. Since H.R. 15612 brings under a single management authority all Federal solar work and provides that this authority be transferred to ERDA if such an agency comes into being, its passage would, in effect, actually expand ERDA's potential responsibilities in the solar area even before ERDA is created. This, in my opinion, would correct a clear deficiency in the current ERDA proposal. If ERDA legislation is not enacted into law, the solar energy research, development, and demonstration programs will be integrated and managed in an orderly fashion under the management project established under this bill.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize the valuable benefits we can expect from the development of solar energy. I believe that by 1990, if we mount the proper R. & D. effort, we can be producing 1 percent of the Nation's energy needs from solar energy. By the year 2000, this may be a considerably larger percentage. Energy from the Sun is secure energy, invulnerable to the vicissitudes of international trade. It is clean energy, free of the pollutants we have had to put up with in using fossil fuels. And its supply will never be used up.

Solar energy will not replace fossil fuels in the immediate future, but its use, even for limited applications, will free scarce fossil fuels for uses for which alternatives are not currently feasible.

To realize these benefits, we need an aggressive, organized, and adequately financed national solar R. & D. program. The task is not easy, nor is it going to be accomplished overnight. But our energy situation is critical. We must begin now. I believe that H.R. 15612 will provide the legislative apparatus we need to succeed in this effort. I hope all of my colleagues will join in helping assure favorable consideration and rapid passage of H.R. 15612.

DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATION OF LEONIA, N.J., CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on September 28 the Democratic Organization of Leonia, N.J., is going to celebrate its 50th anniversary. In view of the fact that I have the honor of representing this municipality in Congress, I would like to congratulate the people of Leonia on this occasion.

To help commemorate this event Mr. Speaker, 90-year-old Elizabeth Denny Vann, who was present at the first meeting 50 years ago, recently wrote a letter to Nancy Hawkins, a long-time resident of Leonia. In her letter, Mrs. Vann explores the true significance of this golden anniversary from the perspective of today.

Though she now lives in Richmond, Va., Mrs. Vann has countless fond remembrances of her life in Leonia, and writes that she values the friendships she made in Bergen County "above those made during my long life anywhere in the world."

Mr. Speaker, to celebrate this occasion further, I would now like to share some of Mrs. Vann's insights with my colleagues. Regardless of their own political affiliations, I am sure they will be fascinated by Mrs. Vann's account of political life in America 50 years ago. Her letter follows:

MARCH 19, 1974.

DEAREST NANCY: In response to a request from Mrs. Hawkins I am writing what I recall about the activities of the Democrats in Leonia from the date when we moved to the town, May 1, 1923 after purchasing a home at 186 Harrison St. until the close of the meeting of 1924.

I should preface this by saying I was born and lived in the South—Virginia and Tennessee, until my marriage on May 20, 1908. At this time my husband was the Executive Secretary of Central People's Institute (Instituto Central do Pavo) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, a social service settlement in the slums of Rio, modeled after the famous nineteenth-century establishments in London, New York and Chicago.

Before coming to Leonia I had always lived where women were "second class citizens" so far as participating in the processes of government were concerned. In those long gone days women were *protected* by their fathers, husbands and sons. They excelled in the arts of persuasion and made their views on public matters known through influencing the men in their lives who had the vote. This does not mean that I was reared in ignorance of "politics" but that my grandfather and father considered the art of politics a profession far below an activity in which women should be engaged. Table-talk in our home between those two men fell on my receptive ears. I was fascinated by the comments on policies, programs and candidates. I was also allowed to ask questions but my "opinions" were never solicited. Votes were granted to women in this country during my six years residence in Brazil....

In 1923 we lived near Columbia University in New York City but we were small towners at heart and sought a permanent home in a community where we could enjoy neighborhood benefits and where we could know the families of our son's associates.

It could only have been kind Providence who guided our steps to Leonia. After only a few hours' search we found a house within our means and with convenient transportation to down-town New York by railroad and up and mid-town New York by street car, ferry and subway....

I now let my thoughts go back some 50 years as to how I became a participating citizen of my country....

Early in the fall after only a few months' residence Mrs. Bridges invited me to go to a "town meeting" where the proposed Oakdene Ave. storm drain was to be discussed from all points of view by the citizens. I presume it was a Council hearing, but it met in the High School auditorium. I demurred at going and my husband was in foreign parts but Mrs. Bridges insisted our taxes would help pay this bill and hence it was my "civic duty" to attend.

Thus I attended my first political meeting. It was a long and stormy one—Mayor Pollock presided. I soon learned Leonians can be very vocal at such meetings....

The law of New Jersey in 1924 required a residence of one year in the state and a certain number of months in the county and days in the town to register as a voting citizen.

When that right became ours I was well trained as to the steps to be taken. Again my husband was on a foreign trip. Even before I had qualified by the elapse of time to vote I was approached by a Leonia friend whose

acquaintance I had made in New York City before moving to Leonia to stand at least 50 feet from a polling place and distribute a card to potential voters asking them to vote to have a privately supported library in Leonia taken over as a Free Public Library which would receive money for its support from town taxes. Being in favor of this I was glad to accede to her request. This was my first public political act. As she was leaving my home she inquired if I were already registered.

At that time the Election Boards held public registration days for new voters. She told me where the Board of my voting district could be found and then said "I suppose you are a Republican. There are no decent Democrats in Leonia."

For the first time in my life I was faced with having to give myself a party designation. After a short pause I said "I already know two in Leonia." You do? Who are they?" "They are Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Vann" and I saved her confusion by a warm handshake. We were friends to the day of her death—though I had little to do with her sons becoming working Democrats in later years. . . .

When registration day arrived I presented myself with my proof of residence. The official said "Declare your party." "Democratic." I watched his every move as he carefully wrote my name and address in ink in a book marked "*Republican.*" I protested, he apologized for his "error" and said he was not allowed to make erasures and I could easily change it next year. I told him the law was you must refrain from voting for two years before you could change your party. He kept refusing to make a change while I continued my protest.

At that moment I glimpsed Leonia's Chief of Police—I think it was "Chief Beck"—passing the door. So I said I would summon him to tell us the law and the official gave in, erased my name from the Republican book and wrote it in a clear hand in the Democratic book. . . . When I told this incident to Mrs. Hamilton she said "Why don't you run for County Committee from your ward in Leonia?" She had had no experience with such a bold endeavor, nor had I. Here was my first chance to "learn by doing." In time we learned the essentials, secured the election forms from Hackensack and then almost gave up the idea because 10 signatures of registered *bona fide* Democrats in my district were required. Where could they be found in one small district in Leonia? Mrs. Hamilton began to count, "There are Mrs. Shedd (mother of Leonia's Will Shedd) and her three sisters on Broad Ave.; there is your husband (he would be home in time to register), that is five; there are Mr. and Mrs. Stagg at Grand and Christie Heights, they are old county Democrats, not commuters; there are Paul Hoyler and his wife on Leonia Ave."; and then a long pause. She finally said "I think Mrs. Bridges is still a Democrat." At this "point-in-time" I forget if Mrs. Bridges' name is on my first petition, but the tenth person was found. . . .

After 50 years the remaining steps are not so clear in my memory. . . . If my memory be correct we found 3 other men and 3 other women who consented to run for County Committee under the Democratic name in the other districts and all were elected.

I do not recall the public subject which resulted in my being invited to attend a meeting of Democrats in the fall of 1924 in Fred Hath's studio on Allaire Ave., the home now owned by Arthur and Nancy Hawkins. So I attended my first Democratic Party meeting, escorted by Paul Hoyler. You raise the question whether this was an organization meeting. Frankly I do not know. Judge Van Buskirk from Hackensack was the speaker—a long-time and highly respected "old citizen" of the county. I was surprised by the good attendance, some of the men I knew, others I had never met. Certainly some of these men and women already knew the Judge. Certainly 8 citizens of Leonia had served at the last election officially as Democrats, according to law [on the Election Board].

At some point in time I inquired who had appointed them. . . . I was told no Democrats of Leonia were interested enough in politics to run for County Committee and so names of people supposed to be Democrats were suggested to the County Board of Election by Huyler Ford the "Republican leader in Leonia" and so were appointed to the election board in Leonia—these were paid positions, County Committee members were not paid.

The actual facts may be far different, but it was clear that the Democratic voters of Leonia were not interested enough to have a viable organization at that time. Who invited the Judge to Leonia or invited the people to the meeting at Fred Hath's studio I also do not know and never did. Since Fred Hath was a paid employee in Hudson County—Park Commissioner or some such title—it may be that the very active Democratic organization of Hudson County asked him to reactivate interest in Leonia, the town in which he lived. You'll have to find some records at the courthouse or in the hands of the Party organization of the County to unravel this story. At the time I was interested in the future not in the past and made no inquiries.

Some of the men I remember at that meeting were Drs. Thurman Van Metre, Edwin Patterson, Ralph Alexander and possibly Hugh Wiley Puckett—all professors at Columbia or Barnard. These I already knew. . . . Ed Appleby and his wife may also have been present. Mr. Blaisdell and Ralph and Mrs. Guernsey of Oak Tree Place I seem to remember. Mrs. Hamilton never attended Party meetings. She was chairman of two *non*-partison forums and not until the Democratic convention at Madison Square Garden did I even know she was a registered Democrat.

So I could not say a Democratic organization was born that night in Leonia but one was certainly revived, if it already existed and has continued to this day with varying fortunes and leaders according as the population has changed and grown in these fifty years and that meeting could properly be celebrated as the birth of continuous activity.

I recall no election of officers or mention of an existing club, nor a secretary taking minutes or collection of dues. My whole attention was centered on the Judge and the fact that he was there to plead for our support at the next election for Democratic candidates "from the top to the bottom of the ticket." He was forceful and persuasive and reasonable. He engaged my attention and I began to see that only through Party organization and activity could what I believed in for my country be achieved. I have never wavered in that conviction. I still believe that Democratic principles endorsed by honest men and with good candidates are the best hope of the future of this country—now more that ever I believe it. I realize many people of many differing points of view, education, possibilities and achievements make up every political party. There has to be give and take, compromise and agreement to achieve any given platform or program. However there are a few cardinal principles about which there should be universal agreement. Honesty in deed—truth in speech—elementary justice—and loyalty to our form of government. Unless our leaders give us this minimum they will cease to be leaders and do not merit the support of honest men and women. This has been my yardstick for 50 years and always will be. When I could not honestly support a candidate I have always told the leaders why and withheld my support, using one or another of the possible ways to show my displeasure. By this means I think I have held the confidence of the people I have worked with. Much of my life has been given in one form or another to help my Party. I have had no political ambitions for myself, but I have worked hard for the election of many fine candidates—often I have lost, sometimes I have won. But I've never had to be ashamed of the candidates I supported even though I've seldom agreed with *everything* they advocated. I know our candidates are only human and liable to err—but if a candidate is essentially honest and follows his true vision I am satisfied. I would not contradict Bill Shedd's date about a formal organization. It may be we just operated with our Municipal County Committee members as town leaders of Democracy, but we did a pile of work of as public a nature as possible between 1924 and 1933.

I forget the year that Harvey Ely was elected State Senator and Mort O'Connell Bergen County Sheriff but with less than a hundred registered Democratic votes in Leonia we secured over 1,000 votes for each man and won astonished recognition from the County leaders.

I even forget the year the Democratic Women's County organization came into being, that may have been the same year or a bit earlier, at the beginning of the "Depression"—if so, the Party leaders never would have asked me to be President unless our achievements in Leonia were already well known to them.

Not every election did we have a headquarters on Broad Ave. but we had one for each crucial campaign. And we raised our own money to support it mostly by free will gifts from Leonia Democrats.

I am proud to say that I recall only one Leonian who violated our local code of loyalty-honesty and square dealing. One day a newcomer to Leonia strode into our headquarters with a swagger; seated himself opposite me at a table, lit a huge cigar and blew smoke in my face, with his feet propped up on the table and began to tell me *his* demands of special favors *in the town* for which he was willing to put a large sum of money at our disposal provided we promised to listen to him and promote his desires. In return he would guarantee the election of our town candidates and be the ruling hand, behind the scenes.

I was so astounded I listened to quite a bit he had to say. Then I stood up and told him to take his feet off my table and extinguish his offensive cigar, also to take of his hat. Out of surprise at my attack he listened for a bit too and then retreated in disorder. It was my only such experience in Leonia or anywhere else. Otherwise I have been treated with unfailing courtesy as a Party equal until the last Presidential election in Richmond when I had an encounter with the "Committee to Re-elect the President" (CREEP).

Then a very important man of that Committee accused me on the radio of having either been "bribed" or "taken advantage of" by McGovern supporters because I had spoken at a press conference, which was televised, at which I protested the free use of Social Security envelopes sent out in October to 22 million-plus elderly citizens in which a card was inserted giving Mr. Nixon credit for having secured the increase in Social Security payments to each recipient.

My whole protest was directed against the effort to drag Social Security into a political campaign, thereby saving the price of an eight cent stamp to circulate this untruth and to influence the November vote for him. The *fact* was the President had proposed to veto the whole bill because of the increase. I think I've had a marvelous political career in 50 years if I encountered only one personal crook, and got only one public lam-

basting from a Republican organization which is even now being held up to scorn and contumely around the world for its dishonesty.

You will gather from this, Nancy, that I am still a loyal Democrat—forced by age and advancing blindness and deafness to have definitely retired from the political scene.

I am delighted to hear from you again. I regret no single day spent in Bergen County, most of them in Leonia, and I value the friendships made there above those made during my long life anywhere in the world.

ELIZABETH C. DENNY VANN.

PRIVACY PROTECTION

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I set forth an article that I prepared for and which appeared in the New York Law Journal on the subject of privacy. The article follows:

RUNAWAY THREAT TO PRIVACY IN UNITED STATES

(By Edward I. Koch)

Each day a massive amount of personal information about individual Americans is collected by both private businesses and governmental agencies. This data is not gathered by clandestine agents. The great bulk of this information is supplied voluntarily by citizens as they go about their daily affairs, or gathered routinely as part of an ordinary business transaction.

Certainly, the federal government has files on most of us. The Social Security Administration, for instance, maintains more than 160 million files on persons living and dead, the Department of Defense has more than 14 million military service histories, the Census Bureau maintains its records, the Internal Revenue Service retains annual tax returns, and the Department of State has our passport applications. Countless additional files on individual citizens are maintained by other offices of the federal government.

State and local governments also accumulate mountains of personal information. This includes data relating to education, employment, income and property ownership. Banks and other financial institutions, credit bureaus, hospitals and private schools also accumulate extensive amounts of sensitive personal data.

No doubt much of this information must be collected and maintained in today's complex world so that it will be available for proper use. Nevertheless, the increased use of computers and sophisticated electronic data handling techniques now provides simple and convenient ways to store, collate and correlate this information.

It is time that we recognized that the assembling of personal information, originally collected piecemeal by a large number of separate agencies but now easily brought together in computer data banks, is a significant threat to our individual liberty and to our privacy.

NO REGULATION

Since Warren and Brandeis wrote "The Right to Privacy" in the *Harvard Law Review* in 1890 the law of privacy has developed in many areas. Over this same period, however, the average citizen's interaction with all levels of government and with business has grown even more. Thus, the amount of personal information about each of us which has already been collected in computer data banks and which is now potentially available to strangers is frighteningly large. The collection and disclosure of this personal data is presently totally unregulated, with the result that each citizen's right to privacy is threatened as never before.

While our courts have upheld the right of privacy in many cases, it is nonetheless true that Americans presently have no effective method of preventing the indiscriminate disclosure of personal information concerning them or even of ascertaing whether such information is accurate. Indeed, the problem is even more serious since private citizens presently have no means of determining which organizations are maintaining files on them.

More than five years ago—before Watergate and the excesses of the present Administration aroused a more widespread concern with privacy—I proposed the first Federal Privacy Act, designed to give the ordinary citizen a workable means of protecting his privacy with respect to critical records, without impeding the necessary work of government. That bill has not been enacted although it had the possible effect of providing the basis for important hearings in the Congress.

LEGISLATION NEEDED

The time is long overdue for Congress to address itself to the problem of the significant invasion of personal privacy through the collection and maintenance of personal data files. This area must not remain today devoid of effective regulation. The only response of the Administration has been the creation of a cabinet-level White House committee to "draw up safeguards for protection of the privacy of individual citizens against misuse of information about them stored in computers." In light of the Administration's record in this field, one can predict with confidence that little of substance will come from this effort.

What is needed now is a concerted push to enact strong legislation. To this end, Representative Barry Goldwater, Jr. and I introduced a comprehensive new "Right to Privacy Act" in the House of Representatives on April 19, 1974. The sponsorship of the Koch-Goldwater bill by Barry Goldwater, Jr., a Republican, and by myself, a Democrat, with our differences in other fields, demonstrates that on the issue of personal privacy there is a common bond between conservatives and liberals.

INSPECTION GUARANTEED

The Right to Privacy Act is designed to protect each individual's right to privacy. It would require that organizations which maintain personal information files inform the individuals affected that a file of information about them exists and would further require these organizations to permit inspection and correction of the data in these files. The act would define "personal information" to include anything which describes an individual, including his education, his financial transactions, his medical history or his employment records.

All levels of government as well as business organizations would be required to comply with the provisions of the act. Any particular agency or organization would be restricted to collecting only that information which is appropriate to its needs. In addition, the act would require that such information be maintained completely and competently, that it not be disclosed to third parties without the individual's consent, and that a record be maintained of such disclosures as well as of those who have had access to that file. In addition, when personal information is sought from an individual, he must be told if the request is mandatory or voluntary and what penalty or loss of benefit will result from non-compliance.

RIGHT TO CHALLENGE

Copies of an individual's files, including investigative reports, must be made available to that individual at reasonable cost and the individual must be able to challenge inaccurate or undocumented information and to have his position in a dispute added to this file.

The act would further provide that persons involved in handling personal information must act under a code of professional secrecy and be subject to penalties for any breach of secrecy.

The act would establish a five-member Federal Privacy Board which would serve on a full-time basis and whose members would be appointed for a three-year term by the President with Senate confirmation. The board would collect and publish information on personal information systems, issue regulations concerning such systems, inspect systems when non-compliance is suspected, hear requests for exceptions, and transmit annual reports to Congress and the President.

The Right to Privacy Act will not inhibit the collection of material needed for national defense or for the pursuit of active criminal prosecutions, but it will provide effective protection against possible invasion of personal privacy.

WIDESPREAD ABUSE

I suggest that the right to privacy of every citizen of the United States is threatened by the unregulated maintenance of data banks of personal information, by government or by private organizations, and that each citizen has a strong personal interest in the enactment of the Right to Privacy Act during this Congress.

A quick recounting of only a few of the recent abuses in this area will demonstrate the dimensions of the problem and the reason why this legislation is needed to safeguard our privacy.

In 1970 it was learned that the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Bureau of the Internal Revenue Service was selling mailing lists of individuals who had registered as gun collectors to firearms merchants.

GI CODE NUMBERS

In March of this year, after several years of prodding by myself and certain other members of Congress after remedial legislation had been introduced, the Department of Defense agreed to remove Separation Program Numbers and re-enlistment code numbers from all veterans' discharge papers. These numbers could indicate anything from "expiration of service" to suspected (but unproven) homosexuality or sexual perversion. Despite the fact that the meanings of these code numbers were not supposed to be available to the public, they were in fact known and used by employers and others to deny employment and other benefits to veterans.

While this alone was a serious invasion of the right to privacy of these veterans, this particular instance demonstrates an even more insidious aspect of the problem of the misuse of personal information since these coded numbers were placed on discharge papers by the services without the veteran having been afforded an opportunity to contest the applicability of a particular number.

In yet another area, persistent pressure from concerned Congressmen was required to force the rescission of an Executive Order which would have permitted the Department of Agriculture to review the tax returns of 3 million farmers. This Executive Order was reported to have been designed to be the precursor of similar orders which would have permitted other government agencies access to the tax returns of additional groups of citizens.

NEWSPAPER'S TELEPHONE CALLS

The recent effort of the Internal Revenue Service to secure from the New York Telephone Company records of telephone calls made from the offices of the *New York Times* in connection with an internal IRS investigation is yet another example of how seemingly

innocuous personal information may be misused if improperly disclosed.

Many issues that come before the Congress affect only a small segment of our population. The right to privacy concerns each one of us directly. It concerns our right to express ourselves, our relationships with family and friends, our right to go through life without the uncomfortable feeling that someone is always looking over our shoulders. George Orwell's *1984* is but ten years away. The Orwellian threat of a helpless citizenry enmeshed in the coils of an all-powerful computer data bank is upon us now. To preserve our privacy requires that we take firm steps now—before his fantasy becomes our reality.

TO ABOLISH THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, for 187 years, the United States, under its Constitution, has conducted its Presidential elections under a system of balloting that is archaic, confusing, cumbersome, and inequitable.

I find it unconscionable that a nation which has always had tremendous importance to the worth of the individual and his or her role in our society has failed to modify our elective system to insure that each and every citizen has an equal voice in the selection of their President.

By continuing to conduct our elections under the electoral college system, we are not realizing our true potential as a democracy and we have not achieved true equality under the law. We continue to be guided by a historical motivation no longer applicable to the modern American society.

Certainly, as one aspect of the current national catharsis, abolition of the wholly undesirable electoral college system is an idea whose time has come. The one-man, one-vote concept of political equality, as set forth by the Supreme Court on Gray against Sanders, 1963, takes on an even greater meaning.

The ideal represented by that decision was defined with great clarity by Justice William O. Douglas, who said:

> The concept of political equality from the Declaration of Independence, to Lincoln's Gettysburg Address . . . can mean only one thing—one person, one vote.

In actuality, there are a number of additional arguments which can be applied in favor of the direct popular election of the President and Vice President, all of which lend credence to the desirability of realizing action on the issue in this 93d Congress. But, can there be a single more compelling reason to adopt pending legislation to abolish the electoral college than to supplant it with a system that insures the full and complete equality for all our people?

As a cosponsor of legislation to accomplish same, I submit for consideration these major additional substantiating facts, some of which point to existing aspects of the elective system that border on the ridiculous.

At least 14 "minority" Presidents have been elected, 3 of whom received less votes than their opponents. In 11 instances, less than 50 percent of the popular votes cast were received but more votes than the nearest opponent. The fact that it is possible for a candidate to receive fewer votes than the nearest opponent and be elected is cause for concern;

The current 12 largest States alone can determine the thrust of a Presidential election by possessing excessive elective influence, regardless of the vote of the remaining 38 States. This is known as the winner-take-all system and it strains confidence in the true nature of our "representative" government;

An elector under the electoral college system is not even bound by any consideration other than party affiliation, personal viewpoint, or mere whim. The electors may choose to change their candidate and thus alter the outcome of a Presidential election. This can certainly take place in a close election;

It was not the intention of the Founding Fathers to permit the individual State to cast its electoral votes en bloc. Furthermore, it is apparent that candidates from the larger States have enjoyed an unfair advantage insofar as they are more likely to receive the large bloc of electoral votes in their respective States;

If no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes, the House of Representatives determines the outcome of the election. This is entirely contrary to my conception of representative government by the people;

The various legislatures of the States may entirely determine the method of selecting Presidential electors, leaving open the potential for extensive abuse of power by the State legislatures.

In my view, each of the above represents a forceful, compelling argument in favor of abolishing the electoral college system, which has no place in modern America. The motivations behind the creation of the system by the Founding Fathers in 1787 have little relevance to our present-day makeup and the nature of our society and our Nation.

In actuality, the framers of the Constitution had little faith in the ability of the average citizen to fully ponder and grasp the major issues of the day. The delegates to the Constitutional Convention felt that a voter in one State could not possibly be knowledgeable of matters related to the leading citizens of another State.

It is understandable, however, that the Founding Fathers did not and could not envision the present makeup and strength of the States, nor could they have envisioned an America as it is today.

With the advent of the mass media and opportunities for universal education, the lack of faith in the average voter's ability to view and understand the issue no longer applies. It is this historical motivation which surely has no place in the 1970's nor in the future.

But, our love of liberty and equality under the law and our faith in the individual are as real and acute today as in the 1770's, and will continue to be valued.

It is for this reason that the responsible and desirable course of action is to abolish the electoral college.

It is out of place in our elective process.

Nor do I espouse the "district" nor the "proportional" systems, neither of which represents the ultimate ideal of representative government.

Our Constitution is a magnificent document, with relevance and meaning in our modern-day society, but it must also be a flexible ideal, one which can adapt to changing needs in a changing, maturing nation.

The true essence of what our constitutional ideals are all about can be found in the concept of political equality under the law for all. Nothing less than true equality must be accepted. The ultimate point at which we will finally realize our quest for total equality is by allowing each and every American citizen to fully exercise their right to vote—equally.

It is imperative, therefore, that this 93d Congress be recognized as the legislative session which gave to the American people the pure essence of democracy. We must abolish the electoral college and establish a system under which the President and Vice President are elected by popular vote, by all of our people, and by each.

OKLAHOMA PARKS DIRECTOR URGES AUTHORIZATION BOOST FOR CONSERVATION FUND PROJECTS

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the director of Oklahoma's Parks and Recreation Department, Mr. Chris Delaporte, appeared today before the House Parks and Recreation Subcommittee to testify in support of legislation which will increase the present $300 million authorization level for the land and water conservation fund.

Mr. Delaporte provided the subcommittee with a number of very persuasive arguments in support of the authorization increase, and I believe his farsighted assessment of our Nation's future recreational needs was of great benefit and interest to the subcommittee members.

Mr. Delaporte's testimony will be helpful to my colleagues in understanding the very urgent need for an annual increase in the authorization for our country's recreational programs, and I include the text of Mr. Delaporte's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF CHRIS THERELL DELAPORTE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE OUTDOOR RECREATION LIAISON OFFICERS

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: Last May NASORLO had the opportunity to appear before the Appropriations subcommittees on Interior and Insular Affairs in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. At that time we called for an in-

crease in the appropriations ceiling from $300 million to 1 billion. NASORLO had previously testified in support of S. 2661.

We are pleased and honored to appear here today to testify in support of legislation which will accomplish these necessary changes.

We also wish to voice our support of House Resolution 15357 which would establish an Historical Preservation Fund.

One year ago, the appropriation to the Land and Water Conservation Fund was reduced from the authorized $300 million to $66 million for Fiscal Year 1974. The rationale for this reduction was to allow a year for the states to "catch-up" on the obligation of funds allotted to them. During Fiscal Year '74, the balances of almost all states have been substantially reduced—we have caught up with the money available for expenditure. As of June 30, 1974, only a total of 18 million dollars remained unobligated among all the states.

Unfortunately, while we have been catching up with our balances, we have been falling farther and farther behind the demand of the American people for recreational opportunities. Our citizens are being increasingly cut off from the land. Our nation is increasingly urbanized and industrialized. Our jobs are increasingly specialized and routine.

As our people have given up their farms and ranches for backyards, and their backyards for apartment balconies, the need for access to the land for recreational purposes has grown geometrically, and has been multiplied by the increasing technological sophistication of the recreationist.

As the demand has increased, so have the costs of meeting this demand. And, unfortunately, as demand and costs increase, many opportunities for valuable acquisition and development are on the verge of being lost. The time is fortuitous for the expansion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Program and for an unequivocal renewal of commitment to meeting the recreational needs of this Nation.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Program has worked so well partially because of its reliability. Cities, counties, and states have been able to commit resources with confident anticipation of an equal commitment on the part of Federal Government.

Last year's cut-back has shaken this confidence. Across the nation, bond programs have been passed for park and recreation purposes in expectation of receiving federal matching funds. This money now lies fallow. The Land and Water Conservation Fund even if funded fully at the current authorization level is not adequate to the demand. National commitment to the provision of recreational opportunities is being questioned.

In response to the obvious demand, and in order to restore continuity to the Program, we urge this Committee to act favorably toward the increase of the authorization level of the Land and Water Conservation Fund to 1 billion dollars per year.

We also urge favorable consideration of legislation changing the acquisition match from 50/50 to 70/30, as well as legislation which would make 25% of the funds received by a state available for planning and development of sheltered facilities.

We further support the establishment of an historic preservation fund, with an authorized funding level of $100,000,000 per year.

The one objection to these actions which must be seriously addressed is that an increase in Land and Water Conservation Fund expenditures will be inflationary. Our feeling is that any inflationary effect would be minimal, yet the effect in both human and economic terms of inaction would be staggering. Opportunities to provide for the recreational needs of generations of Americans would be irretrievably lost.

In considering this factor we ask you to weigh the possibilities of a minimal bad effect against the certain adverse consequences of inaction. We also point out that the inflationary effect can be reevaluated and considered each year in appropriations hearings and adjustments made if necessary.

With the exception of the actions advocated above, we urge that there be no additional changes in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. While some of the other proposed changes appear to have merit, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Program has not received the serious in-depth evaluation which is a necessary precondition for large-scale changes in the Act.

We would welcome special hearings on the part of this Committee inviting testimony on substantive changes in the Organic Act.

We are especially concerned about proposed changes which would limit the discretion of the State Liaison Office in recommending and approving projects. The strength of this Program is due in part to its ability to meet the diverse needs of all the States and Territories. Changes in the Organic Act which limit this flexibility deserve close consideration and specific testimony on each point.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Program is one of the most functional programs enacted by Congress. The idea of using depletable natural resources to fund investment in new public resources is one of the most fundamentally sound public policies of this Nation.

As this revenue from use of these depletable resources increases, as the demand for additional recreational experiences increases, so do the opportunities to serve increase. We, as State Liaison Officers, feel privileged to be a part of this Program, and we ask you to help us take advantage of these increased opportunities.

By increasing the authorized funding level to 1 billion dollars, by providing 70/30 match for acquisition, by making money available for sheltered facilities, and by providing additional funds for historical preservation you will be performing an invaluable service to the people of this country.

SUPREME COURT'S DECISION DID NOT SOLVE THE ISSUE OF EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on July 24 the Supreme Court ruled in United States against Nixon that "the President's assertion of a generalized privilege of confidentiality" must give way to the "constitutional need for relevant evidence" in "criminal trials."

It has been popularly asserted that this decision has resolved the issue as to whether the President can invoke the claim of executive privilege to withhold information. That is not true. On the contrary, the decision seems, for the first time, to have given a semblance of validity to the claim of executive privilege in contexts other than ir criminal trials, even though no other issue was involved in the case—except the President's claim of executive privilege on the basis of generalized confidentiality to withhold evidence needed in a criminal trial. Thus, to the extent that the Supreme Court has gone beyond the issue involved in that case, any claim of executive privilege rests solely on dicta in that case.

This point is very well analyzed in an article by Carrie Johnson entitled "Privilege and Precedent," published on the editorial page of the Washington Post of Sunday, July 28, 1974. I am sure this analysis will be of great interest to Members of Congress and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I therefore include the text of this article at this point in the RECORD.

PRIVILEGE AND PRECEDENT

(By Carrie Johnson)

In the first Supreme Court test of the scope of executive privilege, President Nixon lost but the presidency gained.

There was more than face-saving to Mr. Nixon's statement, issued through his counsel, James St. Clair, that while he was "of course, disappointed in the result," he was "gratified" that "the Court reaffirmed both the validity and the importance of the principle of executive privilege—the principle I had sought to maintain."

What the Court actually reaffirmed was a different principle: the rule of law. But the Court did hold, for the first time, that a generalized, presumptive presidential privilege has a constitutional base. Moreover, the Court suggested that certain specific claims of confidentiality might be accorded even greater deference in the future by the courts.

Thus in the course of compelling Mr. Nixon to surrender the tapes to Judge John Sirica, the Court may have made it easier for future Presidents to withhold information, especially from Congress. At minimum, the decision seems likely to lead to more frequent claims of executive privilege, more litigation and sharper judicial definition of the boundaries between executive and legislative powers—boundaries which have traditionally been pragmatic, flexible and imprecise.

This is speculation, of course. Chief Justice Warren Burger, writing for the Court, emphasized in a footnote that the opinion addressed only the conflict between the President's general claim of privilege and the specific needs of a criminal trial. *U.S. v. Nixon*, the Chief Justice wrote, was not concerned with the extent of the generalized executive privilege in civil litigation or conflicts with Congress, or with "the President's interest in protecting state secrets." Nor did the Court address the issue of executive privilege in impeachment proceedings.

But the 8–0 decision is broad and emphatic enough to have great impact in all of those areas. Impeachment is a special case; the decision should give no encouragement at all to Mr. Nixon's attempts to withhold evidence which the Congress wants in carrying out its explicit, exclusive constitutional duty to judge the conduct of the President. If the President may not control the evidence in someone else's trial, it would be ludicrous for any court—if called on to decide the issue—to let the President dictate the evidence in his own case.

Setting the impeachment question aside, however, several aspects of the case appear to buttress the ability of Presidents to refuse congressional demands for information on White House decisions and activities. The first is the legitimacy which the Court bestowed on executive privilege in general. While the doctrine is nowhere mentioned in the Constitution, the Chief Justice wrote "a presumptive privilege for presidential communications" is "fundamental to the operations of government and inextricably rooted in the separation of powers." Moreover, the public and presidential interest in preserving that confidentiality "is weighty indeed and entitled to great respect."

This gives the doctrine new, solid legal footing and great political weight. Until last Wednesday, those who advocated a general executive privilege had few judicial footnotes

for their claim. Now they have a unanimous high court decision, with the added force of a single opinion by the Chief Justice himself.

The Court did hold that "a broad, undifferentiated claim" of confidentiality could fall in a conflict with other basic values, such as the specific needs of a criminal trial. Presumably such a general claim might also have to yield before the demonstrated need of a congressional committee for particular kinds of materials.

But the Court suggested that an even higher degree of privilege might exist where a President made a specific "claim of need to protect military, diplomatic or sensitive national security secrets." Those are, of course, precisely the policy areas in which Presidents are already most inclined to resist congressional inquiries—and the Court suggests that Congress in the future might be able to get even less information than is forthcoming now.

Support, for instance, that the Senate Judiciary Committee, in the exercise of its oversight powers, is examining the use of warrantless national-security wiretaps. Or suppose that the House Armed Services Committee wants to probe mysterious U.S. military moves in the Mideast. And suppose that the President, citing *U.S.* v. *Nixon*, refuses to furnish any information on grounds that "sensitive national security secrets" would be jeopardized. Assuming both branches of government pressed their claims, which of them would prevail—the President's assertion of privilege, or the committee's need to know how presidential power is being used?

To date, such conflicts have usually resolved themselves in political tests of strength and will. Congress threatens to cut appropriations or block appointments; the President holds pet congressional projects hostage, or beguiles key legislators by sharing some secrets secretly with them. The outcome of such maneuvering is usually less than a full airing of the facts—but it is also less than a binding precedent, and thus has the enormous advantage of leaving room for future flexibility and play between the two branches of government.

In response to President Nixon's assertions of broad privilege, many in Congress have become intrigued with possibilities for taking executive-privilege disputes to court without going to the extreme of citing a President or his subordinate for contempt. The Senate has passed and the House Government Operations Committee has reported a bill giving federal courts jurisdiction to hear such cases, and requiring the contested materials to be given to Congress unless a judge upholds a specific presidential claim of confidentiality.

That course, however, is not likely to be productive. The Senate Watergate committee has already tried it—and did not get any presidential tapes. And if *U.S.* v. *Nixon* encourages further resorts to court, the decision also suggests that the judiciary, in weighing the competing interests of the executive and Congress, may find for the President much of the time. There is "that high degree of deference" which the Court said that presidential records should receive. There is, beyond that, the special protection which, according to the Court, "state secrets" should enjoy.

There is another factor, too. In ruling that Mr. Nixon must turn over those tapes, the Court noted that presidential advisers are not likely to be inhibited by the possibility of "infrequent occasions of disclosure" of their comments in criminal trials. But congressional demands for disclosure are far more frequent and, courts could well conclude, therefore more threatening—even when the inquiry is otherwise justified.

To worry about such points is not to say that Presidents should have no secrets, or that the most sensitive policy deliberations in the Oval Office should be exposed to public and congressional scrutiny as a matter of course. Certainly some things have to be secret and some expectations of confidentiality are essential to the functioning of government.

But if one believes that future Presidents, as well as Mr. Nixon, should be as forthcoming and accountable as possible, then *U.S.* v. *Nixon* has worrisome aspects. The decision should be scrutinized not only for the presidential powers which the Court rejected and the confrontation it resolved, but also for the powers which the decision did sanction and the future conflicts which may result.

THE AFL–CIO CALL FOR NATIONAL DEBATE ON ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 1974, Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, delivered a major address to the National Press Club here in the Nation's capital on the subject of the foreign policy initiatives of the Nixon administration.

In his speech, Mr. Meany raised some serious and troubling questions about détente between the United States and the Soviet Union—questions to which we, in the Congress, should be addressing ourselves before these unilateral actions of the administration come to have the force and effect of a national policy.

Mr. Meany calls, in particular, for a full-dress national debate on détente—on what it consists of, and what it might mean to the American people. I applaud Mr. Meany's call for such discussion, and I commend to my colleagues excerpts of his remarks, which I am placing in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY GEORGE MEANY

A week ago yesterday, the lead story in the *New York Times* was about our Secretary of State, Dr. Kissinger.

There is nothing new in that, of course—Dr. Kissinger has been on the front pages a lot lately. But, what was especially interesting about this story, at least to me, was that it reported that our Secretary of State was preparing for a major debate when he got home from Europe—a debate, in the words of the *Times*, on the meaning of security in the nuclear age, and on the value and risks of closer ties with the Soviet Union.

In other words, a discussion of what has come to be known as "detente".

I believe the American people welcome the idea of such a discussion. I think the foreign policies of this Administration cry out for public discussion. In fact, I think these policies should not be carried one step further until they have been openly and amply debated before the American people.

After all, it is quite obvious that there have been some dramatic changes in our government's foreign policies. These changes, whether you agree with them or not, mark a radical departure from the assumptions and attitudes that governed our bi-partisan foreign policies throughout the period since World War II.

In a democracy, such massive shifts in policy cannot be imposed upon the people without discussion.

I think we have a pretty good idea of where Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kissinger want to take us—but, do the people want to follow?

So, I am glad that the Secretary is preparing for a debate. We need a good public airing of this Administration's policies. Maybe that way we can clarify some of the mysteries of this detente—on which subject, I have some modest thoughts. . . .

The American labor movement is going to assert as strong a voice as possible in developing the foreign policies of this country.

We intend to continue to be heard because the foreign policies of this Administration—or for that matter any Administration—have a direct bearing on the living standards and the welfare of millions of working people and their families.

When this Administration, in the name of detente, subsidizes a wheat deal with the Soviet Union to the tune of 300 million taxpayers' dollars—those dollars come out of *our* pocketbooks.

When the price of bread then skyrockets, costing our housewives hundreds of millions of extra dollars—those extra dollars come out of *our* pocketbooks.

When the Soviet Union urges the Arabs to play oil blackmail—and when American oil companies create shortages in the quest for profits—the cost comes out of *our* pocketbooks.

When our government's trade policies encourage the export of American jobs and technology, who bears the costs? It comes out of *our* pocketbooks.

And, if the policies of our government should prove wrong and there should be war, all Americans will be called on to sacrifice—and this, of course, includes workers.

So we are not inclined to leave foreign policy to the experts—least of all the experts of this Administration. We are not convinced that they have our interests at heart—the interests of working people, the interests of the great majority of the American people. . . .

The values and priorities of this Administration, at home, carry over into its conduct of foreign affairs. This not a schizophrenic Administration. Mr. Nixon is not a Dr. Jekyll of domestic policy and a Mr. Hyde of foreign policy.

Frankly, I fail to understand some of our so-called liberal friends who say: yes, the Administration has made a mess of the economy, a mess of civil rights, a mess of the war on poverty, a mess of the energy crisis, a mess of the whole domestic scene—but they've done a great job in foreign policy.

It's all of a piece—in my book.

At home and abroad, this Administration pursues the same goal—profit for big business without any concern for people generally. After all, we cannot expect an Administration—without concern for the welfare and security for the poor—the elderly or the veterans—to have any concern for the rights and welfare of the oppressed minorities in the Soviet Union. . . .

Three weeks ago, just prior to Mr. Nixon's visit to Moscow, hundreds of Soviet Jews were rounded up, arrested and jailed. *This*—in connection with a visit from the President of the United States and he uttered not one word of protest. Not one word.

Well, you may say that would have been counterproductive and inappropriate. That would be interfering in the internal affairs of another country—and, the President told us, in his Annapolis speech, that we mustn't do that.

But when the Commissars pulled the plugs on the American networks as American broadcasters sought to interview Andrei Sakharov, Soviet censorship was reaching into the living rooms of Americans.

The Soviet government was deciding what Americans—not Russians but Americans—could and could not see on the news.

And, from our government, from our Secretary of State and from our President, not one word of protest. Not a whisper—not a frown. . . .

But, I think that the next time the President of the United States makes a speech

about how the internal structure of other societies is none of our business, let us remember the day the Commissars pulled the plug on the American people.

Let us remember that how nations behave toward their own people has something to do with how they behave toward other nations. There is a relationship between internal structure and external conduct. There is a relationship between what societies are at home and what they do abroad. That was true for Mussolini and Hitler and Stalin—it is just as true for Brezhnev.

There *is* a difference between democracy and totalitarianism. And, one system *is* better than the other.

Once in a while, I think we need to remind ourselves of that—especially these days when the President of the United States and the leading lights of big corporations are spouting the line that the difference isn't all that important. . . .

But let us get down to the basic question—what *is* this detente? What *is* this thing in whose name we turn our eyes away from brave people struggling for human rights.

What is this detente in whose name a great nation—like ours—which in the last decade spent its best energies in a painful, unfinished but glorious struggle for civil rights and civil liberties—now stands by as the shadow of indifference, opportunism and cynicism darkens its highest ideals.

People died for the right to vote in this country.

People died for the cause of social justice in this country.

People died trying for the right to organize workers into free unions in this country.

In Alabama, the labor movement did not side with Bull Connor and his police dogs. In Georgia, the labor movement did not side with Lester Maddox and his axe-handlers. In the Congress, the labor movement did not side the signers of the Southern Manifesto. . . .

We know which side we were on in the struggle between freedom and repression in our own country. And, we know which side we are on in the same struggle in the Soviet Union.

I wonder which side Mr. Nixon is on—I wonder which side Mr. Kissinger is on. . . .

The idea of detente was held out to the American people as a promise of cooperation between the world's two super-powers—not only to relax tensions between their respective countries so as to lessen the possibility of nuclear war but *to use their power* and influence with other nations to prevent lesser conflicts that could eventually spread to global war.

Then, there was of course the economic side of detente—the *give and take* of trade negotiations—very beneficial to both nations, so we were told.

And, what has happened in the 2 years since detente was sold to the American people?

Has the Soviet fulfilled their commitment to peace?

Has the anti-American propaganda—surely a cause of tension—emanating from Moscow and spread throughout the world—propaganda that holds up the United States as a vicious, imperialistic country—has this propaganda been brought to a halt?

No—the Soviets have not fulfilled their commitment.

No—the vicious anti-American propaganda has not come to a halt. It goes on and on—more vicious than ever.

And, how about the super-powers using their influence to stop conflicts among the smaller nations?

Last October, Egypt and Syria—without warning—attacked Israel on one of the high holy days of the Jewish religious calendar. This attack, without question, was incited by the Soviet Union. This attack was carried out by Soviet-trained personnel, using the most modern weapons of war supplied by the Soviet Union. As soon as the attack started and immediately after the Israelis fought back, the Soviet Union launched a massive airlift of military hardware to Syria and Egypt.

This action indicated—without question—that the entire operation was planned and executed by the Arabs under the watchful eye of Soviet instructors and supervisors.

And, at the very same time, Brezhnev openly and publicly pressed the other Arab nations to come into the war against the Israelis. . . .

So when we look at what happened in the Middle East, we ask ourselves what contribution did the Russians make to detente in that situation?

Dr. Kissinger said they acted with great restraint.

If fanning the flames of war in the Middle East goes by the name of restraint, I would like to know what goes by the name of belligerence.

And then there was the first SALT agreement in which we made unilateral concessions to the Soviets. We allowed them a numerical superiority in missiles on the ground that we had a technological superiority in MIRVs.

Some of us warned against this approach, notably Senator Jackson. We said the Soviets could catch up technologically—that they could MIRV their rockets. But this was poohpoohed. We were called hawks, Dr. Strangeloves and God knows what else.

But what has happened? The reason Mr. Nixon failed to reach an agreement on offensive weapons limitations in Moscow this time around was precisely because the Russians are determined to go full steam ahead with the MIRVing of their missiles.

What did we get in return for these unilateral concessions in the first Salt Agreement? I don't know—perhaps President Nixon or Secretary Kissinger could tell us.

Underneath all the mysteries, all the secret diplomacy, all the surface smiles, all the rolling rhetoric—what is the reality of détente?

First, the Soviet Union is worried about America getting too friendly with China. I don't think this has very much to do with the great Nixon-Kissinger diplomacy at all. The Russians and the Chinese have been at each other's throat for a long time—not because of Kissinger's genius—but because Russian imperialism poses a threat to China.

Secondly, the Russians are in desperate need of American technology.

You know, we Americans tend to forget how backward the Soviet economy really is. We see the Russians going into space and constructing nuclear weapons and we assume that they are as advanced as we are.

We tend to forget the enormous price the Russian people pay for this military hardware—twice as much of their gross national product as we do in the United States.

And, to sustain this level of weapons production, the Soviet consumer economy has been strangled for almost 50 years.

Consumer goods we take for granted are in continuous short supply in the Soviet Union. Not only industrial consumer goods—not only housing—but food. Soviet agricultural production is a mess—thanks to Joe Stalin's wonderful miracle of forced collectivization of agriculture.

So what do the Russians want from us?

They wanted us to bail them out of their agricultural disaster—and we did. We looked the other way as they pulled off the Great Grain deal so costly to American families.

They want most-favored-nation status. But is this really the issue? Is this the obstacle to trade?

We should keep in mind that except for items on the prohibited list related to national security, we are already trading with the Soviet Union.

In 1971, U.S.-Soviet trade amounted to $224 million. By 1972, it was up to $900 million. This increase took place without granting the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status.

What the Russians need is not a reduction of trade barriers so their goods can come in. What they want is American exports. They want American technology, machinery, equipment—American know-how .The trouble is they can't pay for it. They can't trade for it because at the moment, they don't produce goods that are in great demand here—although they may in the future. Remember, totalitarian governments can easily shift investment and production to suit their purposes.

But for now, the name of the game is credit. And, that means, among other things, the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

Now, the Eximbank was originally set up to encourage American exports by making loans available to foreign buyers. In this way, it was supposed to promote American sales and jobs.

But what it is doing now is subsidizing overseas production that will hurt American exports and employment—and, one of the prime beneficiaries of this largesse is the Soviet Union.

In the last year or so, the Eximbank—which is financed by American taxpayers—has lent the Soviet Union amost $469 million—most of it is 6 percent interest and a small portion of 7 percent.

Now, this—very simply—is an economic aid program.

The price rate in the United States is 12 percent. We have been lending hundreds of millions to the Soviet Union at about half that rate—at a time when millions of hard working Americans cannot get mortgage money to buy a home.

This is a give-away program. This is a welfare program to bail out the Soviet government.

Now, what are some of these loans for?

Well, in May the Eximbank announced a loan of $180 million to develop fertilizer production in the Soviet Union. This is a $400 million project that will enable the Russians to produce nitrogen fertilizer and export it to the United States. In other words, if we are short of fertilizer, then instead of investing in fertilizer plants at home, we invest in fertilizer plants in the Soviet Union so they can export fertilizer to this country.

Then, of course, we have the famous Kama River Truck project. Your friendly Eximbank gave the Russians two loans towards that one—$86,450,000 at 6 percent and $67,500,000 at 7 percent for a total of $153,950,000. . . .

You might wonder whether a truck plant could be of military use to the Soviet Union. The answer is yes—and the Administration knew it. . . .

Evidently this Administration is so hellbent on detente at any price that they will give the Russians equipment with a military potential.

We're also helping out with a $36 million iron ore pellet plant.

Oh yes, the Russians are after Boeing, Lockheed and McDonnell-Douglas to sell them half a billion dollars—that's billion—not million—worth of wide-bodied jets. . . .

It looks like a great deal—until you take a close look at the conditions laid down by the Soviet negotiators.

Number One, the Russians want the planes on long-term, low-interest rate credit. Number Two, they want to co-produce them in the Soviet Union.

They want to co-produce these jets in a plant built for them in the Soviet Union by Boeing, McDonnell-Douglas or Lockheed. This plant construction would be financed by American credits and would eventually employ 80,000 workers and would produce more than 100 wide-bodied jets each year.

Also, the Soviet negotiators demand complete access to all our present and future technology in this field.

What does this all mean for the American aerospace industry and its many thousands of workers.

We'd sell some of these big jets in the next couple of years while we would be setting the Soviets up in a big way with our financing credits, our technical know-how and then we would have a competitor with access to unlimited slave labor—selling these jets at prices well below American prices.

This is what the Soviets call the economic side of detente.

What is really involved here is American economic aid to the Soviet Union plus the transfer of American technology as well. To me, it looks like a good old-fashioned shell game.

The Soviets are now cutting deals with American corporations that give them computer technology, integrated circuits, telecommunications, photo-optical equipment, sophisticated machine tools, oscilloscopes, aircraft parts, ship and submarine quieting techniques—that sort of thing and at bargain rate credits that are subsidized by the American taxpayer.

There is one other interesting bit of technology we have that the Russians want. According to the *Chicago Tribune*, the Russians want to buy some police technology from us—specifically, they want voice print recorders.

These are like finger printing machines except they make pictures of your voice. With this picture on file, your voice can be positively identified on the phone.

I am sure this will come as great news to Andrei Sakharov and to Soviet Jews who are trying to maintain phone contact with friends in the West....

Frankly, I just don't know what to make of this latest junket. I don't know what the President hoped to accomplish in Moscow. I don't know why he had to make the trip—unless it was for domestic political consumption.

After all, the ABM limitation was no big deal in the year of 1974—neither was the limitation on underground nuclear testing. According to newspaper reports, there was no discussion of mutual force reduction in Europe—and the hoped for agreement on offensive weapons was a flop.

The failure at Moscow to make any progress on the crucial question of putting a limit on offensive nuclear weapons means that the arms race goes on unabated.

It means also that the basic idea of this so-called detente as it was sold to the American people—the relaxing of tensions between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. has gone down the drain. . . .

Actually, Mr. Nixon looked a little pathetic—and I don't like to see the United States represented in the Soviet Union by a pathetic President.

On the surface, then, it appears that Yalta, 1974 was another Nixon failure. But the Administration keeps hinting darkly at deeper progress.

Now, they can't have it both ways. If the surface evidence is wrong and there was deeper progress—that, to me, means secret agreements. If there were no secret agreements, then the surface evidence stands!

Considering the course of this detente so far, considering its public give-aways, its open unilateral concession to the Soviet Union, I shudder to think of what any secret agreements might mean for the future of America and freedom in this world.

I think the American people are entitled to know what really happened in Yalta.

The answer may rest with the historians of tomorrow—but, let us at least have the debate!

MILITARY JUSTICE?—PART 2

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Ms. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, on an April night in 1969 at a Marine Corps base near Danang, South Vietnam, a young private first class named Mark Avrech typed a short statement expressing his feelings about the war. In pertinent part the statement read:

It seems to me that the South Vietnamese people could do a little more for the defense of their country. Why should we go out and fight their battles while they sit at home and complain about communist aggression. What are we, cannon fodder or human beings? The United States has no business over here. This is a conflict between two different politically minded groups. Not a direct attack upon the United States. We have peace talks with North Vietnam and the V.C. That's just fine and dandy except now how many men died in Vietnam the week they argued over the shape of the table? . . . Do we dare express our feelings with the threat of court-martial perpetually hanging over our heads? Are your opinions worth risking a court-martial? We must strive for peace and if not peace then a complete U.S. withdrawal. We've been sitting ducks for too long . . ."

Avrech's plan was to have the mimeograph operator make copies of his statement which he could then distribute to members of his company. Instead the mimeograph operator reported him to a superior officer. However valid Avrech's judgments about the war were, his judgment about the state of his superiors' mind was quite sound. He was court-martialed under article 80 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice—UCMJ—which makes it a crime to attempt to violate any other section of the code. In his case the attempt was to violate UCMJ article 134—the so-called general article—by publishing a statement "with design to promote disloyalty and disaffection among the troops."

Avrech was convicted and sentenced to reduction in grade to the lowest rank, forfeiture of 3 months' pay, and confinement for 1 month at hard labor. The commanding officer suspended the confinement, but the remainder of the sentence was sustained by the Staff Judge Advocate and the Judge Advocate General of the Navy. Following his severance from the service, Avrech attacked the judgment in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia where the military ruling was affirmed. The court of appeals reversed, holding article 134 unconstitutionally vague. On July 8 the Supreme Court reversed the judgment below and reinstated the court-martial verdict. In a 6–3 per curium decision, Secretary of the Navy against Avrech, the Court found the case of Parker against Nevy, in which the constitutionality of article 134 had recently been upheld, controlling.

Apart from the unconscionable denial of the most basic rights of free thought and expression represented by the Avrech holding—to which I will return in a moment—the case casts into bold relief certain critical lackings in the system of military justice.

First, it is noteworthy that the U.S. Court of Military Appeals—COMA—the highest court of military justice in the land—never had the opportunity to review this case despite its profound constitutional dimensions. Had a general or field grade officer been involved, he would have been entitled to COMA review as a matter of right. But to earn the same review, Private First Class Avrech would have had to have been sentenced to at least 6 months imprisonment.

Second, it is far from clear that even the Federal courts themselves had the power to review the Judge Advocate General's determination of the case. That was a central issue in the Supreme Court appeal, extensively briefed by the parties, but dogged by the court majority. The majority simply assumed arguendo the reviewability of a court-martial for purposes of ruling against Avrech on the merits and then used its ruling on the merits as an excuse for declining to determine the jurisdictional issue.

Third, while the Levy holding would appear to be definitive on the issue of the constitutionality of article 134, it does not logically follow that it is definitive on the individual merits of Avrech's situation. Surely a generally worded statute can constitutionally be applied to one set of facts but not another. And the distinction between Captain Levy's conduct and Private First Class Avrech's was plain. Captain Levy refused a direct order to train special forces personnel for Vietnam's duty while Private First Class Avrech disobeyed no orders and neglected no duties. Captain Levy, stationed at the U.S. Army Hospital, Fort Jackson, S.C., urged black soldiers not to accept assignment to Vietnam and not to fight if transported there, while saying that he would himself refuse Vietnam duty. Private First Class Avrech urged no one to violate any order, told no one to lay down his arms, and, of course, was already in Vietnam himself. Given military exigencies Captain Levy may conceivably have exceeded the perimeters of the first amendment. Private First Class Avrech did no such thing.

In his dissent to the Avrech holding Mr. Justice Douglas placed the first amendment issue into clear focus:

Talk is of course incitement; but not all incitement leads to action. What respondent in this case wrote out with the purpose of showing to the Marines in his unit, might, if released, create only revulsion. Or it might have produced a strong reaction. Conceivably more might have shared his views. But he was not setting up a rendezvous for all who wanted to go AWOL nor laying a dark plot against his superior officers. He was attempting to speak with his comrades in arms about the oppressive nature of the war they were fighting. His attempt, if successful, might at best result in letters to his family or Congressman or Senators who might read what he said to local people or publish the letters in newspapers or make him the subject of debate in legislative halls.

Secrecy and suppression of views which the Court today sanctions increases rather than repels the dangers of the world in which we live. I think full dedication to the spirit of the First Amendment is the real solvent

of the dangers and tensions of the day. That philosophy may be hostile to many military minds. But it is time the Nation made clear that the military is not a system apart but lives under a Constitution that allows discussion of the Great Issues of the day, not merely the trivial ones—subject to limitations as to time, place, or occasion but never to control.

Mr. Speaker, the military is and will remain what Justice Douglas called a system apart, so long as service men and women remain a Constitution apart from ordinary citizens. So long as great questions of law remain unreviewable even by COMA; so long as one set of procedures applies to officers and another set to the men and women who serve under them; so long as important questions of law and fact reside in a gray area between Federal appellate jurisdiction and nonjurisdiction, the military will remain "a system apart."

The time to review and remedy such failings as exist in the system of military justice is now, while we are in a period of relative tranquility and while no Americans are subject to the draft. This sort of quietude provides an atmosphere conducive to detached reflection and constructive change. If we cannot provide basic procedural rights to an Armed Forces at peace, surely such rights will be far more difficult to legislate should an emergency occur and passions run high.

TITLE I OPENS THE DOOR TO EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of this Nation's best investments in the future is aid to education. Only through public education will we be able to achieve, or even approximate, the kind of society we all hope for. Because it is so important to our future, education must be equal and high quality.

The ESEA of 1965 reflected the beginning of congressional commitment to high-quality public education. Title I in particular indicated determination to provide equal opportunity in the schools. Since 1965, ESEA has been renewed and the commitment reaffirmed. But the program has never received the funds it deserves.

I urge my colleagues to read the following article from June's Focus, the publication of the Joint Center for Political Studies, which was written by Ms. Pasty Fleming, legislative assistant to Representative SHIRLEY CHISHOLM. Ms. Fleming, who used to be assistant to Representative AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, is an expert on equal opportunity and education. Her perceptive analysis of title I should be of interest to Members of Congress who are interested in trying to improve the public education system.

The article follows:

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR AID TO POVERTY SCHOOLS

(By Patsy Fleming)

The major social reform legislation that emerged from Congress in the early 1960s arose from circumstances of the time. The problems of the poor, the absence of equal rights for all Americans, the large numbers of "disadvantaged" children who were not learning to read, began to capture the attention of legislators and administrators who believed they could solve these problems through social intervention programs and technology.

In this socially responsible atmosphere, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) was created, for it was clear to Congress and the administration that there was a high correlation between lack of education and poverty. ESEA was, nevertheless, an impressive political achievement, for there was, even in the liberal climate of the sixties, strong opposition to such federal intervention in what was considered a responsibility of the states and the local school districts.

Of the numerous sections of ESEA, Title I has the most impact on poor children, a large proportion of whom are black. It is also the main federal vehicle for getting aid to disadvantaged children. It is the most controversial, the most complex, the most misunderstood, and in some school districts, the most misdirected of federal education programs.

The purpose of Title I as it appears in the law is "to provide financial assistance to local education agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families." Under the Act, school districts get money to plan and operate special programs for educationally disadvantaged children. The funds are to be used to supplement rather than to replace any currently operating program in those school districts.

Programs funded under Title I can include remedial instruction in the basic skill areas such as reading and math; hiring of additional teachers and teacher aides to reduce pupil-teacher ratios; inservice training for teachers and aides; educational preschool programs; and nutrition, medical and dental services, when these are not available from other sources.

During the 1972–1973 school year, the Office of Education reported that 16 million children were eligible for Title I services; more than six million were actually served. Title I programs can be found in 14,000 school districts across the country. Of the children in Title I programs, 36 per cent are black.

ESEA, including Title I, was to expire on June 30 of this year, but the House and the Senate have passed different versions of amendments that would extend ESEA programs from three to four years. A House-Senate conference to reconcile the differences has been convened.

The formula that determines how Title I funds are to be distributed was the source of much conflict and controversy. Discussions in both houses focused on the various factors that would comprise such a formula and the level of funding that the states and counties would be entitled to. Underlying the discussions, however, were three important themes.

First, most congressmen favored a formula that would shift money away from the larger cities to suburban and rural areas. This indicates a loss of political power of big-city congressmen, at least in dealing with federal aid to education. As the middle-income population shifts more to the suburbs, their representatives are casting the deciding votes—and in this case the votes were with the rural congressmen.

A second undercurrent is typical of the early seventies as opposed to the sixties. Middle-income and working-class groups are now demanding a portion of federal aid to the poor. This was evidenced in Congress in a move to turn Title I into a general aid program—a move which failed this time but will be attempted on the next set of amendments to Title I, as well as with other programs focusing on poor and minority people.

The third element was the fact that there has never been enough money to fund this program adequately. Even with an expected appropriation for fiscal year 1975 of $1.885 billion (up $177 million from fiscal year 1974), members of Congress were forced to squabble over an amount of funds too small to have a lasting impact on most of the millions of children deemed eligible no matter what the formula is.

The formula finally adopted by both houses has a definite suburban and rural bias as compared with current funding patterns. A rural bias would be quite acceptable, if it did not result in substantially diminishing the entitlements of most larger cities. Poor people and black people are concentrated in the large cities, and rural areas have their share, too. But robbing Peter to pay Paul is neither an equitable nor a reasonable solution to a problem based on too few dollars.

Under current law, children eligible to be counted for Title I must be from families with incomes below $2000 per year, or from families that earn above $2000 but are receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Institutionalized "neglected and dependent" children, and some in foster homes, are also eligible.

The amount of money a school district receives is determined by the number of eligible children it contains. Once the funds get to the local school district, it is up to the school administrators to see that they are distributed to schools in areas with concentrations of children from low-income families. Within a school identified as eligible for a Title I program according to the income criteria mentioned above, achievement test scores sometimes are used to identify children in need of the program. But this is the only level—within the school—where test scores might be used to identify children, according to current law. Down to the level of the individual school, poverty is the determining factor.

During discussions of the extension of Title I by the House Education and Labor Committee, the question of the correlation between poverty and educational disadvantage as measured on achievement tests was raised. There was a move, led by Rep. Albert Quie (R-Minn.), to make students with low test scores eligible for Title I aid, regardless of their families' income. He proposed distribution of funds according to numbers of low scores in each state. This change from current practice would have increased the number of eligible students significantly, spreading already limited Title I funds even more thinly. However, both the House and the Senate decided to continue to focus Title I funds on poor children for whom equal educational opportunities are more elusive.

A congressional committees heard testimony and debated the amendments to extend ESEA, the question at the top of their minds was, "Has Title I been successful?"

In answering that question, it must be kept in mind that Title I contains many provisions, designed to meet many different goals. To ensure the bill's passage in 1965, congressional sponsors inserted sections aimed at many things: remedying the academic problems of disadvantaged students; meeting their health and nutrition needs; training and employing paraprofessional helpers in the schools, establishing a precedent for major federal assistance to education, and equalizing the fiscal burdens of paying for schools between affluent suburban areas and impoverished urban and rural areas.

Title I, alone among federal programs for education, has moved in the direction of equalization by emphasizing money for impoverished central city and rural areas, areas with high proportions of minority students, areas with low income levels, and areas with greater educational needs as measured by average achievement scores. Unfortunately, some large cities will lose money under the

shift in distribution formula enacted in the new bill.

Although it has made some progress, however slight, in achieving this goal of equalization, the accomplishments of Title I in the other areas have been criticized. That's a small wonder, because of the many goals which to a certain extent compete with each other.

This last objective is often ignored, but it is one of the most important. A primary motivation of the bill was the intent to assist school districts having trouble supporting adequate education programs because of "concentrations of low-income families."

Those who use standardized test scores as the only means of evaluating the effect of Title I on more than six million children are ignoring the numerous other objectives woven into the law. No one should be surprised that they come up with negative findings. Such scores should not be used to measure the program nationwide. They can, however, properly be used on a project-by-project basis, so that each local program can be improved as necessary, and can be held accountable for meeting whatever objectives and goals it has set.

There is justifiable cause for withholding funds from school districts that either negligently or deliberately violate Title I legislation or regulations. In 1969 the Washington Research Project published its influential report, Title I of ESEA: Is It Helping Poor Children?, which charged flagrant violations of the law. Most illegalities involved violations of the regulation requiring that Title I funds be used to supplement rather than supplant currently operating programs and services, or expenditure of Title I funds for items not allowable under the law, such as the case of two swimming pools in Louisiana built with Title I funds.

As a result of the report, the U.S. Office of Education appointed a high-level Title I Task Force and increased its understaffed Division of Compensatory Education, which administers the program.

More recently, the National Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law of Washington, D.C., brought suit against the use of Title I funds in Philadelphia, Pa. In a landmark decision, a U.S. District Court judge took control from state and local education administrators and appointed an independent three-man panel to monitor and evaluate all the Philadelphia Title I programs. The panel came down hard against programs that "are insufficiently relevant to the specific educational needs of poor children" and ordered the district to eliminate 10 of their 38 programs. Later, an appeal resulted in a reversal of this decision, allowing the programs in question to continue through the end of the school year.

There was another important outcome of the Washington Research Project report's publication, in addition to the identification of problems mentioned above. WRP began to push the Office of Education to come up with strong requirements for local parent advisory councils. After a long struggle between OE, which wanted councils, and the education establishment, which did not, a compromise was reached by OE, requiring "system-wide" parent advisory councils. In the House version of the ESEA extension, system-wide councils are optional, but a parent council is required for every school receiving Title I funds. The Senate bill requires only system-wide councils. This will be resolved in conference.

A look at the past eight years of fully operational Title I programs shows the tremendous impact of the program on the attitudes of teachers, administrators and the general public toward "disadvantaged" children and their struggle to obtain basic skills. A voice for these children has been developed in Washington and the relief of their problems is a national objective.

Their parents, also, have become involved in the educational process and are beginning to develop political skills that can be translated from education to other forums. In many places, Jane and Johnny are learning to read while Mom and Dad learn to influence the political process. This may be the true legacy of Title I.

THE NEED FOR PASSING THE STUDDS-MAGNUSON BILL

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been considerable controversy concerning the fishing interests of the United States. Many assert that the Magnuson-Studds' 200-mile limit is a very self-interested bill and that it will hurt the United States in the long run. On the other side are those, myself included, who see the 200-mile limit as a positive step in helping the American fisherman in his constant fight with the far advanced foreign fishing fleets.

Recently, an editorial appeared in the Boston Globe concerning this issue. The editorial, in my opinion, left out the basic element and narrowly looked at the problem from the view that the 200-mile limit would be "carving up the sea" just as we do a leg of lamb. Mr. Sam Favazza, a constituent of mine from Gloucester, profoundly rebutted that editorial in a recent letter to the Globe, and I feel that he captured the real problem that the American fisherman faces.

For the information of all my colleagues, I would like to insert both of these pieces in the RECORD.

[From the Boston Globe]

SAVINGS THE SEAS BY LAW

The third United Nations Law of the Sea Conference opens today in Venezuela, with 151 nations gathered to tackle an agenda of 25 items and a record of minor accomplishments at its two previous sessions in 1958 and 1960. But the pressures on the world's oceans a decade ago were nothing compared to the pressures today. And international negotiation and agreement has become imperative if the high seas are not to be carved up and fought over as the land has been.

The oceans make up 70 percent of the earth's surface. If 30 percent of these waters were nationalized by territorial rights out to 200 miles, it would affect trade and transportation, it could limit marine research, it might prevent overall control of marine pollution, and it could seriously affect world access to fish and other sea-borne proteins as well as to oil and other metals and minerals.

Right now New England fishermen are pressing for exclusive fishing rights up to 200 miles off the coast. And the voyage of the "Sharon and Noreen" has won political friends to the cause. But, if a 200-mile fishing limit would benefit the $40 million New England fishing industry and perhaps protect the $125 million Pacific salmon industry against foreign competition, it could seriously hurt the $132 million US tuna industry in the Pacific off South America and the $173 million US shrimp industry operating in the Gulf of Mexico.

Peru and Ecuador, with small fleets of their own, have already shown what capital can be made by seizing and fining American vessels within 200 miles from their shores. A much better approach is to establish quotas, seasons and fishing regulations as has been done with increasing success through the 17-member International Commission for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (ICNAF). New quotas and tighter inspection procedures have just been issued from the 24th annual ICNAF meeting which wound up June 14 in Halifax.

A similar case is being made by 12 Atlantic states which are suing the US government for territorial rights on offshore oil under colonial charters. The case has been pending before the U.S. Supreme Court for five years and, with the Administration's push to lease 10 million acres for offshore oil exploration, a resolution should be expected soon. And the implications of local control over a resource that already amounts to 20 percent of the world's remaining oil are enormous.

Carving up the sea to meet territorial imperatives is a dangerous way to solve the world's problems of food, energy and the adverse effects of pollution. National jurisdiction over the world's sea lanes could lead to a system of marine toll roads. In a shrinking world, where all nations do not have access to the sea and where dwindling resources must be conserved and shared, international regulation is the only answer. The international commissions like ICNAF have paved the way. Now it is time to work toward broader laws of the sea, first at Caracas and later at Vienna and elsewhere.

CITY OF GLOUCESTER
FISHERIES COMMISSION,
Gloucester, Mass., June 24, 1974.

EDITOR
The Boston Globe,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: I should appreciate your printing these comments on your editorial of June 19 entitled "Saving the Seas by Law."

Your statement that "Right now New England fishermen are pressing for exclusive fishing rights up to 200 miles off the coast" is inaccurate. The Studds-Magnuson Bill supported by the New England fishermen calls for exclusive management up to 200 miles off the coast by the U.S.A. It allows for foreign fishing in this area but under U.S. conservation rules and regulations.

Then you say, "But, if a 200-mile fishing limit would benefit the $40 million New England fishing industry and perhaps protect the $125 million Pacific salmon industry against foreign competition, it could seriously hurt the $132 million U.S. tuna industry in the Pacific off South America and the $173 million U.S. shrimp industry operating in the Gulf of Mexico."

This statement leaves the reader with the impression that the Studds-Magnuson Bill is supported only in New England. It ignores the support of all the states bordering the Atlantic from Maine through Georgia by a recent vote of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, as well as the enthusiastic support of our largest fisheries state, Alaska, and the fishing industries of northern California, Oregon and Washington. It also creates doubt as to the support of the salmon industry which according to U.S. Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska is 95% behind this bill, the exception being a small group of processors of foreign caught salmon.

It is also interesting to note that of the $195 million of shrimp landings in 1973 by U.S. fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico, only $41 million (about 20%) was caught in international waters off foreign shores. Unfortunately that minority consisting of some large well-financed processing interests is erroneously assumed to speak for the entire shrimp industry.

The only American fishery dependent mostly on fish caught in international waters off foreign shores is the tuna fishery. Their spokesmen are vocal in opposition to the Studds-Magnuson Bill. But this opposition is unjustified since the bill allows that oceanic species, such as tuna, should be managed by international commissions as they are now.

The fact is the Studds-Magnuson Bill is very close to the U.S. position at the Caracas

Law of the Sea Conference. Both allow for (1) management of anadromous species such as salmon by the nation in whose rivers they spawn, (2) management of oceanic species such as tuna by international commissions, and (3) management of coastal species by the coastal nation. The difference is that while federal authorities insist on the ponderous time-consuming process of an international agreement, the Studds-Magnuson Bill recognizes the urgency of the situation and calls for immediate interim unilateral action. (Massachusetts landings in 1962 when foreign fishing off our coast started was 500,000,000 lbs. In 1972 our landings were 250,000,000 lbs.)

Your statement that "National jurisdiction over the world's sea lanes could lead to a system of marine toll roads." only serves to confuse the issue. The Studds-Magnuson Bill does not allow for extended territorial jurisdiction but rather for extended fisheries management only.

Finally, my 8 years experience with ICNAF as an industry advisor denies me the faith you express in that international commission. While dedicated to the conservation of the marine resources of this area, it has seen our 1973 haddock catch reduced to 2% of the 1965 catch, our herring stocks reduced to 10% of what they were a decade ago, and our yellowtail flounder stocks on the same road to depletion.

At the recent ICNAF meeting in Halifax which your editorial commends for its agreement on "new quotas and tighter inspection procedures", despite the recommendation of its own scientists there was no reduction in herring quotas to prevent further depletion, and no agreement on yellowtail flounder quotas because of opposition by one overseas nation based on its own economic considerations. Basically this is the weakness of international management of coastal stocks of fish—while the coastal nation emphasizes conservation since its smaller coastal fishing vessels depend on the viability of the resource, the overseas nations emphasize economic considerations since their large mobile fleets can turn to other distant fishing grounds following the depletion of a resource in a particular area.

The only practical way to properly manage and conserve coastal stocks of fish is to place the management responsiblity entirely in the hands of the coastal nation. That nation is in the best position to study the resource and police the fishing effort, and that nation stands to gain the most from the viability of the resource or lose the most from its decline.

Sincerely,

SALVATORE J. FAVAZZA,
Executive Secretary.

AN OPEN LETTER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Long Island Committee of Combined Concern, a broad-based, interreligious group consisting of representatives of Church Women United, the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, the Women's League for Conservative Judaism and the National Council of Catholic Women, has devoted a considerable portion of its time to studying the problem of drug abuse and its effect on our society. This distinguished group has drafted an open letter and a resolution which clearly show their concern and point the way toward a possible means of resolving the drug problem that takes its toll on communities throughout the Nation.

I would like to again remind my colleagues that we must not let the present Cyprus situation drive our other concerns with Turkey from our minds. We must take the strongest possible steps to convince the Turks to rescind their decision to resume the production of the opium poppy. The Committee of Combined Concern supports these efforts and they and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The committee's open letter and resolution follow:

AN OPEN LETTER

To: The State Department
Members of Congress
Newspapers.

From: The Committee of Combined Concern.

The Committee of Combined Concern, on which representatives of Church Women United, the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, the Women's League for Conservative Judaism and the National Council of Catholic Women have served, has been doing long-range study on the problem of drug abuse and has been authorized to contribute its findings and resources to the above-named organizations and movements, each of which is nation-wide in scope.

It is our considered opinion that we cannot stand by and silently watch as our society and its aspirations and goals become further corroded by a lethal drug culture that has already gained too deep a foothold; that if we truly desire to stop the near epidemic of heroin addiction that characterized this nation in the 1960's and early 70's, and if we are to prevent addicts from stealing to support their habits, we must see to it that the illicit supply is eradicated at the sources. In this connection the Turkish ban on the cultivation and production of opium has been helpful and we applaud those officials in the United States and Turkey who wish to continue this policy.

We have therefore adopted the attached Resolution to which we respectfully request you give your consideration.

RESOLUTION ON DRUG LEGISLATION BY COMMITTEE OF COMBINED CONCERN

As a Committee of Combined Concern whose organizations include over 25 million women in Church Women United (Protestant, Roman Catholic, Orthodox), the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, the Women's League for Conservative Judaism and the National Council of Catholic Women, we are reminded that drug abuse continues to be a most serious illness.

We urge the adoption of the House resolution introduced by Congressmen Wolff, Rangel and Rodino and in the Senate by Senators Mondale and Buckley asking President Nixon to continue serious negotiations with the Turkish government to prevent the dissolution of the opium ban. If these negotiations are unsuccessful, and Turkey resumes opium poppy cultivation, the resolution asks for a suspension of all United States aid and assistance to Turkey.

We feel the United States should continue to assist Turkey in properly financing crop diversification programs in the poppy areas. Specific assistance for industrial projects which do not compete with American manufacturers or exports should be given high priority.

In addition, we feel that raising the level of understanding in Turkey about the international drug problem is essential for any future cooperation between the countries. We hope such understanding will lead Turkey to recognize its international responsibilities.

In the context of a mutual security agreement between our two nations, it must be made clear to the Turkish people that the rescinding of the opium production ban jeopardizes the security of our nation through the exploitation of our youth by nefarious drug traffickers.

Should Turkey ignore the dangers which renewed poppy production presents to the American people, then this matter should be brought up before the Congress to review all pertinent agreements between the two nations. Moreover, it should then be mandatory to have controls and enforcement financed and inspected through an international mechanism to avoid the appearance of United States domination. Without control, it would be a most difficult enforcement operation for the Turkish government to undertake.

IS A TAX CUT REALLY DESIRABLE?

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the recently published June-July issue of ADA World contained an interesting and informative article regarding taxes which I believe deserves the attention of our colleagues. In this article, Mr. Leon Shull, national director of Americans for Democratic Action, compares the desirability of tax cuts with the desirability of tax reform.

I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, and I urge our colleagues to familiarize themselves with Mr. Shull's arguments, since his views demonstrate unusual insight into the complexities of our Federal tax system.

Let me note, Mr. Speaker, that this article was written prior to the administration's recent announcement that we have now fulfilled the textbook requirement to be formally considered in a recession; Mr. Shull wrote his essay before we were informed of the second-quarter decline in the gross national product.

TAXES: FAILURE ON THE HILL

(By Leon Shull)

The experts tell us we are not in a true recession. They explain that the score-card definition of a recession is a two-quarter decline in real output. This may be so, but nevertheless we are faced with rising unemployment, a laggard economy, rampant inflation, and general uncertainty. Most business economists project a 7¾ percent increase in the Gross National Product for 1974 with price increases accounting for 7 percent—or only a minimal expansion in real output.

If this projection holds true, we can expect an unemployment rate of 6 percent or more by the final quarter of 1974. Unemployment in Michigan already has reached approximately 10 percent due to the sharp drop in automobile production. New housing volume continues to shrink in real terms. By the first quarter of 1974, housing starts had been cut to about ¾ of what it was a year ago, and, while there are some projections and forecasts that private housing starts will turn up, no one expects them to achieve the 1972 level or even the 1973 level, when the drop already had begun.

Clearly, government action is indicated. The conservatives will not admit it. Yet they

do call for action by government; in addition to removal of all price and wage controls, they want new tax benefits for industry, repeal or delay of environmental protection measures, and a free hand generally, by which they mean opposition to all regulatory measures—especially those which would protect consumers.

What is particularly discouraging is the response of some liberal Senators and Representatives who are calling for tax cuts. Though some Senators would disguise their tax cuts as "tax credits," making them more palatable for liberals and certainly more desirable than loopholes for the rich, nevertheless tax cuts are bought at the expense of needed social services. We had two tax cuts under the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations and two under the Nixon Administration. And even with our economy running at less than capacity, the Treasury would be collecting some $40 billion more a year—at a conservative estimate—had these tax cuts not taken place.

Surely there is need for tax *reform*. And present tax rates could be cut if present rates were applied without tax loopholes. Joseph A. Pechman and Benjamin A. Okner of the Brookings Institution have estimated that present rates applied to such a comprehensive tax base would have yielded an additional $77 billion in 1972. Actually our present tax rates could have been cut, according to the Pechman-Okner estimates, by 43 percent with the same amount of revenue raised if the lower rates had been applied on a more comprehensive base—that is, without loopholes.

It doesn't take much imagination to visualize the huge funds that would be made available for social programs by the closing of tax loopholes. Rescission is of course politically impossible, but if the tax cuts of the last decade were to be rescinded, the amount of funds available for social programs could meet all our needs. From the funds lost to this country by the tax cuts of the last decade, we could pay the additional cost of national health insurance as envisioned by the Kennedy-Griffiths bill, the cost of a modest negative income tax, and a $10 billion public service employment program. But if liberals are going to continue to advocate tax cuts (or credits), we can expect the erosion of the progressive tax principle to continue.

Why liberals favor such tax cuts remains incomprehensible. It is easy to see why conservatives want tax cuts; they know what liberals apparently fail to understand—that once a cut is made it is virtually impossible, short of a major war, to again increase taxes. It wasn't even possible to increase taxes during the Vietnam war—actually the reverse occurred. Taxes were last increased during World War II, more than 20 years ago. It is true that the federal government, unlike states and cities, still collects almost half its receipts through progressive taxes. But, if the trend continues, if even liberals continue to call for cuts in our progressive federal tax system, we can expect its progressive features to diminish. It is worth remembering that between 1960 and 1974, according to a Brookings Institution study, corporate income tax receipts dropped as a percentage of total taxes from 23 to 15 percent, while regressive social insurance taxes (wage taxes) increased from 16 to 30 percent. The federal tax system is on its way to becoming just as regressive as state and local systems.

It is important that we understand what has been happening to taxes. The largest single component of federal revenues is the individual income tax, but payroll or employment taxes are the second largest source and they are growing faster. Payroll taxes this year will amount to 30 percent of all federal revenue—up 20 percent from ten years ago.

The point here is that, unlike the individual income tax, a wage tax—Social Security payroll tax—is regressive. That is, low income families pay a higher proportion of their income in payroll tax than do high income families. There is a neat trick to this. The Social Security tax rate is 11.7 percent. Half is paid by the employer and half is deducted from the employee's check. But as the Brookings Institution points out, "Economists generally agree that the whole tax actually comes out of wages: If there were no such tax, wages would be higher by approximately the amount paid by employers." Lest anyone think that I exaggerate the case, let us turn again to a Brookings Institution study:

"In 1969, a four-person family with one earner making $3,000 paid no income tax and was subject to a Social Security Payroll Tax of $288. In 1973 the same family still pays no income tax, but its payroll tax has grown to $351—a 22 percent increase. This figure includes, for reasons explained above, both the employer and employee payroll tax contributions. What is the net result of all this? The two tax changes of the Nixon Administration have increased tax liabilities for families with incomes below $3,500; decreased the combined liabilities of families with incomes of $3,500 to $8,900; and increased taxes for those with incomes of $8,900 to $13,000. For incomes above $13,000 the combined taxes have declined, since income tax deductions for higher-income groups have more than offset increased Social Security taxes."

What we need now is a hard drive by liberals to prevent conservatives from nibbling away the tax base from which much-needed revenues must come.

To stimulate the laggard economy and combat rising unemployment—with minimum inflationary impact—we need an immediate investment in public service employment. A $10 billion investment in public jobs will result in a million new jobs. An end to only a few of the intolerable tax loopholes could easily produce the $10 billion necessary for such a program.

If we want to help the important automobile industry, why not an investment of at least $1 billion in buses for mass public transportation? We not only would meet a severe need, we would be attacking the energy crisis as well.

Instead of tax loopholes which aid real estate operators in making billions in profits, why not invest those tax expenditures in housing for low and middle income citizens? (In this connection we should be aware that tax subsidies to home owners in 1972 cost the federal government $10 billion, making this "program" by far the largest federal housing subsidy program. Furthermore, three-fifths of these tax concessions go to families over $20,000 and only 7 percent to families with incomes under $10,000.)

As we said in 1972, ADA believes the American people will be willing to pay if they can expect in return tangible improvements in employment, education, health, law enforcement, the environment, and the like through services which can be made available only through public investment. In the final analysis, if we are going to solve this nation's problems, then we must be willing to pay the bill.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY SONS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a copy of resolutions adopted by the Sons of the American Revolution on June 27, 1974. The views of this great patriotic organization are worthy of most careful consideration.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

RESOLUTION NO. 1

Whereas, under the 1903 Treaty with Panama, the United States obtained the grant in perpetuity of the use, occupation and control of the Canal Zone territory with all sovereign rights, power and authority to the entire exclusion of the exercise by Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority as well as the ownership of all privately held land and property in the Zone by purchase from individual owners; and

Whereas, the United States has an overriding national security interest in maintaining undiluted control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal and solemn obligations under its treaties with Great Britain and Colombia for the efficient operation of the Canal; and

Whereas, the United States Government is currently engaged in negotiations with the Government of Panama to surrender United States sovereign rights to Panama both in the Canal Zone and with respect to the Canal itself without authorization of the Congress, which will diminish, if not absolutely abrogate, the present U.S. treaty-based sovereignty and ownership of the Zone; and

Whereas, these negotiations are being utilized by the United States Government in an effort to get Panama to grant an option for the construction of a "sea-level" canal eventually to replace the present canal, and to authorize the major modernization of the existing canal, which project is already authorized under existing treaty provisions; and by the Panamanian government in an attempt to gain sovereign control and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and effective control over the operation of the Canal itself; and

Whereas, similar concessional negotiations by the United States in 1967 resulted in three draft treaties that were frustrated by the will of the Congress of the United States because they would have gravely weakened United States control over the Canal and the Canal Zone; and by the people of Panama because that country did not obtain full control; and

Whereas, the American people have consistently opposed further concessions to any Panamanian government that would further weaken United States control over either the Canal Zone or Canal; and

Whereas, many scientists have demonstrated the probability that the removal of natural ecological barriers between the Pacific and Atlantic oceans entailed in the opening of a sea-level canal could lead to ecological hazards which the advocates of the sea-level canal have ignored in their plans; and

Whereas, the Sons of the American Revolution believes that treaties are solemn obligations binding on the parties and has consistently opposed the abrogation, modification or weakening of the Treaty of 1903;

Now, therefore, be it *resolved* that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution in its 84th Annual Congress assembled, opposes the construction of a new sea-level canal and approves Senate Resolution 301 introduced by Senator Strom Thurmond and 34 additional Senators, to maintain and preserve the sovereign control of the United States over the Canal Zone.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas, the strength and stability of the economic and monetary system of the United States is vital to the defense of the country, and

Whereas, the fiscal and monetary policies

of the Congress and Administration, present and past, have led to the devaluation of the dollar, double digit inflation, and the current economic crisis in the United States, and

Whereas, double digit inflation within is a great as threat, if not a greater threat, to the liberty and freedom and well-being of this country as the threat from our enemies without, and

Whereas, the basic cause of the rampant inflation is the deficit spending of the United States Congress, and

Whereas, under the Constitution of the United States, Congress is charged with the responsibility for all federal appropriations, and

Whereas, it is the urgent duty of the United States Congress to limit federal spending to the revenues of the Federal Government,

Now, therefore, be it *resolved* that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution in its 84th Annual Congress assembled, urges the Congress to balance the federal budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

Whereas, it was the national policy of the United States of America to intervene in Vietnam and prevent a Communist takeover of that country, and

Whereas, it is the duty of every American citizen to bear arms in support of the national policies of the United States, and

Whereas, a citizen of the United States is called upon to share the burdens of citizenship in order to insure its benefits for all citizens, and

Whereas, 40,000 young Americans fled to foreign countries to evade the military obligations of United States citizenship,

Now, therefore, be it *resolved* that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution at its 84th Annual Congress assembled, is opposed to any granting of amnesty to those who refused to bear arms for their country and instead, fled to foreign countries to evade their military obligations.

RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas, this country was founded by God-fearing men and women and conceived in liberty, and

Whereas, men of all countries have been moved by the eloquence and high spiritual qualities of the Declaration of Independence, and

Whereas, the Bicentennial will be a focal point for a nationwide review, and reaffirmation of the values upon which this Nation was founded, and

Whereas, all businesses and private citizens should display the United States Flag daily during daylight hours except during inclement weather, and

Whereas, it is fitting for patriots to celebrate each Fourth of July with prayer, music, fireworks and other expressions of joy and cheer, and

Whereas, it is the duty of every citizen and local community to take the initiative in planning a suitable commemoration of the Bicentennial.

Now, therefore, be it *resolved* that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution at its 84th Annual Congress assembled, urges its members and all citizens to fly flags daily, to ring bells and blow automobile horns on the Fourth of July at a time to be set by each community as a suitable prelude to the Bicentennial.

RESOLUTION NO. 5

Whereas, we believe the Federal Government has entered upon a movement to eliminate basic rights and powers guaranteed to the states by the 10th Amendment to the Constitution, in particular the control of education and public schools, the control of land, the extension of jurisdiction of the federal judiciary, the weakening of state criminal law enforcement by the imposition of untenable federal standards that result in interminable trials and sheer technicalities that often show more concern for the criminal than for the innocent victim and the long-suffering public, to name a few.

Now, therefore be it *resolved* that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution at its 84th Annual Congress assembled, recommends that our state governors and legislators resist these federal encroachments upon state sovereignty and oppose the extension of federal grants and Supreme Court decisions.

RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas, hostile foreign nations desire to obtain advanced American technology during a period of our history entitled "detente," and

Whereas, the sharing of our technology with unfriendly foreign powers will weaken this country's power and protection of the free world, and

Whereas, the joint exploration of space with any foreign nation will result in the release of technical information vital to the defense of this nation, and

Whereas no foreign power has been successful in its man-in-space program.

Now, therefore, be it *resolved* that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, in its 84th Annual Congress assembled, opposes in general the sharing of any of our technology with unfriendly foreign nations and in particular the sharing of our man-in-space capability with any foreign power, and recommends that all federal agencies should intensify efforts to prevent the dissemination of critical technology to any foreign power.

RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas, the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution supports proper commemoration and celebration of the American War for Independence which gained the 13 Original Colonies their freedom; and

Whereas. the Battle of Cowpens. fought in South Carolina near the present village of Cowpens was a major victory for loyal Americans in their fight for liberty; and

Whereas, the Federal Government has appropriated certain funds for the improvement and enhancement of the Cowpens Battleground site; and

Whereas, the effect of monies spent will be much more effective and widespread, and of longer duration, if a permanent annual celebration is held at the Battleground;

Now, therefore, be it *resolved* that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution in its 84th Annual Congress assembled, favors allocation of an adequate portion of available funds for the construction of a suitable amphitheater which will be made available for the production of an annual outdoor drama based upon the Battle of Cowpens and surrounding events, so that the people of America will have a better opportunity to become more conversant with the great deeds of our illustrious ancestors.

RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas, Professional Standards Review Organization (PSRO) was established as a rider attached to the Social Security Law of 1972 without public hearings or proper consideration; and

Whereas, confidential medical records of every patient under any of the numerous government-sponsored health care programs will be open to PSRO inspectors; and

Whereas, "norms" set by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, after examination of all patient records, will change the concept of health care, nullifying doctor-patient privacy preventing full use of the doctor's knowledge, experience and training; and

Whereas, PSRO can overrule a doctor's decision in prescribing, hospitalization, or operating under penalty of fine and suspension from medical practice;

Now, therefore, be it *resolved* that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution at its 84th Annual Convention assembled, supports the adoption of H.R. 9375, or similar resolutions, which would repeal the provisions of the Social Security Act which violate the confidentiality of the doctor-patient relationship which would be contrary to numerous state statutes, contrary to professional ethics, and which would lead to federal control of medicine.

RESOLUTION NO. 9

Whereas, there is pending in the United States Congress a resolution sponsored by Senator Harry Flood Byrd, Jr. of Virginia in which Senator William Scott of Virginia has also joined as a co-sponsor, to restore the citizenship of General Robert E. Lee,

Now, therefore, be it *resolved* that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution at its 84th Annual Congress assembled, joins in with the purpose and spirit of this pending Congressional resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. 10

Now, therefore, be it *resolved* that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution at its 84th Annual Congress assembled, reiterates and reaffirms that all previous resolutions adopted at prior Congresses be reaffirmed.

RESOLUTION NO. 11

Whereas, the 84th Annual Congress of the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution has been successful in every respect, and

Whereas, that success has been due to the efforts of those who planned and took part in the program,

Now, therefore, be it *resolved* by the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, that it hereby expresses its gratitude and deep appreciation:

1. to the President General for his able leadership.
2. to the officers, chairmen and members of their committees,
3. to the loyal headquarters staff for their constant effort in providing an efficient operation,
4. to the speakers, Compatriot (Dr.) Norman Vincent Peale and the Honorable J. William Middendorf, II, Secretary of the Navy, for their inspiring addresses,
5. to the United States Navy; Joint Armed Forces (Pentagon); Colonial Guard, 175th Infantry; United States Marine Corps and the Commander-in-Chief's Guard Colors, U.S. Army, for furnishing color guards,
6. to the United States Marine Band, the United States Army Soldiers' Chorus, the Chorus of the Chesapeake, and the U. S. Navy Sea Chanters for furnishing music and entertainment,
7. to the press, radio and television for their coverage of the Congress,
8. to the Maryland Society for its contribution to a successful 84th Annual Congress,
9. to all individuals who contributed to the success of this Congress.

SOVIET CHRISTIANS PERSECUTED TOO

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the world has become aroused as the result of the revelations of the persecutions of Soviet Jews. It is only right that after so many years these atrocities should finally be protested. But, let us not forget that men are also being persecuted

in Soviet Russia because they are Christians.

On May 21, 1974, Radio Liberty which monitors the Soviet Press and Radio and broadcasts into the Soviet Union released a report that should shock every American. According to Radio Liberty the children of practicing Christians in the Soviet Union have been removed from the custody of their parents to prevent them from receiving religious instruction.

The July 1974 issue of East-West Digest published in England by Geoffrey Stewart Smith, a former Conservative Member of Parliament, revealed further persecutions of Russian Christians. East-West Digest reprinted a letter to the Kremlin leaders from the four children of Georgi Vins, one of the leaders of the Russian Baptist Movement, protesting that their father has been arrested again.

I would like to call my colleagues' attention to these two documents, the Radio Liberty Report and the article in East-West Digest, both of which follow:

SOVIET CHRISTIANS DEPRIVED OF PARENTAL RIGHTS

Unlike in any other communist country in Europe, Soviet children are still being removed from the custody of their parents on the grounds that they are being brought up as Christians. An account of the trial of four Russian Baptists in connection with the education of children was published in *Sovetskaia Belorussia* on April 27, 1973.

Among the defendants was Nina Masiuk, a member of an unregistered Baptist congregation in Soligorsk. Her son Sergei was removed from custody of his mother in 1971, and in November 1972 she was formally deprived of parental rights. The boy, the article reports, has suffered severe physical and moral harm from being forced to attend numerous meetings from an early age and from the narrowness of his religious upbringing.

Consequently he himself, we are told, greeted his admission to a children's home "with great joy." Despite his mother's attempts to abduct him he is now more healthy in every way, doing well at school and, leaving his religious beliefs behind him, being active in the Komssomol. "Yes," the article concludes, "this boy has been saved."

The names of Sergei and his mother, however, are not unknown in the West, thanks to the Council of Prisoners' Revelatives, whose Bulletin No. 10, compiled in October 1972, devoted a considerable amount of space to the mother and son's own statements about the affair. Such information from the Bulletin means that one can now often cross-check information from Christian and hostile atheist sources in Russia. Sergei's account is as follows:

"On April 4, 1972, the headmaster of school No. 3, Nikolai Nikolaevich Dalgot, called me from classes and took me to the children's department at the police station. Then a policeman arrived with some other people, including my father. The policeman took me by the arm and made me get into a car. They took me to a boarding school at Krasnaia Sloboda in the Soligorsk district, Minsk region. When they took me I cried a lot. . . ."

Sergei's father, an irresponsible and violent man, left his wife and two sons in 1968, visiting them subsequently from time to time only to threaten and mistreat them. It was he who began to persuade the authorities to deprive his wife, Nina, of the custody of their younger son. His weapon against her was none other than her Christian belief. Although the father was declared by the court to be unfit to care for a child, Sergei was nevertheless sent away "to isolate him from the influence of religion." He ran away to his mother, which resulted in reprisals in the form of fines and the deprivation of visiting rights.

The authorities claim that Masiuk allowed her son to be educationally influenced by the church, but she maintains that religious education is the legitimate right of parents, and that she as a parent has the constitutional right to bring up and educate her child by the very article which has been invoked against her. This is the "Decree on the Separation of the Church from the State and the School from the Church," promulgated by Lenin himself in 1918. The education of children is declared to be "the exclusive right of the family, the school and the state, but not the church."

Sergei's mother gives fuller details of the case in an appeal to the highest authorities which is impressive in its sound knowledge of constitutional law and clear vision of the situation:

"I have already forwarded a complant to the government, but my complaint was passed on to the Supreme Court of the Belorussian Republic, and the Vice-President of the Court, Comrade Shardyko, replied to me: 'It has been proven that you involved your son Sergei in a Baptist-Evangelical sect, and took him to meetings of the sect. In the interests of your son Sergei, the court rightly decided to place him in the care of the welfare and medical authorities.'

"This answer speaks for itself. In this answer not a word is said about the basic documents on the rights of the case—the Constitution of the USSR, the above-mentioned 'Decree' (on the separation of school from church) and the 'Convention' (on the struggle against discrimination in education).

"The attitude of Comrade Shardyko is not that of a man standing in the strength of his duty of safeguarding the laws of the country and the principles of justice. It is the attitude of an atheist, who, setting aside all laws, public opinion and social practice, wants forcibly to prevent people from believing in God and removes children from their parents for the sole reason of their belief in God."

The Bulletin also sets forth the case of the Berdnik family of Kaliningrad. All five of the children of Ivan and Anna Berdnik, aged between twelve and under one year, were taken away from them in 1971. Like Sergei's mother, the Berdniks were accused of causing "moral harm" to the children by bringing them up as Christians and encouraging them to attend "Sunday school" lessons held on Saturdays in the houses of various members of their church. The submission of the local education authority to the regional court states that:

"In the Berdnik family, children learn to pray from the age of two. As soon as they can write they are given the task of copying psalms, which they are forced to learn by heart and then recite at the prayer meetings in front of the believers.

"On investigation of the Berdnik household, a commission consisting of members of the Parents' Committee of the school submitted that the family consisted of seven persons. . . . The family was not well off. Five children slept in one dark, smoke-blackened room."

The implication of the report is that the parents' beliefs are being painfully imposed upon the children.

In another part of the document the Sunday school is described, where the children were taught to sing songs and hymns, which, from the titles quoted, sound very much like those sung by Sunday school children the world over—yet the description succeeds in making the whole thing take on a sinister air:

"It has been established that Mr. and Mrs. Berdnik permitted their sons to attend religious instruction and prayer meetings, where they were taught the fundamentals of religion and performed poems, psalms and other forms of religious music. During the lessons the children became familiar, with, and were made to learn by heart, such religious dogmas as 'Be careful, little mouth, what you say,' 'Our Father gave us salvation,' . . . etc. Children were inveigled into the group by various methods:

1. "By setting the children religious questions with the aim of instilling in them a submissive attitude.

2. "By the preparation of special cards with questions on religious subjects.

3. "By drawing the children into 'meetings' for adult believers, using these to teach the children religious dogmas."

Apropos of the report just quoted, it is worth noting that the accusation of overcrowding in the Berdnik household, with its implication that religion is conducive to dirt and poverty, is refuted elsewhere in the Council of Prisoners' Relatives' Bulletin. The family, it states, had three spacious rooms in their flat—a generous provision in the conditions of acute housing shortage prevalent in the Soviet Union.

The church in Barnaul illustrates in a particularly poignant way the dilemma of Christian parents in the USSR today. The Barnaul Christians want to live their faith and to pass it on to their children. The result has been, for themselves, harassment and persecution, and for their children, mockrey and ill-treatment at school. This became so bad that the Christian parents removed their children from school, refusing to send them back until the situation changed. This tense state of affairs lasted for about a year. The children have now returned to school, but it is not known whether their situation has really improved.

A more recent case which may be mentioned is that of Zoia Radygina of Perm. A court order depriving Mrs. Radygina of her three younger children was passed on June 8, 1973; the police came to the house on August 1. When she appealed against this cruel action, she was told that she had failed to educate her children in the spirit of the "Moral Code of a Builder of Communism" (the Soviet guideline to the education of the young). Her two boys, Sasha and Vasia, were taken away by the police. Eleven-year-old Tamara was not at home, and is said to be in hiding with relatives.

Zoia Radygina's plight has called forth appeals from all over the Soviet Union. Many groups of believers have written to the Soviet leaders asking that her children be returned to her. These appeals were echoed in London by demonstrations outside the Soviet Embassy on March 8 and 23, 1974, organized by "Aid to the Russian church."

Some appeals on behalf of Mrs. Radygina recently received in the West mention a number of similar cases, though without giving many details. Two families from the Crimea, Romanovich and Zdorov, are said in an appeal to Podgorny and Rudenko dated January 1974 to have lost their parental rights. Another appeal on behalf of Mr. Radygina mentions a family called Ivanov which suffered a similar fate in April last year.

These and other accounts of a similar nature seem to provide evidence that the practice of depriving believers of parental rights is spreading.

[From East-West Digest, July 1974]

GEORGI VINS ARRESTED AGAIN

One of the world's outstanding Christian leaders has just been arrested in the Soviet Union. Georgi Vins is one of the founders of the Soviet "reform Baptists." The Soviet press calls them initsiativniki. This group split from the official Baptists in 1961, stating that the official Church had compromised with the authorities. Vins, now aged 46, has been one of the leaders from the beginning.

In 1966 there took place one of the most

remarkable events in the life of this movement, the May demonstration outside the Central Committee building of the Communist Party in Moscow. Vins was one of those arrested at that time. He was later sentenced to three years in the labour camps. A transcript of his trial is included in Michael Bourdeau's book Faith on Trial in Russia—the biography of Georgi Vins. His health became worse and worse. His relatives and friends appealed urgently on his behalf and a campaign began in the West. It may well be due to this that Vins remained alive. Released at the end of his term, he returned home to convalesce. He then took up leadership of the Church again. In 1970 a new case was opened against him, but he refused to obey summonses to appear at government offices. In order to continue his church work, Vins was forced to leave home and live in hiding, seeing his wife and family only on occasional visits. Other reform Baptist leaders live under similar conditions.

News has just reached the West that Georgi Vins has been found and arrested in Kiev. This took place at the end of March and the details are still shrouded in mystery. Even the family does not know his condition and they have issued urgent appeals to the government and believers. His mother, Lidia, herself released only recently after three years in detention, has said that he has been arrested as a "state criminal." His church has joined in fasting and prayer. Vins has four children and they have written this moving letter to the Soviet leaders.

APRIL 18, 1974.

To: A. N. Kosygin, the Kremlin, Moscow
N. V. Podgorny, the Kremlin, Moscow
Copies to: Council of Church of Evangelical Christians and Baptists, Council of ECB Prisoners' Relatives.

"In violation of the Constitution of the USSR and of international conventions on human rights, our father Georgi Petrovich Vins has again been illegally arrested for his religious convictions and his work in the Church.

"For thirteen years our father has constantly been subject to persecutions from the authorities. He served a term of imprisonment from 1966 to 1969, from which he returned with his health seriously undermined. This new arrest causes us to fear for his life. We do not want to see our father posthumously rehabilitated like our grandfather, Pyotr Yakovlevich Vins, who was sentenced for his religious convictions and tortured to death in the camps, but later rehabilitated.

"Our whole family has been suffering persecutions for many years now. Our grandmother, Lidia Mikhailovna Vins, served a term in the camps from 1970 to 1973 because she campaigned for our father during his imprisonment and for other believers who had suffered repressions. Our mother, Mrs. N. I. Vins, was dismissed from her job in 1962 because of her religious convictions and for some years she was unable to get work anywhere. She is now working, but not in her own profession.

"The repressions also affect us children. Natasha Vins was illegally dismissed from work on 9 January, 1974. During a preliminary conversation the senior doctor of Kiev Hospital No. 17, Khryapa, declared that he would find a pretext for dismissing her, since religion and medicine were incompatible. Petya Vins has finished the tenth form (i.e. he is now 17—Ed.) but cannot find work anywhere.

"All these actions against our family are an attempt to annihilate us. Our father's preset arrest is impermissible, and if you do not release him immediately, we will take all possible steps, beginning with an appeal to all believers, telling them what has happened.

"We have full reason to suppose that he is in bad health. All responsibility for his life and continued imprisonment rests with you. If our father is not released and if measures are taken against him in prison which endanger his health, then we want to inform you and believers throughout the world that our whole family is fully resolved to die with him."

Our address: Kiev-114, ul. Soshenka 11b.
NATASHA VINS.
PETYA (PETER) VINS.
LIZA VINS.
ZHENYA (EUGENE) VINS.

The fact that Vins's family has been under official scrutiny is revealed in official sources too. An article in the June 1971 issue of the Soviet atheist magazine Science and Religion lamented that: "Teachers at the Kiev Intermediate School No. 16 did not even know that the father of one of their pupils, Petya Vins, was one of the leaders of the initsiativniki, although the boy had been studying there for two years, did not take part in cultural outings and refused to joint the Pioneers."

THE WAR AGAINST NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, one of the critical areas of concern to our national health and safety is the on-going war against narcotic traffickers, which is being waged daily by the Drug Enforcement Agency. This is an especially crucial battle now that Turkey has decided to resume opium growing. The law enforcement agencies in our country will need all the technological and scientific resources available to combat this menace effectively.

Recently, an article appeared in Popular Mechanics, written by Edward Hymoff—a constituent of mine from Yonkers, N.Y. It is most interesting and informative on the subject of how technology can be used in this struggle. I commend it to my colleagues:

THE WAR AGAINST NARCOTIC TRAFFICKERS

(By Edward Hymoff)

The three small planes took off cautiously one at a time, grouped smartly into formation, then streaked off through the darkened night sky, headed secretly for the U.S. border. The ships—fast, powerful turbocharged Cessna 206s—were part of a highly organized, well-equipped underworld "air force" used to smuggle marijuana, heroin and other dangerous and illegal drugs into the country from Mexico. The job would be "a piece of cake," thought the smugglers. They had done it many times before. Making as many as 18 trips a week, they'd fly down to Mexico, pick up their illicit cargo, then head back to some obscure delivery point inside the U.S. border. Operating from little-used or abandoned airstrips, running without lights and flying low to escape radar detection, they were virtually impossible to spot. This was just another routine mission, another valuable haul, another big laugh on the cops.

What the smugglers didn't reckon on was a crack team of airborne narcotics agents following unseen from behind. The agents were using a new type of aircraft-detection system, a thermal imaging device called FLIR for Forward Looking Infra Red. In the FLIR system, tiny amounts of heat given off by an otherwise invisible surface form an image on a TV-like screen, revealing the object's location and shape. Unlike radar, which can't detect signals close to the ground because of background "clutter," FLIR operates at any altitude and over great distance. Heat from an airplane's fuselage, even miles away, is sufficient to form an image on the scope.

As the smugglers were sneaking across the border seemingly unnoticed, patrolling agents in the air received a terse radio message: "Palomino is jumping the fence." Palomino was the Mexican nickname for 54-year-old Martin Houltin, a long-sought notorious drug trafficker who had been evading capture for years.

The message "jumping the fence" was a tip-off from ground agents that Houltin and his partners were making another border hop. The airborne agents immediately switched on their FLIR scopes, picked up Houltin's planes on the screen and gave chase. By monitoring Houlton's radio frequencies, they learned his destination—a deserted stretch of back road in the New Mexico wilderness where trucks and cars were waiting to take over his deadly cargo. As the agents tracked the smugglers' flight on their screens, they began alerting police helicopters and ground units to proceed to the rendezvous point. By the time the planes touched down, using the road as a landing strip, the helicopters and police patrol cars were already converging on the scene.

That was the end of Houltin and his gang. Seized in the dramatic capture were 2300 pounds of marijuana—enough to put the not-so-smug smugglers out of business behind bars for many years. This was late last fall, one of the first uses of the new FLIR tracking system. Now, with FLIR's help, airborne smuggling, one of the most elusive forms of drug trafficking, is rapidly being brought under control.

But FLIR is only one of many modern sophisticated weapons now in use in the war on smuggling. All over the country, Drug Enforcement Administration agents, U.S. Customs officials and state and local police are cooperating in an all-out massive attack on the drug menace. One inconspicuous aid seldom noticed by motorists passing through border checkpoints is helping to trap smugglers on the ground just as successfully as FLIR is doing in the air. Most drivers are never aware of its presence, but one in particular has good reason to remember it well. On a recent afternoon, Luis Alberto Ascarraga-Milmo was waiting calmly in a line of cars—one of more than 7 million vehicles that annually cross the International Bridge spanning the Rio Grande River between Nueva Laredo on the Mexican side and Laredo, Tex., on the U.S. side. Getting through the checkpoint would be a cinch, thought the Mexican. He had made many similar trips, each time carrying heroin carefully hidden in a different vehicle.

As the line of cars inched slowly through the border inspection station a customs official would strike the keys of a small computer console concealed inside his booth out of motorists' view. He'd tap out a license-plate number on the keyboard, and from the computer's data bank 1350 miles away in San Diego, Calif., a reply would come back almost instantaneously. In most cases, the display on the computer's small screen would be negative, indicating that the vehicle was not suspect. As Ascarraga-Milmo rolled confidently up to the booth, a relaxed, friendly smile on his face, the agent's fingers moved swiftly over the keyboard. In a flash, the screen was alight and blinking with a "hit."

Data from the central bank described a different vehicle but the same registration, signaling that the car was "hot." The Mexican had switched the plates to another vehicle, but hadn't fooled the computer. Instantly, the inspector pressed a warning button and from out of nowhere armed narcotics agents suddenly swarmed over the Mexican's car. An intensive search turned up 19 packets of 85-percent pure heroin—nearly 24 pounds

that, cut to 5-percent purity, would have an estimated street value of $10 million. Ascarraga-Milmo was identified as a member of a huge international dope-smuggling syndicate that was subsequently broken—all as a result of one tiny computer's infallible memory.

Federal narcotics agents' bag of tricks contains a variety of aids ranging from dogs trained to sniff out drugs hidden in the tires and bumpers of automobiles to airborne cameras that can photograph opium-growing poppy fields from two or three miles in the sky. Highly specialized airborne surveillance systems are just beginning to pay off in ferreting out obscure sources of opium cultivation in inaccessible areas not easily reached or detected from the ground. One such piece of equipment currently in test use is the multispectral camera that, through aerial photos, can identify the particular "spectral signature" of drug-producing plants, pinpointing their exact location. In friendly nations cooperating with the United States, information gained through such photos is relayed to local authorities who then move in to destroy the killer crops before they can be harvested.

Insects, long used to detect chemical-biological warfare agents, are now being tested to see if they can spot poppy pollen in the same way. The insects react differently when exposed to different chemicals, and it's hoped that their particular reaction to poppy pollen and other drug-related substances may reveal the sources of the drugs. A modified version of the "people sniffer" used in Vietnam to sense the presence of enemy soldiers is also being tried to "smell out" chemical fumes given off by illicit narcotics-refining factories operating secretly in remote parts of the world. Eventually, an orbiting satellite may circle the earth, automatically transmitting drug-producing locations back to narcotics agents on the ground.

If all this sounds "far out," it's just the beginning—an example of the fantastic extent to which science and technology have been thrown into the battle against drugs.

And stopping drugs before they enter the country—either at their source of cultivation or at our borders and ports—is the biggest single job facing federal narcotics agents for one very simple but appalling reason—it's estimated that more than 90 percent of all drugs produced throughout the world are imported *into* the United States. Stopping them before they get in is thus the name of the game.

Heroin and cocaine are two of the biggest and most lethal imports—heroin from Europe, Mexico and Southeast Asia and cocaine from Latin America. Proof that narcotics agents are succeeding in their task is the fact that one and a third tons of heroin and nearly a ton of cocaine were seized during last year alone, along with a whopping 307 tons of marijuana and 19 tons of hashish, a refined form of "pot." Also confiscated last year were more than 35 million illegal narcotic pills and capsules with such colorful and exotic names as "Mexican reds," "red birds," "red devils," "pinks," "barbs," "goofballs," "speed" and "bennies."

Because of the importance of halting narcotics trafficking at the source, one method has been to increase the number of foreign law enforcement officers and narcotics experts through special training courses overseas. Within the past few years, more than 4300 police officers from 40 countries have participated in over 60 training programs conducted throughout the world. In addition, there are now 172 special U.S. narcotics agents assigned to 58 embassies and consulates in 39 countries to offer expert aid to local authorities.

Within the United States, the Drug Enforcement Administration operates six regional forensic laboratories for the analysis, identification and classification of drug samples that may eventually provide vital clues to unknown sources or serve as important evidence in drug-prosecution cases. The DEA's labs employ 120 specialized chemists and last year alone analyzed more than 45,000 separate drug exhibits. The DEA maintains a file of more than 8000 known drug samples—much like a ballistics or fingerprint file—against which new samples can be compared for identification.

Because drugs are manufactured and packaged in different ways in different areas, matching up an unknown sample with one of known origin can often reveal its source and maker—like a fingerprint identifies its owner.

In one such case, the DEA successfully curtailed the flood of illegal amphetamines regularly smuggled into the United States from Mexico. DEA chemists tested the contents of red secobarbital capsules—"red devils"—and found that the drug itself matched up with a type known to be manufactured in Europe, but that the red capsules were obviously of a kind made and filled in Mexico. Thus, while the secobarbital was being legally imported into Mexico from Europe in bulk form, it was being packed into Mexican capsules and illegally smuggled into the United States. When informed, the Mexican government cooperated by halting secobarbital imports, cutting off the European supply.

Another part of the DEA's forensic work is to help provide positive evidence of drug possession in prosecution cases—a must in order to obtain a conviction and generally difficult to establish because the higher-ups in the trafficking trade are extremely careful never to be caught with any actual drugs themselves. In one recent case, a well-known heroin smuggler, Louis Cirillo, was under investigation, but authorities lacked sufficient proof of possession to link him definitely with the crime. Heroin shipments were known to have been made to his suburban home in New Jersey, but agents searching the house had never turned up any signs of the drug.

Then a DEA supervisor, scanning a report on the frustrated investigation, spotted something that caught his eye. An informant had tipped off agents that, during one of the shipments of heroin to Cirillo's home, a packet had fallen on the garage floor and broken open. The agents had checked the floor, but it had been too thoroughly scrubbed clean to reveal any traces of the drug. The DEA supervisor sent his forensic experts out to try more advanced techniques of detection. Taking scrapings of the floor and applying such sophisticated tests as thin-layer chromatography and mass spectrometry, the experts found enough evidence of heroin to definitely establish its existence in Cirillo's home—six months after the original spillage. As a result, Cirillo was later convicted and given a 25-year sentence.

Thus, in the war on drugs, science and technology are fast proving to be among our most effective weapons, often accomplishing in minutes or hours what no amount of endless sleuthing could hope to do.

A GOOD RULING ON BUSING

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the July 26, 1974, edition of the Chicago Tribune refers to the recent Supreme Court decision on the Detroit school busing case as "sound in both law and commonsense," and I am inclined to agree with that evaluation.

I place the text of the editorial in the RECORD at this point.

A GOOD RULING ON BUSING

The Supreme Court has finally issued a precedent-setting ruling on the controversial subject of court-ordered busing of school pupils for purposes of desegregation. By a vote of 5 to 4, the court held there is no necessity for throwing suburban and central city attendance areas together, in the absence of evidence of unconstitutional acts to segregate. The case before the court concerned Detroit, but the decision will affect many other cities.

In the Detroit case, the decisive vote was cast by Justice Lewis F. Powell Jr., who last year did not participate in a similar Richmond, Va., case because he had been a member of the Richmond school board. The Richmond case divided the court 4 to 4, establishing no precedent. Now at last the country has a majority decision from the Supreme Court—the one from which four justices [Brennan, Douglas, Marshall, and White] dissented. The majority opinion was written by Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, joined by Justices Blackmun, Powell, Stewart, and Rehnquist.

The majority opinion reaffirms the right and duty of the courts "to prescribe appropriate remedies" where "conflict with the 14th Amendment" had been demonstrated. But before the courts order "consolidating separate units . . . or imposing a cross-district remedy," the majority stated, "it must be shown that racially discriminatory acts . . . have been a substantial cause of interdistrict segregation."

Thus the Supreme Court sensibly directs attention to the too-often blurred distinction between de jure segregation [imposed by "racially discriminatory acts"] and de facto segregation, a byproduct of residential patterns. American states and school districts, in the South as elsewhere, now acknowledge the necessity of unitary school systems, free from mandated separation of pupils on a racial basis. But, the Supreme Court holds, lower courts erred in ordering busing of pupils in Detroit and 53 outlying districts "only because of their conclusion that total desegregation of Detroit would not produce the racial balance which they perceived as desirable."

The decision is sound in both law and common sense. The reasons for preventing deliberate racial segregation in schools are valid ones, but they have never implied a mandate to require, at all costs, any particular racial proportions in schools. A court-ordered consolidation such as that planned for Detroit and its suburbs, the Supreme Court sensibly stated, would make the court "a de facto 'legislative authority' to resolve complex problems and the single 'school superintendent' for the entire area." The Supreme Court correctly said that "few, if any judges" are qualified to perform such functions, and that for the courts to assume them "would deprive the people of control of schools thru their elected representatives" in the absence of any constitutional violations.

Tho Justice Thurgood Marshall protested the decision as "a giant step backwards," the decision is really a significant step forward towards common sense and consensus and away from doctrinaire extremism and controversy. Who would have gained had District Judge Stephen Roth's metropolitan desegregation plan [which included an order for Detroit schools to buy 295 buses to implement it] been upheld? Certainly not the school children of either Detroit or its suburbs. It is unfair and unrealistic to require the schools to look as if race were not a factor in contemporary housing patterns.

The current decision is no retreat from national aspirations for an indivisible nation, with liberty and justice for all. It is rather

a sound and authoritative recognition that the Constitution does not require massive busing of school pupils thruout metropolitan areas and that the quality of education is bound to suffer when children must spend hours being transported to schools far from the familiarity of their own neighborhoods. Most Americans, including blacks as well as whites and liberals as well as conservatives, will agree with the court and will be glad that the court agrees with them.

APPRECIATING AMERICA

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, too often I believe that we Americans do not truly appreciate what a great country we are privileged to call home. Of late our national soul-searching seems to concentrate on the bad things in the United States of America. Personally, I would much rather talk about the good things in America, things that we see around us each and every day—especially the freedoms we enjoy in every facet of our daily lives. Many times we overlook these freedoms and have to be reminded of exactly what life in America means.

The freedom we enjoy here is graphically demonstrated in a letter received by one of my staff assistants, Richard Davies, from a friend traveling in Russia and other Eastern European nations. The writer, David Hale, is a native of Vermont and graduated from the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service.

As a person who has visited, and has been arrested, in the Soviet Union, Mr. Hale's letter is a reminder of the oppression which I witnessed first hand 3 years ago. For the uninitiated, this letter will bring home some shocking truths to those who might want to consider some of the "good" points of a totalitarian state. I submit the text of the letter for the inspection of my colleagues with my thanks to Mr. Hale and Mr. Davies:

DEAR RICHARD: Our trip was a bit tiring—all that driving—but fascinating just the same. Our only car trouble was on the return leg, thirty minutes from Calais: a flat tire.

Everyone out there is very anxious for contact with the West. Our border search lasted nearly three hours, but not solely because they were looking for contraband. The guards themselves were personally interested in our belongings. Not only did they dismantle our engine: they all took turns sitting on the front seat and honking the horn. They hardly noticed Dennis' prayer book: but they marvelled at a guidebook to fishing in Czechoslovakia. In fact, they read every single bit of travel literature we had. The commander of the customs station asked me three times if I had a "Playboy" magazine: apparently he has not been able to confiscate one for nearly two years.

The situation was much the same inside the country. Every time we stopped a crowd would gather to look at our car. On several occasions we had to open the hood so they could inspect the engine, as well as repair manuals. Children would also tag along and ask for gum. One fourteen year old boy, in perfect English, even asked me, "Mister, do you have any chewing gum, foreign magazines, ballpoint pens, or nylon stockings". We gave him gum. At the Kiev Intourist itself, I saw a girl (theirs) reading an English copy of Harold Robbins *The Carpetbaggers*. Being bumpkins, the border people think all pornography has to have pictures.

The other East European countries are considerably more relaxed than the Russians. They do not have police check-points every twenty miles recording your movements and they give you free access to the backroads: in the Soviet Union we were confined to one. The Russian border station appeared to be deserted when we arrived. When the boys in the back sobered-up they took only five minutes to search the car. But stamping our passports took almost two hours as they had misplaced their list of which countries required visas. Tell your Congressman that because of detente, I got in for free: the British and Canadians still have to pay.

I gave a book about the English Industrial Revolution to a Rumanian dancing girl: she appreciated it more than nylon stockings as she wants to improve her English. It was not a romance: she, like everyone else, is just frightfully curious about the outside world. She even asked me to write to her. A Rumanian railway inspector tried to buy some goods from me illegally: I gave him as a present, some of our coffee, tea, and nylon stockings, for which he gave me a kiss, slavic-style. I was not going to risk selling something to a man I knew nothing about.

The day we were returning to the Western Ukraine from Kiev there was a bad flood. Despite what the real estate men in Vermont say, the Russians have no floodplain zoning; nor drainage. What a mess; we were confined to our hotel. But this proved interesting as the army set up relief operations in the lobby. Sipping vodka into the wee hours of the morning I befriended an official of their tourist office who was a former English professor and by far the most sarcastic person I met on the entire trip. In fact, I would rate his political commitment at zero. When I told him I was from Vermont, he said we had a large ski-industry. Surprised, I asked him how he knew that. He replied with a laugh, "I know everything. I am from the U.S.S.R.!"

I think the more contact these places have with the west the more difficult a time the governments will have suppressing information. As things stand now, crowds come to the Intourist hotels to dance and to stare in the windows of the foreign currency shops. It must really gall them to think these items are reserved for outsiders. But they show no sign of restricting tourism because they badly need the foreign exchange. In fact, on the edge of the Iron Curtain, in the shadow of two machine gun towers, ten yards from where a barbed wire fence demarcates the East German minefield which runs alongside the border there is a drab colorless custom house decorated only by a large portrait of the East German communist leader and a Diner's Club Card.

Good Luck,

DAVID.

WORLD ACTION HUNGER COALITION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is shocking to realize that in the late 20th century—an era of unprecedented affluence for the world's developed countries—that hunger is still the common lot of much of the world's people. Moreover, there are indications that this problem is growing worse. The development of the capacity to produce fertilizer has lagged and the price has risen astronomically, the benefits of our recent foreign assistance efforts have been eroded by global inflation and the world's population continues to grow at the frightening rate of 2 percent a year.

James P. Grant, president of the Overseas Development Council, recently told a Senate committee that:

Barring major international action, the combination of quadrupling food and energy prices, and the cutback of fertilizer exports dooms millions . . . to premature death and increased malnutrition and even outright starvation.

The United Nations ominously predicts that 20 million people will starve to death in 1974.

The outlook for the future is indeed bleak unless serious efforts are made to increase our food resources and to formulate an effective U.S. foreign assistance policy. The World Hunger Action Coalition is a group of concerned Americans drawn together in order to take concrete steps to ameliorate this tragic situation. I would like to commend the efforts of this group and especially those of the cochairman of the advisory commission of public officials; Senator CHARLES PERCY and Gov. Milton Shapp. Mr. Speaker, I intend at this time to insert into the RECORD a statement of principles from the World Hunger Action Coalition. The item follows:

WORKING DOCUMENT OF THE WORLD HUNGER ACTION COALITION

THE COALITION

The World Hunger Action Coalition is a group of Americans drawn together by their concern about ameliorating world hunger.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

The world is confronted by a food crisis of an unprecedented and long-term character which presents a moral as well as an economic challenge to the U.S. The increasingly widespread shortage of food is aggravated by rapidly escalating prices for fertilizer, petroleum and food itself, which threaten to curtail what is available to hungry people even further. The gap between the well-fed and the underfed is widening; there are more hungry people in the world now than ever in the past. This situation demands immediate reserves.

Since the developed countries, such as the United States, are better off both economically and technologically, and since the consumption patterns stemming from our affluence contribute significantly to the pressure on limited world food supplies, we must take primary responsibility for relieving present and guarding against future scarcity, even to the point of limiting our own escalating standards of living.

In seeking to discharge this responsibility, we must recognize (a) that the right to eat is fundamental to human life, (b) that our own hungry people are an integral part of the world problem, and (c) that any program designed to relieve world hunger must protect the farmer's right to a fair return on his investment and labor as well as the rights of consumers. While assistance to the hungry in the form of food is imperative, food aid is not a substitute for development assistance, especially at the level of the individual villager and farmer.

The Coalition, alarmed at an apparent isolationist trend in the U.S., believes that the developed nations cannot afford, either morally or otherwise, to enlarge the gap between themselves and the less developed countries or to alienate further the poor in their own countries. Cognizant of the fact that we all share a global interdependence

and that the resources of the world are finite, we encourage steps, both immediate and long-range, to alleviate the world food problem and the underdeveloped condition of which it is a symptom.

Just as we in the United States once made our farm surpluses available to the needy in the days of abundance, we must now reaffirm that commitment in a time of scarcity. While not neglecting domestic needs, we believe the U.S. should carry out a deliberate and conscious policy of creating food reserves that will help sustain hungry people abroad in the face of the vagaries of weather, crop and price fluctuations, and natural and human disasters.

GOALS

To attack world hunger immediately by stimulating public interest in and action toward (a) sharply increasing food aid through both private and public channels, (b) building up the U.S. component of a worldwide food reserve, and (c) insuring that the U.S. delegation to the World Food Conference in Rome advocates a policy of sharing national food resources with the hungry.

TARGET: WORLD FOOD CONFERENCE

The World Food Conference, called by the United Nations for Rome in November, 1974, offers an opportunity to plan cooperative action toward minimum world food security, including food aid, disaster relief, and other measures, and to reemphasize the essential link between general economic development and the provision of an adequate diet for all. The success of the Conference will depend on how effectively governments cooperate and, in particular, whether they are willing to turn a proposal already accepted in principle—i.e., the world food reserve—into an effective system of food security.

Moreover, we see the World Food Conference not only as a forum for repairing the more immediate damage done to the most vulnerable of the poor countries by the recent sharp price rises in energy and food, but more importantly as an opportunity to relate these short-term measures to the more basic continuing development problems of alleviating poverty and accelerating social and economic progress toward equitable distribution of the planet's finite resources. It should thus be the occasion to discuss and design a global program that would move far beyond food.

All governments must play a great part in this. The U.S. Government, however, now lacks a formal national policy on world food needs. Therefore, in implementing its stated goal to influence the U.S. delegation and through it the World Food Conference, the Coalition intends:

1. To become a national voice in the formation in the U.S. of a world food policy along the lines described above.

2. To help the American people understand the reality and the severity of the world food crisis.

3. To stimulate public participation in an immediate effort to increase food aid and build up a food reserve.

4. To stress the need to view hunger in the broader context of development, whose ultimate goal is to enhance the quality of human life

5. To mobilize grassroots support for development assistance to less developed countries.

6. To advocate a policy in the U.S. of greater concrete concern for the poor in America, particularly in areas related to food and nutrition.

7. To insure implementation after the World Food Conference of the policies we hope to see adopted there.

The agenda now envisioned for the World Food Conference—the launching of a world food reserve system, stepped-up food aid, and a worldwide effort to increase food production in the developing countries—seems to us to offer the possibility of moving beyond a rather narrow focus on food to a thorough discussion of the much broader development questions, of which food is a single but most important aspect. The Conference will not be a culmination, but a beginning of concerted solutions to the moral and economic problem of a world increasingly divided between the very rich and the very poor, between the satiated and the hungry. The matter is one of justice and equity.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, July 30, 1974*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Paul Economides, Greek Orthodox Church of Southern Maryland, Annapolis, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and all merciful God, by whom all powers and authorities are ordained, and who taught us that rulers are ministers of God to us, hear us, for unto Thee we bow our heads.

Bless these men chosen by the people of this great country, for Thou knowest them. Thou knowest their needs, their motives, their hopes, and their fears.

Send upon them, O Lord, Thy rich mercies and give them courage to admit their mistakes.

Preserve their lives and multiply their days with health and wisdom.

Grant unto them progress in all their virtues, and bless the tenure of their office so that they may be victorious in their struggle against evil, violence, injustice, and poverty. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

THE REVEREND PAUL G. ECONOMIDES OF ANNAPOLIS

(Mrs. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to welcome the Reverend Paul G. Economides of Annapolis as the guest chaplain this morning for our opening prayer. Reverend Economides is the pastor of the Greek Orthodox Church of Southern Maryland, and is also chaplain of the Greek Orthodox students at Georgetown University at the present time.

The Reverend Economides was born in Constantinople, Turkey, and studied at the University of Athens, in Greece, and at Harvard. He has served since his ordination at the Greek Orthodox Cathedral in Boston, in New York City, and in Columbus, Ohio.

Pastor Economides has been instrumental in establishing the Greek Orthodox Church of Southern Maryland, and a new church and offices will be constructed on recently acquired land in southern Maryland. I know that the new church will add much to our community, and its pastor is to be commended for his enthusiastic and thoughtful efforts on behalf of the Greek Orthodox community in Maryland.

Reverend Economides' wife, Catherine, and his elder son, George, are with us today in the gallery, and I know they join me in sharing personal and Maryland pride at the accomplishments of Father Paul.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 16090

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 16090.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

BUILDUP OF TURKISH FORCES ON CYPRUS

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my deep concern over the continued buildup of Turkish forces in Cyprus. Turkey's presence in Cyprus is undermining NATO efforts to reach an accord and is in clear defiance of the right of the Cypriot people to determine their own destiny.

Turkish Premier Bulent Ecevit insists that Turkey's right to maintain and reinforce its units on Cyprus is "irrevocable." In fact, however, Turkey has no such right. The 1960 settlement allows for the presence of small Turkish and Greek units on Cyprus. This is a far cry from the 25,000 Turkish forces now occupying a 200-square-mile zone on the island. The present difficulties in Cyprus have enabled the Turkish military to accomplish a feat which would not have been possible even by a frontal assault.

Turkey must realize its international obligation to withdraw from Cyprus. Delay in removing their forces aggravates still another risk to peace, that of Soviet efforts to assume a major role in negotiations. It is incumbent upon the NATO alliance to convince Turkey and all other foreign forces that their presence in Cyprus is not conducive to a viable peace accord.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, on July 24, 1974, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has me recorded as not voting on rollcall No. 405 final passage of H.R. 16027, the Interior appropriations bill. I specifically recall voting on this bill due to its importance and concern to me. I approved of its pas-