who is deaf or deaf-blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York:

H.R. 16193. A bill to prohibit certain conflicts of interest between financial institutions and corporations regulated by certain agencies of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 16194. A bill to further the purposes of the Wilderness Act by designating certain lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, to provide for study of certain additional lands for such inclusion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEELMAN (for himself, Mr. KEMP, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GUDE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. HEINZ):

H.R. 16195. A bill to require candidates for Federal office, Members of the Congress, and officers and employees of the United States to file statements with the Comptroller General with respect to their income and financial transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. LENT, Mr. KYROS, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 16196. 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. HUBER:

H.R. 16197. A bill to establish a Commission on Medical Malpractice Awards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 16198. A bill to amend the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish fire safety requirements for locomotives in order to minimize the danger of fires along railroad right-of-ways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16199. A bill to amend section 4945 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make it clear that nothing in that provision authorizes the limitation of the grants awarded by a private foundation to a fixed percentage of the number of applicants for such grants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 16200. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, marital status, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 16201. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. DELANEY, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. KOCH, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. PEYSER):

H.R. 16202. A bill to establish in the Department of Housing and Urban Development a housing enforcement assistance program to aid cities and other municipalities in the more effective enforcement of housing codes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROE (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MINISH, and Mr. VAN DEERLIN):

H.R. 16203. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance for programs for the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of, and research in, Huntington's disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT):

H.R. 16204. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assure the development of a national health policy and of effective area and State health planning and resources development programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 16205. A bill to provide emergency deficiency assistance to producers of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STOKES (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RAILSBACK, and Mr. RIEGLE):

H.R. 16206. A bill to require that discharge certificates issued to members of the armed forces not indicate the conditions or reasons for discharge, to limit the separation of enlisted members under conditions other than honorable and to improve the procedures for the review of discharges and dismissals; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 16207. A bill to provide for emergency relief for small business concerns in connection with fixed price Government contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mr. QUIE):

H. Con. Res. 570. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to make corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 69; ordered to be printed.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Con. Res. 571. Concurrent resolution for negotiations on the Turkish opium ban; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. Con. Res. 572. Concurrent resolution calling for a domestic summit to develop a unified plan of action to restore stability and prosperity to the American economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCOLLISTER:

H. Con. Res. 573. Concurrent resolution calling for a domestic summit to develop a unified plan of action to restore stability and prosperity to the American economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HEINZ (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Res. 1281. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H. Res. 1282. Resolution providing for additional copies of the committee print, a staff study entitled "Terrorism"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. REES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. WAGGONNER):

H. Res. 1283. Resolution requesting that each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands conduct a survey or study to determine the views of their citizens with respect to abortion laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURLESON of Texas:

H.R. 16208. A bill for the relief of the estate of Earnest Nancy Brindley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 16209. A bill for the relief of Chae Won Yang, Myung Jae Yang, Yoo Jung Yang, Jee Sun Yang, Yoo Sun Yang, and Hong Suk Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 16210. A bill for the relief of Maria Elena San Agustin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FEDERAL FOOLISHNESS

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have discussed in the Senate my friend, Jack Rider, who operates Stations WFTC and WRNS, in Kinston, N.C.

If there is a more forthright broadcaster in America, it has not been my privilege to listen to him. Jack writes and presents a daily editorial, called "Editorially Speaking," for his stations. And, as I have said before, when Jack Rider speaks out, the people for miles around listen attentively and, for the most part, approvingly.

On July 17, Jack Rider presented an editorial that has come to my attention. As I read it, it was my immediate judgment that other Senators would be interested in his comment.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jack Rider's "Editorially Speaking" of July 17 be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

EDITORIALLY SPEAKING

(By Jack Rider)

Government is by consent of the governed, and I can only wonder how long the people are going to keep consenting to far worse invasions against their freedom than King George ever dreamed about in his wildest fantasies. Consider this: Monday we and thousands of other people who have from time to time sold anything to the Du Pont Company received a form letter, which cost the Du Pont Company about 50 cents to get out to every supplier it has all across the nation. The cost of this red-tape compliance, of course, has to be added to all the products Du Pont manufacturers . . . but the political cost is far, far worse than the fractional increase it causes in the price of Dacron or

any other Du Pont product. This letter says, in part:

"Being subject to the provision of Executive Order 11246, as amended, relating to equal employment opportunity, as well as Executive Orders 11265, 11640, 11701 and 11758, E. I. du Pont de Nemours, and Company is required to certify that: (1) It is in compliance with the Equal Opportunity Clause as set forth in Section 202 of Executive Order 11246; (2) It does not maintain segregated facilities for its employees; (3) It will file annual reports on Standard Form 100 (EEO–1); (4) It has developed and maintains a written and signed affirmative action program at each of its facilities."

And the letter continues, "We are required in turn to obtain a similar certification of fair employment practices from our suppliers, under each of these executive orders; and we have elected to fulfill this obligation by obtaining an annual certification from each non-exempt supplier rather than obtaining individual certification with each contract or purchase order. The necessary certification form is enclosed. Please sign the attached form indicating your acceptance of these terms as a part of any purchase order or agreement between us and return. . ."

Ironically enough on the Du Pont stationery at the bottom there is a slogan which reads: "There is a world of things we're doing something about."

Operating a radio station under the federal feral first, we are no stranger to this kind of tyranny. In order to protect our investment and the jobs of our 20 people, we have to sell our soul to the federal devil, or our franchise will be taken away. There is not a radio or television station owner in this nation who believes that the Federal Government has either a moral or a legal right to dictate whom it shall hire and whom it shall not hire; but we, like Du Pont, sign sworn statements on a dictated, regular basis affirming that we believe what we utterly despise.

NEWARK CELEBRATES PUERTO RICAN DAY PARADE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, 22 years ago, a covenant that proclaimed the creation of a permanent union between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States was signed. On July 25, 1952, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico joined hands with the mainland on the "basis of common citizenship, common defense, common currency, a free market, and a common value of democracy".

For more than two decades this unique relationship between the 3 million people of Puerto Rico and the American people has existed. Progress, economic, social, and cultural has been vital for both the island and the mainland. And, today as we look at this progress and the many achievements resulting from this union, our hearts and spirits are filled with pride and joy.

Puerto Rican Gov. Rafael Hernandez Colon since his election has introduced dynamic programs that have proven to be extremely beneficial to the island. And, to further insure continued advancement, a year ago an ad hoc committee consisting of seven members from the mainland, including five Members of Congress was formed to examine the various problems of the island and introduce steps to strengthen our mutual bond.

Many of our Puerto Rican brothers and sisters, who have chosen to settle on the mainland, regard July 25 as a day of great celebration. The richness of Puerto Rican culture and traditions had indeed become in each succeeding year more and more a part of our communities.

On Sunday, July 28, in my hometown of Newark, N.J., the Puerto Rican people once again joined together to commemorate this most joyous occasion. The 10th Annual Puerto Rican Parade was certainly a beautiful and marvelous display of pride and culture. And, Miguel Rodriguez, grand marshal, and Jose Rosario, parade president, deserve the highest of recognition for their leadership in organizing the days' events.

Gov. Brendan T. Byrne, Mayor Kenneth A. Gibson, Archbishop Peter L. Gerety, members of the State legislature, and other officials were among the 6,000 spectators. Senator Frank Los of Puerto Rico and Rafael Torregrosa, executive director for Puerto Rican Migration Division were also on hand.

Our joy and pride were further elevated when we looked at lovely and talented Mary Lou Rivera of Newark, the winner of Miss Puerto Rico of New Jersey. I know that when our Puerto Rican citizens celebrate, they rejoice with heart and soul. And, I join them in spirit and pride on this most special occasion.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution has asked me to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolutions adopted at its 84th annual Congress, June 23 through June 27, 1974, in Baltimore, Md., and I am pleased to do so.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY 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 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 automobiles 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 jursidiction 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 hearing 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, nullify 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 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.

BINARY NERVE GAS FUNDING—NOT IN THE NATION'S INTEREST

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the military appropriations bill will be before the House Appropriations Committee this Thursday and the full House next week. As far as I now know, one of the items within this bill is the authorization to begin the procurement of the binary chemical weapons system. This request, for approximately $5.8 million, has been the subject of hearings before the House Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, and the Appropriations Committees.

The continued justification for this binary chemical weapons appropriation is the threat posed by the chemical stockpiles of the Soviet Union. This is the same justification which has been presented to the Congress since the end of World War II. There is no evidence to show that a new round of chemical weapon procurements, which may eventually cost this Nation as much as $2 billion, will in any way alter or improve the capability of the United States to prevent the use of chemical weapons by the Soviet Union or to strengthen the U.S. retaliatory threat to any enemy who should be contemplating the use of chemical weapons against our forces. It seems to me that the initiation of such a procurement at this time involves more arguments

against than can be presented in support of the proposal.

We currently have the capability to produce more nerve agent in existing chemical plants than our Armed Forces can possibly foresee as a requirement. We now have vast stockpiles of bulk nerve agent in storage. We are going through a period of adjustment which includes some disposition of deteriorating munitions and elimination of chemical agents no longer considered to be standard agents in our arsenal. The binary offers a limited advantage in safety and handling in comparison with existing stockpiles. It presents many political disadvantages, in addition to possibly being a less effective chemical weapon.

I urge you to examine the discussion presented by Representative FRASER in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 16, 1974. If you agree with this logical analysis, I believe that you will also agree that the procurement of the binary chemical weapon is not in the best interest of this Nation at this time and that to delay this procurement until more thoughtful examination of the issue can be completed will not jeopardize the security of this Nation in any way. The elimination of this item from the fiscal year 1975 military appropriations bill will provide the Congress with the time to examine this issue with greater care.

THE TIDE IS CHANGING

HON. DAVID R. BOWEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. BOWEN. Mr. Speaker, those of us in Congress who represent predominantly rural districts have been very concerned that rural America's needs, goals, and great contribution to the stability of this country not be overlooked. I am pleased to call to the Congress' attention this very excellent editorial in last week's edition of the Winston County Journal at Louisville, Miss., written by one of the many responsible and progressive newspaper editors of our State, Mr. Joe T. Cook. The editorial, entitled, "Tide Is Changing," reads as follows:

TIDE IS CHANGING

The tide is at last flowing in the opposite direction.

Following a period of about 30 years during which young people, particularly, have been leaving their small-town homes and seeking their opportunities in the large metropolitan areas of this country, the trend is now reversing itself.

There has been a sizeable upswing in the nonfarm rural job opportunities. Between March, 1970, and March, 1973, non metropolitan areas reported an increase of 7.8 percent in jobs as compared with 3.6 percent in metropolitan areas.

The large cities have reached the point in time when the quality of life they can offer, everything considered, does not compare with that of the small community.

Urban congestion, spiraling costs of housing and services, the rising crime rate in the cities, the increasing prevalence of drug pushing, the chaotic conditions in the schools—all have combined to influence people to seek a calmer, more rewarding way of life in the smaller communities.

The assistant secretary for rural development of the USDA said recently: "I have no quarrel with those who prefer city life. But for those people who prefer to maintain their rural family and community ties, there should be enough local jobs available within reasonable commuting distance to make this possible. This is a central goal of rural development.

"For many years cities have had most of the jobs. Millions of farm, small town, and other rural people have been forced to move there. . . . Many cities grew excessively, became congested and unmanageable. And small towns often withered as their population dwindled.

"Every new job adds to the economic tempo of the community, bringing additional jobs and business to it. Small-town and rural people are increasingly organizing to hammer out a master plan for their community," he said.

The USDA and other Federal agencies are giving assistance in building better community facilities for small towns. The Appalachian Program, Farmers Home Administration, and several other agencies are approving grants and loans for making possible a better life in the smaller communities of our nation.

Louisville and Winston County are taking advantage of some of this assistance, and we think that our city and county officials should be alert for every possible source of help to improve our community facilities to provide an increasingly better life for those of us who prefer to live in a small town.

ISRAEL'S REMARKABLE ACCOMPLISHMENT

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in Israel's brief 26-year history, the prospects for peace in the Middle East are bright and hope is strong. Israel now may get on with the pressing domestic problems which confront this dynamic nation.

One of the truly monumental accomplishments of Israel has been its unceasing ability to absorb countless thousands of Jewish immigrants over the years. People with disparate backgrounds have come to this land, adopted it as their own, and begun to make a productive contribution to their new society. Generally, the assimilation has been remarkable, not unlike that in the melting pot of New York City and much of the United States around the turn of the century when waves of immigrants came to the United States.

In fact, many of Israel's problems are directly attributable to the huge numbers of people who have chosen it for their new home.

Housing is crowded in the extreme, with three or more persons often sharing one room.

Education, which begins with nursery school, must accommodate the varied backgrounds and languages of all the children, often within a crowded classroom.

Income, social services, agriculture, human welfare—each of these areas presents a unique problem for the Israelis.

To deal with these problems, Israel has one of the highest income taxes anywhere in the world.

Perhaps Israel's greatest problem, however, is the incredible rate of inflation it is currently undergoing. Double-digit inflation is nothing new to the Israelis. However, the current rate of 40 percent a year cannot be permitted to continue. Israel's new government simply must find a way to bring inflation under control.

Another enormous problem is Israel's deficit in its balance of payments. This further weakens its currency and causes instability in its financial affairs.

Yet, with all of this, Israel is still truly a phenonemon of the 20th century. That one small nation could take unproductive land and make it into a home and a refuge for so many must be accounted an outstanding accomplishment. Hopefully a way will be found to extend the peace indefinitely so that Arabs and Jews can once again live and work in harmony together in the Middle East.

PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEWS

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the plight of Soviet Jews was made startlingly clear to me recently through a case involving one of my constitutent's relatives. The tragic story, related to me by Rev. Shabtai Ackerman of the Beth Abraham-Hillel congregation in Birmingham, Mich., underlines the cruel and ruthless tactics the Soviet Union employs to harass and detain Jews wishing to emigrate, and I would like to share it with my colleagues.

Mr. Yichil Kutchuk and his wife and sister-in-law applied for and were granted passports to emigrate to Israel in April. The Kutchuks' son had been allowed to emigrate to Israel 18 months earlier. After being assured that their visas were in order, the Kutchuks packed the belongings they would need for the trip, sold the rest, and made plans for a joyous reunion with their son.

But 3 hours before their scheduled departure by train from Kishinev, the police informed them they had to go to the Customs Office to have their baggage checked. When they arrived at the office they discovered their bags had already been opened. Officials proceeded to confiscate their passports and papers, arrest Mr. Kutchuk, and send his wife home to an empty apartment. Since that time over 3 months ago no one has been permitted to visit Mr. Kutchuk, and no official charges have been made against him. His relatives have learned he is ill and being held in the prison hospital. Mrs. Kutchuk, who suffers from a heart condition, has been forced to appear at the police station every day for question-

ing, returning in the evening to her bare apartment.

Upon learning of this travesty of justice I immediately wrote the Soviet Embassy asking for an explanation. The only reply I have received has been a one-line note telling me that my letter has been referred to proper Soviet authorities. I am not holding my breath waiting for a further reply, although I urgently hope for a pleasant ending to the Kutchuk's story.

Mr. Speaker, this episode is an example of the outrageous treatment of Jews that continues to take place in the Soviet Union on a regular basis. It is precisely these inhumane actions that have prompted many members of Congress, myself included, to urge that the Soviet Union not be granted most favored nation trading status. I will continue to adamantly oppose any granting of such status so long as the cold and calculating persecution of Soviet Jews continues. We in the free world cannot and must not tolerate the continued oppression that the Kutchuks and thousands of others have been subjected to.

THE TROUBLE WITH GOVERNMENT REGULATION

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, occasionally, a philosophical masterpiece arrives at my office. There is not a word I can add to the letter and accompanying article sent to me by Mr. Piatt Hull, a distinguished attorney from Wallace, Idaho. I would like to enter it in the RECORD at this point:

HULL, HULL, & WHEELER,
Attorneys at Law,
Wallace, Idaho, June 28, 1974.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH.
Hon. JAMES MCCLURE.
Hon. STEVE SYMMS.
Hon. ORVAL HANSEN.

GENTLEMEN: I enclose a copy of an article from the current Reader's Digest "The Trouble with Government Regulation" by Walter B. Wriston, Chairman of Citicorp.

This restates a proposition I have urged upon you on past occasions: A problem is never as bad as the government's solution to the problem.

Example: One seemingly minor governmental action that has done as much as any other single thing to screw up the energy situation—setting well head prices on natural gas at the rate of about $2 or $3 per ton of coal measured in btu's. Ergo, everybody tended to convert to gas, nobody drilled for gas and the coal mines tended to go to pot. If the price of gas had been left alone, use would have declined, supplies would have been increased, prices would have been competitive and the coal industry would have tended to thrive.

Regulation has obviously killed the railroad industry. Why should we pay billions to the railroads and at the same time let ICC continue to louse up as it has for generations? Why not abolish the ICC and turn the railroad loose to serve the country, subject only to the Sherman Anti Trust Act? Things can't get worse, they would necessarily get better.

Why not adopt the philosophy that we can run our businesses better than you can—you people don't know a single specific thing about running any business, except, perhaps, the one or two you actually engaged in prior to assuming public office, and you are tending to become damn rusty there.

Very truly yours,

PIATT HULL.

Enclosures.

THE TROUBLE WITH GOVERNMENT REGULATION

(Condensed from a speech by Walter B. Wriston, Chairman, Citicorp)

When bureaucrats try to manipulate the marketplace, the result is usually disastrous. It's far better, says this distinguished banker, to allow the enormous innovative talents of the American people free play.

Anyone in our society whose eyesight and hearing are not totally impaired is likely to believe that we Americans are on a collision course with Doomsday. Certainly, the energy shortage has produced no scarcity in the rhetoric of crisis.

The compulsion of the media to turn every scrap of bad news into a full-blown crisis distorts our perspective, however. For prophets of doom fail to appreciate man's inherent ability to adjust and innovate.

The British economist Thomas Malthus, for example, predicted in 1798 that the imbalance between population growth and food production would bring the world to the verge of starvation. The doomsayers called it the iron law. As time has proved, it was neither iron nor law. Like many of our current crop of transient experts, Malthus underestimated everyone's intelligence but his own; he was incapable of imagining that out of the Industrial Revolution would come reapers, threshers, combines and tractors. He did not foresee the era of cheap energy. Nor did he envision chemicals and fertilizers creating such abundance that foolish governments would pay farmers not to cultivate the soil.

A second reason why doomsayers are so frequently unable to predict accurately what will happen is that they cling to the belief that there are accepted absolutes in a rapidly changing world. Examples abound. A commission appointed by President Herbert Hoover in 1929 later reported to Franklin D. Roosevelt on how to plot our course through 1952. The report was in 13 volumes prepared by some 500 researchers.

Yet the two-volume, 1600-page summary contained not a word about the development of atomic energy, jet propulsion, antibiotics, transistors or other significant advances. The World's Fair of 1939, which was dedicated to the World of Tomorrow, didn't envision the impact of these steps forward. The people who have come closest to predicting the future are some of the science-fiction writers, unencumbered by elaborate research or prestigious committees, but with the courage to dream.

Our latter-day Malthusians appear oblivious to the fact that man, given the proper incentive and freedom to act, has repeatedly found substitutes for dwindling materials. The United States was denied 90 percent of its sources of natural rubber during World War II, but technological ingenuity created synthetic rubber, which is now more widely used than the natural product. Coal was not even considered a resource before the Steam Age, nor was uranium highly valued before the Atomic Age. These experiences of yesterday are relevant today. I do not assert that history repeats itself, but offer a reminder that the human story did not begin with today's crisis.

Energy is no exception. Few Americans even remember that, from the time of the American Revolution until the Civil War, a major source of artificial lighting was the whale-oil lamp. The Civil War disrupted whale-oil production, and its price shot up to $2.55 a gallon—almost double what it had been in 1859. Naturally, there were cries of profiteering and demands for Congress to "do something about it." The government, however, made no move to ration whale oil or to freeze its price, or to put a new tax on the "excess profits" of the whalers. Instead, prices were permitted to rise.

The result, then as now, was predictable. Consumers began to use less whale oil, and the whalers invested more money in new ways to increase their productivity. Meanwhile, men with vision and capital began to develop kerosene and other petroleum products. The first practical generator for outdoor electric lights was built in 1875. By 1896, the price of whale oil had dropped to 40 cents a gallon. Whale-oil lamps now sit in museums to remind us of the impermanence of crisis.

The whale-oil "energy crisis" is one of an infinite series demonstrating the ability of the free market to solve problems of scarcity. Shortages, then and now, can often be eliminated when prices are allowed to exercise their age-old functions—that is, to motivate the consumer to consume less and the producer to produce more, and to spur someone on to develop a new product that is better and cheaper. Shortages become a crisis when government intervenes to frustrate the ability of the free market to function.

But government seems loath to learn from experience about intervention. The result is non-economic. No one who saw it on television last year will soon forget the wholesale drowning of baby chicks. It was done because the government froze the price of grown chickens at a level which made it uneconomic for farmers to raise and sell them. But this drowning was only a rerun of the plowing-under of "surplus" cotton and grain, and the slaughter of piglets a generation ago—a slaughter predicated on the proposition that governments are smarter than markets, which all history refutes. Anyone observing the consequences in our country of price and wage controls can have few illusions left about the efficiency of government-controlled markets.

Substituting bureaucratic regulation for the marketplace has always served first to produce a shortage and then to intensify it. Whenever our system appears to falter by not providing our accustomed relative abundance at a low price, the people who distrust freedom stand ready with the simplistic solution: the government should intervene.

Paradoxically, many of those who look to government to remedy every economic grievance in our society also want government to get out of their personal lives. They cannot have it both ways; they cannot ask more and more government intervention in what ought to be a free market and still insist on more and more freedom for themselves as individuals. No people have ever preserved political liberty for long in an environment of economic dictatorship. We often learn too late that freedom is indivisible.

Although in America we have what is described as a free-enterprise economy, our government today regulates more business practices than most other democracies. Listen to the roll call: the utilities which produce heat, light and power; the railroads (what's left of them); trucking companies, airlines, broadcasters, drug firms, dry cleaners, auto manufacturers, meat packers, film makers, farmers, brokers, banks and a host of other enterprises. Most of these industries are highly competitive, but government has decreed that they must serve a variety of objectives other than selling their products at the lowest price.

The government regulator is always adjured to serve the public interest. Sooner or later, however, he usually develops into both judge and jury, and often into prosecutor as well. Congress should legislate. The Executive should enforce the law. The courts

should interpret the conflict. Instead of this, Congress does its best to bypass the other branches and create separate institutions that combine legislative, executive and judicial functions. The new regulatory body then makes rules with the force of law, substituting its opinion for the judgment of the free market. As time goes on, the bureaucracy changes the active verb "to compete" into the passive "to be regulated." This process tends to create a rigid, backward-looking system—which is neither business-oriented nor consumer-oriented. Instead, it is bureaucracy-oriented.

Many industries continue to be regulated as though they were monopolies, whereas, in *fact*, new competitors have long since taken away a good share of their business. The railroads were put at a disadvantage when the truckers began to siphon off revenues; so were the scheduled airlines when the chartered flights entered the market. Instead of welcoming the competitive challenge, the initial regulatory reflex was to reach out and regulate the new industries—permitting no industry to either win or lose on its merits, but causing the public to pay the check for higher costs.

Consider the railroads, which, before the Interstate Commerce Commission clapped them into a regulatory straitjacket, were pioneers in technology—creating the standard track gauge, new freight cars and safety devices. After the ICC stepped in, the efforts of the railroads to improve efficiency through new technology were time after time hampered by costly delays in regulatory decisions. Instead of concerning themselves with key issues, the regulators expended their efforts on such trivia as setting tariffs which distinguished between horses for slaughter and horses for draft. Predictably, many railroads chugged slowly down the road to ruin.

Our current energy crisis furnishes another fork in the road. If you look beyond the panic and concentrate on the problem, there are a number of ways we can go. We can create a new ICC for oil and gas, with the absolutely predictable result that the current market dislocations will become institutionalized, and temporary scarcity will be regulated into permanent shortages.

Or we can permit the enormous innovative talents of the American people to function. Just as the invention of kerosene and practical electric generators took the whale-oil lamps out of the homes of America and put them in the museum, our current energy problem will also be solved in myriad ways that no one now can foresee—if we let the free market operate. Whether it is whale oil, baby chicks or energy, control by a bureaucracy is no match for the free market in the allocation of human and material resources for the good of everybody.

VICTOR B. TOSI

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, Victor Tosi, a constituent of mine, an outstanding community leader and a friend of mine, has recently stepped down as president of the 47th Precinct Community Council of the North Bronx, N.Y. This is indeed an unfortunate loss to the community which Vic has served most ably for many years. Fortunately, the impact of this loss is cushioned by the fact that he will remain on the executive board as an adviser.

During his tenure in office, Vic was responsible for initiating and implementing many beneficial programs and securing hundreds of jobs for the young people in his area. He was, and still is, vitally concerned about safety and crime prevention in our neighborhoods. Most residents of the area remember the leadership that Vic exerted in securing additional policemen assigned to the neighborhood precinct to more effectively serve the community.

Vic Tosi has always had a continuing involvement in community affairs. He has served as chairman of both the public safety and community liaison committees of community planning board No. 13, has been a member of the board of directors of the Bronx Council of the Arts, was the founder and chairman of the New York City Office of Neighborhood Government Advisory Board in his area, was a PTA president, and served as athletic director of one of his local schools.

His achievements in the community have brought Vic much well-deserved recognition. He has additionally received the New York City Certificate of Commendation, and the General Motors Gold Medal as the outstanding man in New York for community service.

Victor Tosi is indeed dedicated and a hard-working, community-minded citizen who deserves the appreciation of us all for his work.

DAY OF RECKONING

HON. GENE TAYLOR

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as you know, our Nation is, day by day, slipping increasingly further into the grips of inflation and, for the most part, we have no one else to blame but the U.S. Congress.

With each passing day Congress approves spending measures with no real thought to fiscal restraint and as a result we are busting the budget completely. There has been, however, one man in the House of Representatives who has been repeatedly warning each of us on the serious predicament in which we have now placed ourselves. The man, the Honorable H. R. GROSS, has been the constant watchdog of the Federal budget during his 26 years of service to the Nation, and now his constant warnings are coming into bleak reality.

As a freshman Member, I am gratified to have had the opportunity to serve under H. R. GROSS and to have had him as a friend and teacher. It is with this in mind that I wish to present an article written by Mr. Robert M. Bleiberg which appeared in the July 22, 1974, issue of Barron's. In this article Mr. Bleiberg points out Mr. GROSS' repeated attempts to bring the budget back into restraints and emphasizing that it is time the Members of Congress begin listening to his warnings. He further stresses that it is about time to take action and place the budget back into proper bounds. I feel this article warrants the careful consideration of the entire membership of Congress so, at this time, I wish to include it in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From Barron, July 22, 1974]

DAY OF RECKONING?—THERE'S NEVER BEEN A BETTER TIME TO CUT THE BUDGET

"Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
"*Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, Longworth House Office Bldg., Washington, D.C.*

"Dear Mr. Chairman:

As you are well aware, each passing day brings additional news of the tragic effects rampant inflation is having on our economy and our people. This inflation, of course, is fueled in large part by continued spending by the federal government.

"For a number of years I have introduced a bill, H.R. 144, which would require the federal government to live within its means, to limit its spending to its income and to make orderly and systematic payments to reduce the national debt.

"Passage of this legislation would be the first, essential step on the road back to fiscal stability for the United States, and I urge you most strongly to hold hearings on H.R. 144 at the earliest possible moment.

Sincerely,

H. R. GROSS."

Like television's Maytag repairman; Rep. H. R. Gross (R., Iowa) used to be the loneliest party in town. Since January 1959, when the 86th Congress convened, he has regularly dropped into the hopper H.R. 144 (twelve dozen, or 144, of anything is a gross), a Bill "to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war or grave national emergency, and to provide for systematic reduction of the public debt." At each session, the Bill was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, where it invariably died. Despite the eloquent plea to the Chairman (dated July 12, 1974, and cited above), H.R. 144 isn't about to become the law of the land; however, in his perennial quest for federal economy and good husbandry, Congressman Gross has finally evoked some response.

Last week GOP Senators Carl T. Curtis (Neb.), Clifford P. Hansen (Wyo.) and James A. McClure (Idaho) issued a call for "courageous and drastic action," including a 10% slash in legislators' salaries and a $10 billion cut in the federal budget. On the same day, the Honorable Wilbur D. Mills (D., Ark.), abruptly awakening to the "very serious inflationary crisis" for which he and his colleagues are partly to blame, sent a wire urging the White House to veto excessive expenditures, or, if necessary, to impound the proceeds. Last month both House and Senate, by overwhelming majorities (75–0 in the upper chamber), approved the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, whereby the lawmakers, for the first time in generations, hope to regain their long-lost power of the purse.

One can only say, high time. While the voters' attention has been focused on Watergate, and Congress on occasion has made abortive stabs at tax reform, the cost of government has been getting wildly out of hand. Under an allegedly Republican Administration, the U.S. in the past five fiscal years has gone from a $200 billion budget (on the socalled unified basis, which includes the operations of various trust funds) to the $304 billion which the White House last winter submitted for the current fiscal year. During this period, aggregate federal deficits have topped the $125 billion mark, while the public debt is approaching half a trillion dollars. Pending legislation, notably proposals for national health insurance and subsidized mass transit, would add many billions more to the spreading sea of red ink.

Yet by any yardstick, philosophical and

practical alike, the pendulum long since should have swung the other way. On the first count, while expenditures on welfare, for example, have increased geometrically, the number of the nation's poor has declined. Even as federal spending continues to rise by leaps and bounds, confidence in Washington's ability to solve problems "by throwing money at them"—and, not incidentally, in Congress itself—has sunk to perhaps its lowest ebb since the New Deal. As to principle, we are inclined to believe that even in the palmiest days, many if not most federal programs constitute an unnecessary and unwarranted burden on the nation's taxpayers. Today—when even the well-to-do find it harder and harder to make ends meet, and the average breadwinner, strive as he may, financially is falling further behind month by inflation-ravaged month—the swollen budget adds injury to insult. When everyone is feeling the pinch it's surely no time for government to wax expansive.

However, expand it has—and never more so under an Administration which ran on a platform pledged to reverse the trend. From $196.6 billion in the 12 months ended June 30, 1970, U.S. outlays have soared to the $304.4 billion originally sought for the current fiscal year. Including an estimated $18 billion for fiscal '75, now four weeks old, the accumulated deficit for the six fiscal years, measured by the impact on the public debt. will exceed $130 billion, roughly one quarter of the total put on the books since the founding of the Republic. From an annual rate of 7.3% in 1960–65, federal civilian outlays per capita in recent years have been rising at an annual rate of 15.2%. Moreover, spending has outpaced population and inflation alike; adjusted for both factors, the yearly advance has leaped from 4% to 9%.

Some increases are mind-boggling. To illustrate, the Food Stamp Act, which "aims at making more effective use of our abundance of food and at providing additional nutrition to those in need," began in 1965 with an appropriation of $34.3 million. Last fiscal year, such outlays ran to an estimated $2.5 billion, and this year to nearly $4 billion. In the past decade federal welfare spending as a whole has surged from under $24 billion, to an estimated $113 billion. Meanwhile, the number of needy has fallen sharply. According to the latest Annual Report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the number of poor Americans dropped from 39.5 million in 1959 to 24.5 million in 1972. And, of course, along with inflation, the U.S. has experienced a record-breaking surge in production and trade, during which unemployment has remained low and jobs perennially have gone begging.

Such lavish outpouring, it now seems clear, has done more harm than good. Two years ago the far-from-conservative Brookings Institution concluded that when it comes to solving social problems in poverty, health, education and the environment, "the history of the 'Sixties makes clear that current federal approaches are not effective." Everything that has happened since—the waste of millions of dollars on a useless "people mover," demolition of the world's largest public housing project, sale of hundreds of millions of subsidized bushels of wheat to the Soviet Union, unleashing of the worst domestic inflation in a century—only tends to reinforce the dim view.

Small wonder that the legislative branch of government, to judge by a widely quoted survey of public opinion, rates lower than the Executive with the voters. Or that some lawmakers belatedly are voicing alarm. In his telegram last week, Wilbur Mills urged the White House to demand that Congress cut $10 billion out of the $304 billion budget. If Congress refuses to cooperate, added the lawmaker, the President should impound that sum of money. "The people are beginning to panic," he went on. "We're in a very serious crisis." However, other solons—notably Senator Humphrey (D., Minn.) and Speaker of the House Carl Albert (D., Okla.)—are still doing business at the same old doctrinaire stand. Budget deficits and federal spending, said the former the other day, have little or nothing to do with inflation, which, in his opinion, is caused by "energy and commodity shortages, our changing international financial position, and the continued existence of monopoly and oligopoly power in our economy." Not to mention the economic illiterates who govern our destinies.

Wiser heads—especially if pointed the right way by an aroused electorate—may yet prevail. If so, at least a start may be made toward economy. In a study released today, the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, citing as a precedent the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, which effectively cut both budgeted expenditures and new obligational authority by $6–$10 billion, urges a re-run. For the longer haul, an analysis prepared for Treasury Secretary William Simon shows how Congress, given the will, can slash outlays by upwards of $25 billion. For years and years, Congress and its "fiscal constituencies" have sought to avoid the inevitable day of reckoning. They won't succeed forever.—ROBERT M. BLEIBERG.

NAVY RESCUES AMERICANS IN DANGER

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my pride and my gratitude to the men and women of the 6th Fleet who particicipated in the rescue and evacuation efforts during the recent fighting on Cyprus. I have the honor of representing the homeport of many of these brave sailors and marines.

I would also state, Mr. Speaker, that I was absolutely shocked to learn of the remarks of a Member of the other body who questioned the right of the President to send a limited number of American military personnel ashore to direct the evacuation effort. To connect these humanitarian efforts with the limitations on Presidential war powers is not only spurious, it is ludicrous. The lives of 500 American citizens cannot and must not be placed in jeopardy by such considerations.

The recent situation in Cyprus has again emphasized that necessity for having our military forces strategically deployed so that they may respond rapidly to emergencies. The swift and skillful actions of the U.S. 6th Fleet were instrumental in preventing possible loss of American life, as well as contributing to the stability of a volatile international situation.

Shortly after the American Ambassador requested evacuation of American civilians, Secretary of Defense Schlesinger directed a Navy task force to speed to the area.

On the afternoon of July 22, 1974, Marine helicopters from the U.S. 6th Fleet amphibious helicopter carrier U.S.S. *Inchon* began evacuating American citizens from the British Sovereign Base at Dhekelia in southern Cyprus.

Evacuees were flown to a five-ship U.S. Navy amphibious group composed of the U.S.S. *Inchon*; the assault ships U.S.S. *Coronado*, U.S.S. *Trenton*, U.S.S. *Spiegel Grove* and the amphibious tank-landing ship U.S.S. *Saginaw*.

By the end of the evacuation cycle, almost 500 American citizens and about 250 foreign nationals from 24 countries were embarked aboard these 6th Fleet ships.

Following initial evacuation at Dhekelia, the U.S.S. *Trenton*, along with ships and helicopters from the Royal Navy, British, proceeded on July 24 to Akrotiri Bay, Cyprus. There, some 200 persons were transported from the British ship H.M.S. *Hermes* to the U.S.S. *Trenton* in landing craft buffeted by rough seas and high winds.

Sailors and marines from 6th Fleet ships assisted the arriving evacuees, arranged sleeping accommodations in the ship's living spaces, and helped acclimate them to shipboard life during their overnight voyage to Beirut. Numerous first person accounts of the care and hospitality extended during the transits to Beirut have appeared in print.

During evacuation and transit to Lebanon, additional ships of the 6th Fleet stood by in international waters in the area, should the need for further evacuation have arisen.

Arriving in Beirut, *Coronado* and *Trenton* were met by diplomatic officials who processed the disembarked evacuees and arranged onward transportation. The American Ambassador in Beirut, G. McMurtrie Godley, sent the following message to Capt. E. N. Fenno, the commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Coronado*:

Hearty well-done to you and officers and men of *Coronado* for evacuation of civilians from Cyprus. Debarkation went off without a hitch, thanks to outstanding cooperation and first rate professional planning.

I think that all of my colleagues will join me in extending a "well done" to the officers and men of these ships and aircraft as well as the rest of the Defense Department. This kind of readiness and superb professional ability continues to be vital to U.S. interests when peace and humanity are threatened. We should not overlook the dedication of these servicemen nor become complacent about their availability.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, due to a longstanding engagement in the city of Muncie, Ind., in my congressional district, and to the unpredictably extensive debate on the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act, H.R. 11500, I was unavoidably absent Thursday, July 25, on rollcall vote 410, on final passage of H.R. 11500. Had I been present I would have voted "aye," as I did on a previous bill

to regulate strip mining which passed the House a year or two ago.

While this measure may not be the most desirable, and there was room for considerable improvement, as witnessed by the many amendments offered during the 5 days of debate on the measure—we all recognize the urgent need for reclaiming our mined lands, and, on balance, I hope and believe this legislation—as ultimately passed by the House—does represent a workable compromise between the economic and environmental interests, both of which are of very fundamental importance.

NETWORK BIAS

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Anthony Harrigan, executive vice president of the U.S. Industrial Council, recently wrote a very penetrating column entitled "Network Bias," which I believe hits the nail on the head. In it he points out that on any national network program that purports to broadly survey some subject, spokesmen from the liberal to left side of the philosophical spectrum are always included in abundant numbers while the conservative side of the issue is usually not represented or represented by one person as a "token" of fairness. This, in spite of the fact that more and more persons in the United States consider themselves to be conservatives, according to the polls. The article follows:

NETWORK BIAS

The role of the television networks as instruments of establishment liberalism continues to trouble many thoughtful Americans. The networks deny that their programs are slanted. But all their actions reveal that they are interested in presenting only one view—the liberal view—of American life.

A case in point is "The American Challenge," a weekend special on CBS Network earlier this summer. The program purported to offer listeners insight into where the country is going and what are our next frontiers. In an advertisement placed in newsmagazines, CBS said it was broadcasting 39 reports by an "impressive array of thinkers and doers."

It was an impressive array of liberal thinkers and doers. But where were the conservative thinkers and doers? Where was the balance in presentation that should have been offered by the network? The balance simply wasn't there. Only one well-known conservative thinker—William F. Buckley Jr.—was included in the list, as a form of liberal tokenism.

The listening audience heard about America's future from Profs. John Kenneth Galbraith and Paul Samuelson of Harvard, former Johnson administration staffers Richard Goodwin, George Reedy and Bill Moyers, former Sen. Eugene McCarthy, women's liberationist Gloria Steinem, former Socialist Party Chairman Michael Harrington, and a variety of liberal critics of American society, including Margaret Mead, Robert Hutchins, Barry Commoner, Nat Hentoff and Dwight Macdonald. If ever there was a one-sided forum, this was it.

These voices should be heard, but their critics also should be heard. It is inexcusable and intolerable that only the spokesman of liberal elitism should have a hearing on network programs.

Well, someone may say: who should have been on the program to give balance? It would have been the simplest matter for CBS to include a representative group of thinkers and doers who believe in our economic system and in the general structure and objectives of our society—for example, economists Milton Friedman and Henry Manne, essayist Russell Kirk, columnist Stanton Evans, national legislators such as Rep. Philip Crane and Sen. Jesse Helms, and such scholars and commentators as Thomas Molnar, George Roche, Stefan Possony, and R. Emmett Tyrrell Jr.

Why didn't CBS include conservatives of this caliber to balance the liberals and radicals? Why are conservatives systematically excluded from major media events? The answer is that the major media, such as CBS, are determined that the public not receive an in-depth, balanced understanding of national issues. Though fairness is supposed to be built into network programming, the fact is that fairness is almost wholly absent.

One wonders when a really large part of the public will realize that it is being spoon-fed liberal-left views and denied access to other significant views and vital facts. The networks, for example, have functioned as lobbyists for a single point of view—a single conception of America.

Given the fact that the air waves belong to the public, it is outrageous that the electronic media should be characterized by such sustained, systematic bias in the presentation of public issues. In allowing this condition to exist year after year, without making any attempt to require the networks to develop balance in news and commentary, the Federal Communications Commission is betraying its duty to the American people.

SYRIA'S OPPRESSED JEWS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the systematic persecution of the venerable Jewish community in Syria has been a matter of international concern for some years. The timeliness of the Jewish holy day of Tisha B'aV, this year marked on July 28, commemorating the destruction of both Temples in Jerusalem thousands of years ago, makes more poignant the tragic plight of Syrian Jewry.

Most recently, the outrages were highlighted by the barbaric rape and murder of four young Jewish women found near the Syrian-Lebanese border several months ago. As a result of an international call for action, the Syrian Government arrested four people described by Syrian Minister of Interior Ali Zaza as "assassins, robbers, and smugglers" who allegedly confessed to the crime under interrogation. It has been since learned that two of the accused murderers are prominent leaders of the decimated Syrian Jewish community, one of whom is even a brother-in-law of one of the murdered women.

In view of the past record of harassment and persecution of Syria's Jews, one does not find too surprising Syria's condemnation of two major figures of the Jewish community for Syria's own murder of Jewish women.

The secret trial of these two Syrian Jews is now in progress. Regardless of the trumped up charges which these two prominent Jews are accused of, it is the duty of free men to speak out against this outrage. The need to raise our voices against these acts is all the more poignant in the Tisha B'aV season which marks the destruction of ancient Jerusalem. I urge deep censure against these atrocities.

OUR VETERANS MUST BE PROTECTED

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, chaired by our distinguished colleague from Texas, held its first day of hearings on legislation in two areas that is of vital interest to our veterans. The first bill, H.R. 1753, would prevent the loss of veterans' benefits when social security benefits are increased. The second bill, H.R. 13977, would provide the veterans of World War I with a pension on the same basis as the veterans of the Spanish-American War.

As a cosponsor of both bills, I was pleased to submit to the subcommittee my statement of full support, and am inserting below my testimony:

STATEMENT OF THE HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee: I am pleased to have this opportunity to share with you my thoughts on the issue of non-service-connected pensions for our veterans.

I have co-sponsored H.R. 1753 which would protect our veterans from having their pensions reduced because of social security increases. As it happens, every time social security benefits are increased, hundreds of thousands of veterans stand to have their pensions reduced, or to even be dropped from the rolls. And every time this occurs, these veterans look to the Congress as their only source of relief. I realize, as we all do, that these pensions are not considered compensation for military service. Rather, they are an income supplement based on need, and every time a veteran exceeds the established income limitation of $2,600 for an individual, or $3,800 for a veteran with dependents or family, he stands to lose his VA pension.

Our veterans cannot view our action here in Congress as part of the grand (or not so great scheme) of things that we do; he only sees the laws giving with one hand and taking back with the other. And at a time when rampant inflation threatens even our working citizens with middle incomes, the effects on our elderly with fixed incomes can truly be tragic.

If our veterans living on a fixed, marginal income are to be able to meet their daily living expenses, they must receive the full value of all cost-of-living increases legislated by Congress.

You can be certain that these veterans never had a wavering thought about defending our country in times of war. They were ready to assist in any way, to give everything they had to preserve the freedom and democracy of America. Now when these same men need our assistance we cannot let them

down. We must preserve the dignity and security of our veterans by our prompt action on this legislation. The assurance of a more secure pension is a small price to pay for the loyalty and courage these men displayed when our nation called.

I would also like to reiterate my affirmative stand on H.R. 13977, legislation I cosponsored which would entitle World War I veterans and their widows to a pension on the same basis as veterans of the Spanish-American War. Spanish-American veterans received this reduction-free pension only twenty-two years after the end of *their* war. World War II, Korean and Vietnam veterans were entitled to GI bill benefits, training benefits, employment assistance, educational assistance, and home loans.

The Veterans Administration was not even in existence when our veterans came home from World War I, and we have never really made it up to them. Over 4.8 million men served in World War I, but only just over one million are alive today. These men know how tough life was for them. They had no veterans orgnization to help them again reenter the changed society. Many of them had to struggle all their lives to make up for the lost time, money and opportunities that they missed by serving their country. The Great Depression which followed a few years later made things all that much more difficult.

For many of them, life has never gotten any easier. Many of these veterans are living in dire poverty, I am sorry to say. We all know that our Veteran's pension program was devised to recognize our obligation to the war veteran population. I really think, given what these brave men missed, we owe them a reduction-free pension so they may live out their later days in a bit more financial comfort.

It is my sincere hope that we pass this legislation as soon as possible. These men need our assistance while they can still use it. It is the least we can do.

MIZELL POSITION ON IMPEACHMENT

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, today I have issued a statement of position in regard to the concluded impeachment proceedings of the Committee on Judiciary. I would like to insert my statement at this time in the RECORD:

STATEMENT

The recommendation by the Committee on the Judiciary did not come as unexpected. Another step in our constitutionally provided procedure of impeachment is now completed.

Until I reach a conclusion on the evidence of these recommendations, it is imprudent of me to address the question of impeaching the President. I am well aware of my serious responsibility in these proceedings, and I am attempting to study all that is relevant to the articles as reported by the committee.

At the appropriate time, I will be prepared to perform my constitutional duty and responsibility in the impeachment procedure.

When I make my decision, it will not be a political decision, it will not be a partisan decision, and it will not be a politically expedient decision. It will be based on the facts on hand at the time.

This is a grave and serious question that is now before the House of Representatives and the American people, and it is my hope that we work responsibly and expeditiously in order that the other serious questions that now face the American people shall not be neglected.

CAMPAIGN FINANCING REFORM

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the House Administration Committee yesterday reported a comprehensive campaign financing reform bill (H.R. 16090). It is essential that this measure be passed into law during this session of Congress.

H.R. 16090 provides for strict limits on private contributions, spending limits for candidates, total public financing of Presidential elections, a $100 limit on cash contributions, and a board of supervisory officers to oversee and administer the law. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this vital legislation when it comes to the floor of the House. I also urge support for amendments that will strengthen the oversight commission, and provide for public financing of congressional elections.

Iwould like to take this opportunity to commend the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin and the Philadelphia Inquirer for their frequent editorial calls for campaign financing reform. These two newspapers have been out front on the issue of election reform for many months.

The tireless efforts of the news media have uncovered many of the abuses of existing campaign financing laws that might otherwise never have come to light. The persistent efforts of the Inquirer, the Bulletin, and newspapers around the country on their editorial pages to encourage congressional action on campaign financing reform has helped considerably in bringing the issue to the floor of the House.

Following is a sample of some of the editorials that have appeared in the Bulletin and the Inquirer over the last year:

[From the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, Nov. 25, 1973]

NEW "FUEL" FOR CAMPAIGNS

Whether or not all the Watergate "bombshells" have exploded, there's no reason why Congress can't begin cleaning up some of the debris.

An excellent place to concentrate—but understandably, an unpopular one for many incumbent legislators—would be campaign financing practices. No doubt, legislators seeking reelection don't want to make that task any harder; however, since congressional elections are less than a year away, there's no better time for a serious reform effort to begin.

Funding abuses connected with the 1972 Presidential election have, naturally, attracted most of the headline space. The problem of unethical or illegal campaign contributions for favors sought or rendered, unfortunately, is far-reaching.

Last year's campaign records show, for instance, that an independent group called the Builders Action Committee contributed more than $16,000 to 40 congressional candidates, many of whom were members of Senate and House Committees involved with housing legislation. The directors of the builder group are members of the powerful National Association of Home Builders.

A former aide of Senate Watergate investigator Edward J. Gurney (R-Fla) has testified that ne collected for the senator a secret fund of some $300,000 from Florida builders who had contracts with the Federal Housing Administration.

A study of last year's congressional campaign funding, released earlier this year, found that incumbents attracted more campaign money than challengers, that the candidate who spent the most money usually won and that large contributions were vital to candidates' success.

It would seem that the need for a system—such as public funding of election campaigns—that would either eliminate or drastically reduce the necessity as well as the possibility of blatant influence seeking and peddling would, by now, have been firmly established.

The message appears to be getting across in the Senate, where nine senators, including Sens. Hugh Scott and Richard S. Schweiker of Pennsylvania, are pushing a compromise on public funding bills as an amendment to the almost certain-to-be passed debt ceiling bill. It would provide public funds for Senate and House general elections and for presidential primaries.

Delaware's freshman Democratic Senator Joseph Biden said the current system "rips off" politicians as well as the public. He offered the following description: "You know what you've got to do to raise money. And it's the most degrading damn thing in the world. . . We know we've got to go out with our hat in our hand. . . whether it be a labor union, or whether it be to big business interests."

Meanwhile, it seems that public financing and other reforms such as limits on campaign expenditures and contributions, which were approved by the Senate in July, face an uphill, perilous road in the House. There, Rep. Wayne Hays (D-Ohio), chairman of the House Administration Committee and also chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, has no desire to make the job of getting reelected any tougher.

The voter turnout in the last local elections indicates that public confidence in the political system has sunk to new lows. A thorough reform of the campaign financing system could do a lot to lessen the public's doubt about the system and to improve its showing in the polls.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 5, 1973]

CAMPAIGN SPENDING REFORM MUST MOVE FORWARD SWIFTLY

The attempt to make Presidential campaign financing a public matter was defeated Monday in the Senate. That defeat should surprise no one inured to the natural conservatism of elected officials concerning their own access to power.

Revolution is not to be undertaken casually. It cannot be disputed that the proposal to finance Presidential campaigning virtually entirely from tax funds is just that: a radical change in one of the most fundamental mechanisms of American politics.

But we believe it is a revolution long overdue. And we believe that the wisdom and necessity of the revolution is the most obvious and redundant lesson of the scandals that have been tearing at this nation's political heart for a year and more.

It was the need for money, in huge quantity, that corrupted the 1972 electoral process beyond the grimmest, most cynical limits of previous imagination.

Certainly, that dollar-lust derived from the appetite for power that motivates all political hopefuls, for better or worse. But it was the process of raising 60 million dollars for the re-election of Mr. Nixon that accounted for the most despicable crimes, and created the mood that led to other violations of both

law and common decency that have driven the Nixon Administration to its present sad and battered state.

Money flowed in to the Committee to Re-Elect the President from thousands of sources, much of it shoddily, much of it in outright defiance of the law. Many of the contributors, practical men in a tough world, rightly or not could not distinguish between contribution and bribe. As George Spater, board chairman of American Airlines, explained his own firm's illegal contributions, they were made "in fear of what could happen if (they) were not given."

Altogether, an estimated $500 million went into political campaigns in 1972. Raising and spending, and accounting for the contributions of, money in those proportions produces pressures on public servants that can only worsen unless the public-funding revolution is brought to pass.

In failing to cut off the filibuster Monday, the Congressional supporters of the first vital step in that revolution were thwarted, even though the practical possibility they were pressing for would have affected only Presidential campaigns, with Congressional campaign financing still to be dealt with.

There is considerable wisdom in exposing the Congressional campaign funding question to further examination—not because the principle is not sound, but because there are dangers of very substantial and unfair imbalances in any transitional approach. High among these is the enormous campaign-funding power of labor unions—which unlike corporations are now allowed to support candidates with little limitation.

That labor money is far too potent a force to be left unregulated and unlimited. The reform principle could greatly add to the power it represents, and thus to the influence of a small group of labor leaders with very specific political interests.

But that disbalance can be overcome, we are confident, with reasonable accommodation within the House and Senate.

Senate Minority Leader Hugh Scott deserves great credit in pressing for the unsuccessful reform despite heavy White House pressure. Working with Majority Leader Mike Mansfield he gained promise that a full campaign-spending reform bill will be reported out by the Rules Committee within 30 days of Congress's reconvening in January. That promise must be kept, and no time should be lost in fashioning it into law.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Aug. 1, 1973]

CAMPAIGN SPENDING REFORM MUST NOT BE DELAYED

The United States Senate has passed a campaign spending bill that goes far and commendably beyond all previous restrictions on the acquisition, use and accounting of money for political purposes. The House should move swiftly, more swiftly than its leaders indicate are present plans, to pass it and send it to President Nixon for signature.

The nation's attention is on the subject these days. For although money is not the only root of what John Mitchell calls the White House Horrors, it is a main stem. And loose, unenforced or unenforceable restraints were, it becomes increasingly clear daily, a major nourishment.

The Senate bill is complex and it is strong. It would, most importantly, establish a seven-member Federal Election Commission, with regulatory and prosecutive powers. That role has previously fallen to the U.S. Department of Justice, which, under the last three Presidents at least, has been the most political of all cabinet agencies. Justice Department zeal and detachment in the area has been minimal and suspect.

The bill, at the moment it was signed, would also establish, with stern criminal sanctions, limits on the amounts of money any single contributor could give any and all candidates, and upon the amount that could be spent by any candidate in pursuit of any Federal office.

More important than the limits, perhaps, would be the section of the bill that would make it a crime to give or receive a cash contribution of more than $50, and to fail to disclose all gifts of $100 or more by amount, name, address and occupation of the donor.

Sen. Howard H. Baker, vice chairman of the committee that is now laboring over the story of American campaign corruption and criminality in 1972, caused something of a stir on the Senate floor by declining to vote either for or against the new campaign spending bill. His point was that it probably does not go far enough, and that much is being learned, and more will be, in the course of the committee's work.

His points are valid. But his reservation of support for the bill was misplaced.

Far off as the 1974 elections may appear, candidates are raising campaign funds for them at this moment. And every day that passes without erecting, staffing and amply funding an independent campaign policing commission is a day that invites further finagling.

Those represent immediate and important needs, which should be satisfied with a minimum of delay—weeks, not months. The Senate Select Committee's report will not come before next February, and at the present rate of progress may be delayed long after that.

In the fullness of that time, even more significant reforms must be considered, including the attractive but radical proposal that campaign funds be taken out of the hands and influences of private donors altogether.

Meanwhile, the American political atmosphere needs quick cleansing, lest the present public dismay be turned to public cynicism.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Aug. 27, 1973]

ENDING ELECTION ABUSES

Both the value and the weaknesses of the 1971 Federal Election Campaign Act are dramatically revealed in the General Accounting Office's voluminous report on political contributions during 1972.

That GAO report, published last week, lists over 70,000 persons who gave or lent some $79.1 million to the presidential candidates after April 7, 1972 (when the 1971 law went into effect). The estimated total for the full year is about $100 million, of which about two-thirds went to President Nixon's campaign.

Knowing who gave how much, while enlightening, is obviously only part of the task of curbing U.S. campaign excesses.

And the problem now is setting a reasonable limit on spending, considering inflation, that won't play into the hands of incumbents; also to clamp down on individual contributions, some of which, as the GAO report reveals, have been astronomical.

Beyond all this is the problem of enforcement. While the GAO has done yeoman service in detailing all the whos and whats of 1972 giving, it is forced to rely on the Justice Department for prosecuting infractions of the law. And the Justice Department is, of course, always somewhat beholden to the incumbent administration.

With Watergate's abuses in mind, the Senate passed, on July 30, tighter campaign financing legislation. Now the questions are: Can it pass the House? Does it set the proper limits on spending and contributions?

There is no answering the first question until reformers try.

As for the limits—on spending, the maximum would be 25 cents per voting age constituent, or about $35 million each party could spend on a presidential race; on contributions, the most any person could give to any candidate would be $3,000 per election, and $25,000 to all candidates for all elections each year.

To eliminate abuses such as those alleged against the Committee to Reelect the President, every expenditure over $1,000 for President would have to be approved by the national committee of the candidate's party.

By far the most needed provision in the Senate bill is one to create a bipartisan and independent Federal Elections Commission with power to subpena, prosecute and fine violators. There should be no hesitancy in enacting this provision in time to be effective for next year's congressional races.

The proposed limits on spending and contributions are tied to the question as to whether there should be public (tax) funds made available to political campaigners.

Certainly, both spending and contributions have been getting out of hand. The GAO report shows the need for curbing campaign excesses, but unless the ceilings are realistic, they may do more harm than good.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Apr. 18, 1974]

FORCING CAMPAIGN REFORM

Although reform-minded members of the U.S. Senate managed to push through a wide-ranging campaign spending reform bill when the legislation appeared to be doomed, final enactment of true reform legislation this session is doubtful.

The bill, passed by the Senate, which applies to presidential and congressional elections, would limit contributions and expenditures, establish an election commission with prosecutory powers and provide for the use of public funds in both primary and general elections.

In spite of the clear need and increasing public demand for such reform, the issue has languished in the House. Representative Wayne Hays, chairman of the House Administration Committee, which has jurisdiction over campaign reform legislation, is also chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. A staunch opponent of public campaign financing, Mr. Hays has kept reform legislation bottled up in committee for nearly sixteen months.

While the Democratic congressional leadership has been quick to exploit Watergate to its fullest political advantage, it has been noticeably silent on the reform question. Cashing in on Watergate is understandable; not to do so would be unlikely. But, missing the point of Watergate and permitting the same abuses to flourish seems equally cynical and indefensible.

The Senate bill undoubtedly asks a lot in the way of reform. In the light of Watergate and related disclosures, however, arguments that it proposes too much change don't hold. Public demand for sweeping reform including some form of public financing is strong. The mandate cannot be ignored.

A number of lawmakers such as Mr. Hays, who wield considerable power and are comfortable with the present system, are obviously determined to have their way. That powerful minority should not be allowed to succeed merely because they are willing to take the political heat.

The House leadership should force the reform issue promptly and see to it that the legislation contains the basic provisions in the Senate bill. And House members should approve the measure by such a wide margin that President Nixon has no justification for vetoing it.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, July 8, 1974]

CAMPAIGN SPENDING REFORM MUST NOT DIE IN THE HOUSE

Congress now is returning from the Fourth of July recess, during which its members

have almost unanimously celebrated the joys and traditions of American democracy. Its members—or those in the House anyway—will almost immediately face a challenge which will draw the line between those whose conception of democracy is merely clambake oratory and those who want to make it work democratically.

The issue that will divide them is campaign funding reform.

Few things in the public process are simple, and the financing of politics, its evils and its strengths, is no exception. But it is hard to imagine that two years after the Watergate break-in there can be many right-minded people in the United States who are not appalled by what lay as its root cause: a political financing system that invites big-money perversion.

The Senate has responded well. On April 11 it passed a bill that offers immensely constructive therapy for those ills. It would, most importantly, establish an independent campaign spending enforcement agency and set up long-overdue public funding of election expenses, including matching grant arrangements for Congressional candidates. It would set ceilings on the size of individual contributions and over-all limits on spending by any candidate.

The House meanwhile has stood by its tradition on such reforms—one of delaying when possible and emasculating when delay fails. The House Administration Committee, under the chairmanship of Democratic Representative Wayne Hays of Ohio, has produced a bill which will go to the House floor this week. It makes mockery of the Senate's efforts and the national needs.

The Hays bill was analyzed by Common Cause, the public interest lobby that has been a pre-eminent campaign-reform force. Its conclusion:

"The House Committee's bill is a grossly inadequate response to the money-in-politics scandals that have been the underpinning of the Watergate story. The loophole-ridden proposal virtually ignores the growing public demand for true reform of American political campaign financing."

Those are strong terms. But they could be stronger, for if the committee's bill should be passed under the guise of a real reform, it could cripple the chances of any actual improvement.

An impressive number of Congressmen are as appalled by the Hays committee's bill as is Common Cause—and ourselves. A number of them have promised efforts to amend into the bill, on the House floor, the main principles and the teeth that the Senate wisely approved.

Those efforts deserve the support of everyone who shares with us the conclusion that American politics is being intolerably corrupted by legislation-through-contribution. Every member of the House this autumn faces re-election or retirement. How each Congressman stands on the campaign-reform issue could very well decide which it is to be for him.

STATEMENT OF LEN B. JORDAN

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, on July 15 the House Parks and Recreation Subcommittee took testimony on the future management of an important area of my State, Idaho's famed Hells Canyon. At that time, it was not possible that my distinguished friend and adviser, former U.S. Senator Len B. Jordan, be present to explain the concept he had proposed for Middle Snake management back in 1968.

Earlier this month, he submitted a written statement to Chairman TAYLOR which I believe demonstrates wisdom and responsibility in the management of our natural resources. I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF LEN B. JORDAN OF BOISE, IDAHO

I wish to be recorded as supporting Congressman Symms' bill for a four year moratorium on the construction of dams on the Middle Snake River.

To identify myself for the record, my name is Len B. Jordan. Except for time away in government service, I have spent my entire life in close proximity to the Middle Snake. I grew up at Enterprise, Oregon, attended public schools there, graduated from the University of Oregon in 1923, moved to Idaho in 1932. I spent 12 years on the Middle Snake—one year on the Lower Imnaha in Oregon and 11 years as owner of an Idaho ranch at the head of navigation on the Middle Snake below Hells Canyon. My knowledge of the area covers a period of more than 50 years.

Since disposing of our Middle Snake ranch in 1943, I have spent many years in public service: Idaho State Legislator, Governor of Idaho, 1951–55; Chairman, U. S. Section of International Joint Commission—1955–58. Working out details with Canada for the joint development of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power project and the Columbia Treaty.

I served in the U.S. Senate from August, 1962 to January 3, 1973 when I retired. During all of my Senate years I served on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I also served on the Committee on Finance and the Joint Economic Committee. I served also on the Public Land Law Review Commission.

My support for the Symms moratorium bill is consistent with my Senate record. Two similar bills, S. 940 in the 91st Session and S. 488 in the 92nd Session both passed the Senate but were not acted upon in the House of Representatives.

On February 1, 1971 I said on the floor of the Senate:

"Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I introduce today, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague, Senator Church of Idaho, a bill which will declare a moratorium on the granting of a Federal Power Commission license for any dam on the Middle Snake River, between the existing Hells Canyon Dam and the authorized Asotin Dam. The moratorium would extend to September 30, 1978, a date which marks the termination of an existing 10-year statutory moratorium on reconnaissance studies to augment the surface water supplies of the Colorado River Basin from outside that basin.

"This bill is an updated version of S. 940, also co-sponsored by the Idaho Senators, which was approved without opposition by the Senate last May 15. The Senate-approved bill was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where it remained without further action when the 91st Congress ended.

"Our colleague, Representative Orval Hansen of Idaho's Second Congressional District, is introducing a companion bill in the House.

"Mr. President, this bill is designed purely and simply to keep open the options for the development of Idaho's limited future water supplies in the Snake River, the State's major source of surface water.

"The time scope of this bill with the remainder of the 10-year moratorium on interbasin water diversion planning incorporated in the Colorado River Basin Act of 1968 is not a mere coincidence. The planning moratorium was inserted in the Colorado River bill at the insistence of the Members of Congress from the Pacific Northwest who had become concerned at talk of diverting the Columbia River or its Snake River tributary to the water-short Pacific Southwest.

"This diversion scare promoted needed interest on the part of my State in its future requirements for water and the means to protect the sources of this needed water. As a result, the State of Idaho established a water resources board and immediately embarked upon a series of studies which will result in formulation of our first State water plan. These multiple planning studies will not be completed until the mid-1970's—another reason for the 7-year moratorium time span.

"Mr. President, I shall conclude with the observations I made 2 years ago when I introduced the predecessor bill, S. 940:

" 'Idaho is now at a water supply crossroads. The stakes are high. Within 7 years we must decide which direction to take, whether it be toward achieving our high reclamation potential by full development of the Middle Snake or to maintain an open river. We do not have to make this decision now. Nor do we wish to be forced into a decision by others who are motivated by the single purpose, power. Bear in mind, there are many sources of power, including nuclear or fossil fuel generation, but the one essential element in making the desert bloom is water.

" 'In Idaho we have a double loyalty in our great love for our vast forests, mountain meadows, open ranges, lakes, and streams. We are determined to protect our great wildlife and recreation resources and we are equally determined to utilize the natural resources of these areas to help us grow and develop fully our industrial and agricultural potential. I believe that these objectives are not incompatible and I hope that Congress will help us reach these objectives by granting a moratorium against further development until our studies have been completed.' "

To those who are not familiar with the area, the name "Hells Canyon" is a vague but exciting place. Many people confuse the ranching area along the navigable portion of the Middle Snake as Hells Canyon. Having spent twelve years living in this area we speak with some degree of accuracy. In her book "Home Below Hell's Canyon" Grace Jordan took care to emphasize that the ranching area where we lived was many miles below the true Hell's Canyon, described as the deepest canyon in North America. That area lies roughly between the end of navigation upstream from Lewiston and the end of navigation downstream from Weiser. This distance of roughly twenty-five river miles is indeed spectacular. No trails, no habitation, walls rising abruptly from the river to the Seven Devils on the Idaho side to the Wallowa Mountains on the Oregon side. That is Hells Canyon, impenetrable except by downstream floating—remote, inaccessible. No matter how you label it the gorge of the Hells Canyon proper is destined to remain unchanged unless it becomes the backwater of a high dam downstream on the Middle Snake.

The ranching area where present interest is focused is not much different than any number of western ranch areas. It is very similar to the Riggins-Whitebird area of the Salmon River. It is accessible by roads, by power boats and by many trails. Moreover, it provides a continuing economic contribution to a region where most of the area is already publicly owned. I repeat the suggestion I mentioned earlier. Those who would change the regimen of a productive ranch country for all time should fortify their judgment by spending a day or two in the area at various seasons of the year. I offer my services as a tour guide for such a trip.

The first point I wish to emphasize is that more than any other tributary of the mighty Columbia river system the Snake is a working river. Its waters are the life blood of Southern and Eastern Idaho. The 3.5 million acres presently irrigated represent only about half of Idaho's irrigation potential. Back through the years leaders of both political parties have stood shoulder to shoulder to insure that this most precious water resource and the land of high potential for reclamation should never be alienated. So far this bipartisan effort has paid off, but we must be ever vigilant so that future generations will bless us for the prudence and foresight of our stewardship.

It is no coincidence that here in Idaho we speak proudly of the Treasure Valley and the Magic Valley. These valleys became treasures through the magic of applying life giving water to arid lands. To illustrate the importance of water to Idaho's economy I have frequently used this illustration. Suppose a major disaster such as a massive tornado or an earthquake reduced every home, every business building, every school, every hospital and church to a mass of rubble and ashes. As long as the Snake River continued to flow the towns and the cities would be rebuilt and revitalized. Like the Phoenix of ancient mythology new structures would rise from the ashes to house a new and thriving economy. But let some major disaster diminish or divert the flow of our Snake River and the towns and cities of the Snake River Valley would wither and die.

The earliest emigrants paid Idaho as little attention as possible. Billowing clouds of sage-scented dust marked the Oregon Trail as the covered wagons toiled slowly and laboriously across the rutted plains of the Snake River Valley on their way to the lush meadows and tree clad hills of the Williamette Valley.

My second point is the need for flood control in the Lewiston-Clarkston area. Most people do not realize that irrigation has flood control benefits too and they are substantial. This is how it comes about. The Snake River at Weiser contributes about 10% of the normal flow of the Columbia River at The Dalles but, due to the flood retarding effect of reclamation facilities upstream, at high flood stage the Snake at Weiser contributes only 5% to the flood flows. Reclamation has tamed the floods by stabilizing the flow of the river. On the other hand the Clearwater and the Salmon and the Imnaha and the Grand Ronde which join the Snake below Weiser contribute about 14% of the normal flow of the Columbia at The Dalles but their contribution increases to nearly 30% of the flood flows. These percentages are calculated prior to Libby and Canadian storage which will reduce flood flows at The Dalles to a tolerable level but will have no effect whatever on flood flows in the Lewiston-Clarkston area.

I would point out to those in that area who want all dams below and no dams above that they are courting disaster. The hydrologic potential for a major flood disaster is enhanced by present development of 8 dams downstream which retard the outflow. The value for power and navigation is unquestioned. In every study made by the Corps of Engineers and other Federal agencies these dams were intended to be operated with adequate upstream storage to retard the runoff for flood protection at the confluence of all these tributaries at Lewiston. When the Lower Granite dam is completed, downtown Lewiston will be protected by dikes.

The question is, will the dikes be adequate? I don't think they will. Modern technology enables us to calculate with great accuracy the amount of the runoff from any watershed. No one has yet devised a way to predict the vagaries of the weather which will determine when or how fast the runoff comes. From a flood control standpoint, the eight power and navigation dams are on the wrong end of the river system. When the floods do come and downtown Lewiston is under water, the origin of those flood flows will be the watersheds of the wild and the untamed rivers upstream rather than from the comparatively docile Snake.

It is unfortunate that flood control facilities cannot be operated from the vantage point that hindsight would provide. Instead, they must be operated on a forecast basis. Who among us has the wisdom of a Solomon to decree, in a time of energy crisis, that certain generators must be idled in order to accommodate flood flows which may not come at all this year as nature cooperates and provides another season of orderly runoff.

A third point is that, if given all the facts, I firmly believe that the majority of Idaho citizens are not ready to surrender control of Idaho's working river to federal authority. A short time ago I approved the action of Idaho's political leaders as they spoke with one voice to urge the Corps of Engineers to keep hands off the management of Lake Coeur d'Alene, a navigable body of water in North Idaho.

I would urge the same hands off policy with respect to the Middle Snake. It seems most inconsistent to me to oppose Federal control of a navigable lake and invite Federal control of a navigable river, especially when that river is the life blood of Idaho.

If we keep the fox away from our chicken coop on Lake Coeur d'Alene, why should we invite the same fox to guard our chickens on the Middle Snake?

Federal designation and control has an irrevocable finality. I cannot recall a single instance where any area or river once set aside and authorized as a National Park, National Wild or Scenic River or a National Recreation Area has ever been withdrawn from the national classification and returned to its prior status.

Claims by some proponents that such resources may be held on a tentative basis as in a soil bank have no historical precedent. Once committed to a national purpose, that commitment is permanent and irrevocable.

And finally I am apprehensive about the effectiveness of "protective language." Sponsors of Recreation Area legislation now being considered for the Middle Snake claim that language written into the bill guarantees rights for future upstream consumptive use when more new lands are reclaimed for irrigation. Before officials of Idaho and Oregon cooperate in moves to give the Middle Snake a federal label whether it be for a National River, a Wild or Scenic River, or even a National Recreation Area in the belief that protective language asserting the supremacy of State water law, I think they should consider what has happened to such protective language on other rivers in other Western states. I shall not give details here but the record is available for examination.

In short, the record shows that no protective language, however specific it may be, has ever survived the challenge in later years by those who sought to disregard it. That is why I have grave concern about the ultimate effectiveness of any attempt to incorporate protective language for future upstream consumptive use under state law in any proposal that bears a national label and/or is set aside for a designated national purpose.

A recent Potomac Associates book entitled "The Limits to Growth" provides some startling predictions on the limits of certain nonrenewable energy resources. They say:

1. Global natural gas reserves will be exhausted in 22 to 49 years.

2. Global reserves of petroleum will be exhausted in 20 to 50 years.

3. Global reserves of coal will be exhausted in 111 to 150 years.

Citizens of New Hampshire and Rhode Island have refused to allow installation of oil refineries within their borders. Delaware led the parade by not only refusing oil refineries but by also prohibiting oil tankers to discharge their cargo off Delaware's shore.

If the United States is to become self sufficient energywise, it will become necessary for each of the 50 states to make some trade offs to accommodate their energy needs. Are the states of Idaho, Oregon and Washington willing to lock up a great potential source of clean renewable energy and demand that other states or foreign nations bring their nonrenewable energy to us?

We speak hopefully of clean new sources, solar, geothermal, breeder reactors as if energy demand would remain constant for 25 or 30 years. Relief is not in sight for the immediate future.

Compared to energy from nonrenewable sources, clean hydro takes on new value and renewed respect. Hydro is solar energy provided by natural laws of the hydrologic cycle. Before we lock up our remaining hydro let's have another look.

For example, Idaho's contribution to the original National Wild and Scenic Rivers is 250 miles—44% of the total mileage. These include the Lochsa, the Selway, the Middle Fork of the Clearwater and the Middle Fork of the Salmon River. Collectively these rivers have a potential hydroelectric potential of 5 billion average annual kilowatt hours.

Presently under study for inclusion in the same system are Idaho rivers Moyie, Priest, St. Joe, all of the main stem of the Salmon River and the Bruneau—a total of 550 linear miles with a hydro potential of 11 billion average annual kilowatt hours.

Superimposed on all of these are proposals for a free flowing Middle Snake and tributaries with a hydro potential of an additional 9½ billion average annual kilowatt hours.

With less than 30% of Idaho's hydro potential presently developed, this state does not need 1000 miles of National Wild and/or Scenic rivers.

Idahoans must have more time to explore our options!

AN ALTERNATE PROPOSAL

This legislation is too important to be treated in haste. It involves the permanent lockup of power from a renewable source equivalent to 19,000,000 barrels of oil a year. It leaves the Lewiston-Clarkston area vulnerable to frequent and extensive flood damage. You will recall that the original Main Control Plan for the Columbia and its tributaries called for storage at Bruces Eddy (now Dworshak), Penny Cliffs and High Mt. Sheep (or Nez Perce). After the treaty with Canada was consummated, Canadian storage was substituted for Snake and Clearwater projects in the Main Control Plan. Thus the Portland-Vancouver area is protected but the Lewiston-Clarkston area is not.

Personally I do not favor the applicant's proposal that is now before the Federal Power Commission. The only justification for flooding true Hells Canyon would be to extend barge navigation to the Weiser-Ontario area, and that is technically possible but not economically feasible at this time. But it is possible to develop about 85% of the potential hydro, preserve the salmon runs on the Salmon and Imnaha and Grand Ronde Rivers, preserve the true Hells Canyon in a free flowing state—all in one coordinated plan, which would include Asotin, China Garden, and Appaloosa (backing the water up only to the head of navigation at the downstream entrance to Hells Canyon). Under this plan, diversion of Salmon River flood flows via tunnel to Appaloosa Reservoir is economically feasible without doing violence to the salmon resource. This would provide needed flood protection for the Lewiston-Clarkston area.

In the late 50's, I was on the IJC working out details of power development at Barnhardt Island on the St. Lawrence as a joint venture between U.S. and Canada. That same concept, now working so well between neighboring nations, surely could work between the three neighboring northwest states. It is worth exploring. I believe the northwest states should retain control of northwest water.

If the United States is to become self-sufficient energy-wise, it behooves each of the several states of the Union to re-examine its own potential energy resources before we levy demands on other states or turn to the volatile Middle East for oil.

A distinguished Supreme Court Justice has declared that a river is more than an amenity—it is a treasure. The Snake River is greater than the Colorado River. In multi-purpose potential it is unexcelled by any river in America. Some of its tributaries are already included in the National Wild Rivers System.

I wish to re-emphasize the fact that the Snake is a working river—one of the most heavily used rivers in the country. Idaho's major industries—agriculture and food processing—are directly dependent upon water from the Snake.

In spite of wishful thinking on the part of many of us, that Idaho should remain unchanged and unspoiled, our state is destined to increase in population. We had better prepare ourselves to manage the inevitable growth so as to retain the best of what we have and to accommodate growth and expansion of the right kind.

Along with our water resources planning we need a comprehensive statewide land use plan that is compatible with our long term objectives. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, land and water and life are interdependent.

The best way that we in Idaho can improve the quality of life is to dedicate ourselves to improving the quality of our stewardship over the land and the water resources which are our heritage. Some people equate non-use with conservation—or conversely, use with exploitation. Neither is true. Wise and responsible use is the essence of true conservation. By using these resources wisely and well, we not only improve the quality of our own lives but we may take pride in passing our heritage on to future generations as good or better than it came to us.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, may I extend an invitation to you and your committee to come to Idaho and talk with our people, inspect the Middle Snake as a committee project and hold public hearings in Idaho.

Idahoans should not have to journey to Washington, D.C. to defend our river.

THE INFORMATION EXPLOSION—A LOGISTICS PROBLEM

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc., in their April issue of Spectrum carried a thought-provoking statement of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE. Chairman TEAGUE joined several other Members of Congress in evaluating the significance of scientific and technical information to our national well-being. Because of the importance of these remarks, I am including them in the RECORD for the benefit of our colleagues and the general public:

THE INFORMATION EXPLOSION—A LOGISTICS PROBLEM

(By Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE)

It is pretty difficult to say anything on the subject of freedom of scientific and technological information except something nice. I do not intend that observation to be a facetious one. It is undeniably true that the strength, quality, and durability of our economy and, in fact, our country depend upon adequate scientific information and its judicious use.

I have said many times before, and I repeat now, my belief that the relative status of all nations within the global community will be throughout the foreseeable future in direct proportion to their effective handling of science and technology.

It is also axiomatic and, I take it, an article of faith that such information must be freely available, freely exchanged—for without such freedom, information is worth very little. Those who may seek to delay or tightly control it usually hurt only themselves and, in any event, their efforts at best can be only temporary. True scientific information, as we should have learned during the past three or four decades, cannot be monopolized and sooner or later will surface everywhere.

FREE EXCHANGES NOT ENOUGH

Having said this much, however, I nonetheless feel constrained to point out that it is by no means enough to say that we as a nation or a Government should have a policy of free exchange of scientific and technological information. Further, we must have active, dynamic policies and mechanisms which will guarantee that this information is appropriately used.

I am sure that none of the *Spectrum* readership needs to be told how complicated a problem this is. For example, there must be certain exceptions to the foregoing rule, such as those spelled out in the Freedom of Information Act, which protects information that has special significance for national security as well as information of a proprietary nature. The latter may be quite as important as the former since it impinges on our whole industrial system of trade secrets and patent laws. Certainly we need these as a spur to innovation. Yet anyone who has looked closely at our patent system in recent years also realizes that here is an area of technological information handling which needs a general overhaul.

Another problem lies in the fact that the various systems by which our technical information is stored, retrieved, and transmitted are often incompatible with each other—a fact that causes enormous confusion and can defeat the very purpose of scientific research and development.

Still another problem lies simply with the surfeit of information, which from time to time inundates those who would like to use it. For example, I recently noted a directory of Information Analysis Centers supported by the Federal government, and found that there were 119 of these scattered about the country. This, of course, is quite aside from the various information banks and storage systems maintained by private sources.

Moreover, we have a number of Federal entities such as the Committee on Scientific and Technical Information within the Executive Office, the Science Information Exchange of the Smithsonian Institution, the Office of Science Information Service of the National Science Foundation, the National Technical Information Service of the Department of Commerce, and others—all of whom are spending a lot of time and effort on promulgating up-to-date scientific information in the hope of assuring its utility.

As any of these organizations will tell you, the task is an extremely complex and difficult one. I sometimes get the impression that scientific information experts are almost afraid to push their own computer buttons for fear of being drowned in floods of data, abstracts, bibliographies, charts, blueprints, and what have you—with maybe two thirds of it either incompatible with or irrelevant to what is being sought.

THERE'S STILL HOPE

I have not intended simply to paint a gloomy picture or to question the value of our national R&D effort. I do not intend to suggest that we have gone so far down the road of accumulating scientific and technological information in an inept fashion that it no longer is possible to manage. I am sure that it *is* manageable. But I also have the strong impression—given the explosion of current technological information—that we need a lot more research, and soon, to learn *how* to manage it. Otherwise that nice sounding phrase "freedom of information" is likely to go down in the books as a pious platitude generated by a civilization that couldn't keep from stumbling over its own technological feet.

REPRESENTATIVE KEMP INTRODUCES THE RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY FIRE PREVENTION ACT

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, I had the pleasure of meeting with the legislative seminar of the Erie County Volunteer Firemen's Association.

In our discussion of measures to prevent and control fire, it was brought to my attention that a significant fire hazard exists along railroad rights-of-way, where sparks given off from the exhaust stacks of locomotives threaten adjoining residential, commercial, and industrial property. The high incidence of fires along railroad rights-of-way places a considerable burden upon our communities in terms of the high cost of fire equipment and manpower to control and extinguish these fires.

The Firemen's Association of New York State, and the Erie County Volunteer Firemen's Association under the outstanding leadership of President William Ziegelhofer, and their able legislative chairman, Leon Jacobs, have been tremendously active in seeking a solution to this problem. For several years in a row, they have supported legislation in the New York State Assembly designed to curtail and eliminate fires caused by sparks from locomotive smokestacks. This past year, legislation to require spark arresting devices on certain locomotives passed both houses of the New York State Assembly. It was not, however, signed into law, because the Governor felt this problem was more properly the province of Federal legislators.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to establish fire safety requirements for locomotives. Entitled the Railroad Right-of-Way Fire Preventive Act, my bill directs the Secretary of Transportation to establish standards of fire safety for locomotives that will greatly

reduce the likelihood of sparks falling from smokestacks and igniting property adjacent to railroad rights-of-way. The technology exists for controlling sparks. So-called spark arresters have been proven effective. It is, therefore, essential that their use be required on those locomotives which present a constant threat of fire.

This body has actively committed itself to the control and prevention of fire. In April we passed the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974—comprehensive legislation designed to give our Nation's firefighters the credit, recognition, and Federal assistance they need to tackle the monumental task of reducing fires. At that time, it was widely recognized that many specifics remained to be done in our overall efforts to combat fire. At that time, it was widely recognized that we must continue to be responsive to the expressed needs and concerns of those closest to fire prevention—our firefighters.

Mr. Speaker, the firefighters of western New York have worked hard to focus attention upon the threat of fire produced by the smokestacks of certain locomotives. My bill would end this threat by requiring that technology we already possess—spark arresters—be required on locomotives. I hope that my colleagues will join me in support of this bill, the text of which follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish fire-safety requirements for locomotives in order to minimize the danger of fires along railroad rights-of-way

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Railroad Right-of-way Fire Prevention Act".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) there is a continuing problem with fires along railroad rights-of-way;

(2) such fires often cause serious damage to residential, commercial, and industrial property located adjacent to such right-of-ways,

(3) such fires impose a considerable burden upon local communities and upon State and Federal agencies which must furnish the firefighting equipment and manpower necessary to control and extinguish such fires;

(4) most such fires are caused by sparks emitted from the exhaust stacks of locomotives;

(5) the technology exists for controlling such emissions and thereby greatly reducing the likelihood of such fires; and

(6) requirements that such technology be utilized by railroads should be nationally uniform to the extent practicable.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to amend the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish railroad safety requirements for controlling spark emissions from locomotives in order that the danger of fires along railroad rights-of-way be significantly reduced.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FIRE SAFETY REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 3. The Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 431–441) is amended—

(1) by adding immediately after the first sentence in section 202(a) the following new sentence: "For the purpose of minimizing the danger of fire along railroad right-of-ways, the Secretary shall prescribe rules, regulations, orders, and standards establishing requirements for controlling spark emissions from locomotives, including, to the extent he deems necessary, requirements that spark arresters, or other devices, of such type or meeting such standards as he may prescribe, be used."; and

(2) in subsection (b) of section 209 by—

(A) inserting immediately after "under this title" the following: ", other than a rule, regulation, order, or standard issued pursuant to the second sentence of section 202(a),"; and

(B) by adding at the end of such subsection the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall include in, or make applicable to, any rule, regulation, order, or standard issued pursuant to the second sentence of section 202(a) a civil penalty for violation thereof in such amount, not less than $100 nor more than $250, as he deems reasonable.".

INITIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF FIRE SAFETY REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Transportation shall initially prescribe rules, regulations, orders, and standards pursuant to the second sentence of section 202(a) of the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970, as added by paragraph (1) of section 3 of this Act, not later than ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act.

RHODESIAN CHROME

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the debate surrounding the reimposition of the ban on imports of Rhodesian chromium, as embodied in S. 1868, is beginning to escalate as action on this issue becomes imminent. Among the oft heard arguments against reimposition of this ban are the following:

First. There is no substitute for chromium.

Second. The U.S.S.R. is not a reliable source of mineral supplies.

Third. There are no other major sources of chromium except for Rhodesia and the U.S.S.R.

Fourth. If a ban were reinstituted, the price of chromium from the U.S.S.R. would skyrocket, having great economic impact on the United States.

However, none of these allegations will withstand close scrutiny, for they are based on half-truths at best. I would like to direct some responses toward these fears.

THE QUESTION OF SUBSTITUTES

The Commodity Data Summaries, 1974, appendix I to the Third Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior Under the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970 states that:

Nickel, zinc, cobalt, molybdenum, vanadium and titanium are competitive alternative materials for chromium in varibus end use applications.

This lengthy list of metals demonstrates that there are indeed a number of substitutes for chrome. Moreover, a considerable portion of the chromium used in the United States today is primarily of decorative value. It would therefore seem entirely possible to achieve the replacement of chromium by other metals without any significant loss in economic terms. The primary requirement would appear to be a modification of consumer demand for certain types of commodities.

Further in this regard, Dr. Franklin P. Huddle of the Science Policy Research Division of the Library of Congress has advised me that:

It is possible that an alloy containing various amounts of aluminum (ranging from 10 to 16 percent) and molybdenum (3 to 4 percent) the balance being iron, could be developed as a replacement for some uses of stainless steel alloys. Studies sponsored by the Office of Saline Water have shown that the corrosive resistance of some of the aluminum iron alloys approximates that of corrosion-resistant stainless steel in salt spray. Earlier studies of the alloy system at the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oaks, Maryland, showed that it had excellent oxidation resistance up to 2,000 degrees F., which suggests the possibility of some high temperature applications (such as jet engine parts, steam turbine superheaters, furnace boiler tubes, etc.).

Amplifying his statement, Dr. Huddle asserts that:

There are admittedly technological problems to be overcome in the use of aluminum irons as an alternative material for stainless steels. However, the most difficult obstacle is the inertial resistance to the new metallurgical concept for the express purpose of replacing a well-established and commercially important product. The vulnerability of U.S. industry to curtailment of chromium imports would need to be recognized by industry as a serious threat before the aluminum irons would be regarded as a useful system . . .

In light of the total lack of industry interest in this promising alternative to the use of chromium, we can only conclude that there is no real concern as to the supposed vulnerability to curtailment of imports.

THE QUESTION OF SOVIET UNION RELIABILITY

This brings us to the second objection often raised against a reimposition of the chromium ban, that is the reliability of supplies of chromium or chromite ore from U.S.S.R. It is significant that the United States imported 32 percent of its platinum groups metals from the U.S.S.R. during the period 1969–72. That our dependence on Soviet supplies is increasing is demonstrated by the fact that we imported nearly twice as much platinum-group metals from the U.S.S.R. in 1972 as in 1971. Evidently our platinum industry is not particularly fearful that supplies from the U.S.S.R. will be cut off. Recent agreements on the part of the U.S. natural gas industry to develop Russian resources indicate that this segment of industry is also not overly concerned with the reliability of Soviet supplies. Why should chromium be any different?

THE QUESTION OF ALTERNATIVE SOURCES OF CHROMIUM

Contrary to the popular misconception, Rhodesia and the U.S.S.R. are not the only world sources of chromium. The Republic of South Africa possesses almost two-thirds of total known world reserves. Reserves in other areas of the

world—including, among others, the Republic of the Philippines and Turkey—constitute twice the known reserves in the U.S.S.R.

The United States itself possesses domestic reserves of chromium. They are found in the Stillwater region of Montana. The U.S. Geological Survey has recently concluded a study of the potential for development of the minerals located in this region—USGS Circular 684. The total reserves of chromite are estimated to be 7.9 million short tons.

THE QUESTION OF ECONOMIC IMPACT

It is obviously impossible to predict what would happen to the price of chromite shipped from the U.S.S.R. if a ban on importation of Rhodesian chrome were to be reinstituted. However, 1972 price figures—as supplied to me by the Congressional Research Service—indicate that Soviet chromite, while higher in grade than that from other sources, was actually priced considerably lower. The figures, on a per content ton basis were: U.S.S.R., $58; South Africa, $42; Rhodesia, $80; and Turkey, $81. These figures indicate that there could be a major rise in the price of chromite from the U.S.S.R. before it would equal the price now being paid for Rhodesian chromite. Moreover, the current atmosphere of détente with the U.S.S.R. together with the considerable broadening of economic ties with this Nation indicates that an unreasonable rise in the price of chrome would be unlikely.

FURTHER ARGUMENTS

RECYCLING

During recent oversight hearings held by the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining on the subject on mineral scarcity, representatives of the specialty steel industry stated that they are allowing themselves to be outbid by foreign purchasers of stainless steel scrap. These representatives could give no valid reason for this situation except for the now-defunct price control effects. If the price of chromium were to rise significantly, in response to the reimposition of the Rhodesian ban, the specialty steel producers might then see the economic advantage of purchasing domestically available stainless steel scrap, thus conserving this valuable resource and reducing our overall dependence on foreign supplies.

IMPORTS OF IMPORTANT METALS FROM OTHER AFRICAN NATIONS

One important political implication associated with the current U.S. policy toward Rhodesian chrome is the effect which it has upon emergent black African nations. Although these nations have made no threats regarding the imposition of a ban on the export of minerals to the United States as a result of our policy toward Rhodesia, the potential is there. The recently held Sixth Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly on the problem of raw materials and development—April 9 to May 2, 1974—clearly indicates a growing awareness on the part of these and other mineral exporting nations of the economic power available through manipulation of mineral resources. Among the important minerals which we now import from black African nations are:

Cobalt: Zaire, 45% of U.S. imports.
Columbium: Nigeria, 14% of U.S. imports.
Manganese:
(a) Gabon, 35% of U.S. imports.
(b) Zaire, 7% of U.S. imports.
Tantalum: Zaire, 14% of U.S. imports.

In the long run, do we want to run the risk of triggering a cutoff of these important mineral resources?

Mr. Speaker, all of the above arguments in favor of the Rhodesian ban are directed at assessing the impact of this ban on the domestic economy of the United States. To me, the economic evidence is overwhelming. However, the ethical argument in support of this ban is even of greater importance. The United States is the only U.N. member to officially disavow the U.N. resolution. As leaders of world opinion, we must take action to censure the illegal and racist government of Rhodesia. I believe America will not in any way jeopardize her economic well-being as far as chromium supplies are concerned if we move to support world leadership by reimposing the Rhodesian ban.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAXES AND IMPEACHMENT

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the decision of the House Judiciary Committee in rejecting the proposed article of impeachment relative to the fraud involved in President Nixon's income tax returns. By their vote, 26 members of the committee have asserted that this matter should not be left to the consideration and collective judgment of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives and, potentially, the 100 Members of the Senate.

Most of the Judiciary Committee members from President Nixon's own party, in the course of debate, conceded the handling of the President's tax returns was "shabby." I agree, but these defenders of the President contented themselves with rendering their personal moral judgments on the President, and then voted to deny the full House of Representatives the opportunity to render its constitutional judgment through the medium of the impeachment process.

It seems clear, from the preponderance of the evidence, that a tax fraud was committed. Even the President's defenders agree that Mr. Nixon signed and filed a grossly incorrect tax return. The President may want to argue that this was an honest mistake, or an error, as his defenders argued in the Judiciary Committee. But it is wrong for some members of the committee simply to assert such a defense and then dismiss the matter out of hand. The defense of honest mistake or error can properly be asserted only by the person who signed and filed the tax return—Mr. Nixon. Such a defense can best be raised in the impeachment proceedings in the House and any trial in the Senate growing out of the House proceedings. A similar defense could be offered by Mr. Nixon in the courts, although such a prospect seems unlikely at present since the question has been raised as to the validity of taking criminal action against a sitting President, and since there is, therefore, some reluctance on the part of the Special Prosecutor to move against Mr. Nixon on the tax fraud question at this time.

The President's defenders on the committee argued for months that only issues of criminality should properly be considered in impeachment proceedings—yet, on the tax fraud issue, which clearly involves criminality, these same members reversed their stand and claimed that, while this might be a matter for the courts, it was not a proper matter for the Congress to consider. Beyond that, in a regrettable departure from fair play, the President's defenders gratuitously brought in the names of former Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY and the late President Lyndon Johnson, asserting that they, too, made gifts of official papers for which they claimed tax deductions. But the President's apologists know that there never has been an assertion against either Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. Johnson, or any other Government official, that tax deductions were claimed on papers donated after the tax laws had been changed to prevent such gifts.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that every piece of objective evidence shows that the President's gift of papers to the National Archives occurred after, not before, the deadline established in the bill, which Mr. Nixon, himself, signed into law—signed into law, that is, only after the President, through White House staff assistants, had lobbied long and unsuccessfully to delay congressional action on the bill and to change its effective date.

It is spurious to argue, as the Nixon loyalists do, that the gift was effectively made merely because the papers were in the possession of the National Archives prior to the deadline. It has long been the custom of Presidents to send papers to the Archives for safe keeping and storage. It is a custodial relationship, a courtesy extended to Presidents, nothing more. In any event, the claim that the papers constituted a gift at the time they were sent to the Archives is effectively destroyed by the President's later actions—because 17 boxes containing the most valuable of the Nixon correspondence with national and world leaders were retained as the President's personal property and were not made subject to the deed of gift.

Beyond that, the facts are that the appraiser was not chosen to evaluate the papers until 4 months after the deadline for making such gifts; that the appraiser did not even begin the selecting-out process until nearly 5 months after the deadline; that the appraiser did not complete this selection process until the following taxable year; and that the deed

of gift, about which there is clear evidence of back-dating, was defective because it gave Mr. Nixon continuing title and authority over the papers during his lifetime—a fact which, all by itself, rendered the gift not a proper subject for a tax shelter, even if the deadline had properly been met.

It is not just the impropriety of the "gift" of Presidential papers that is involved, Mr. Speaker, for there is a whole litany of tax abuses—the failure to report capital gains on the sale of property in New York, California, and Florida; the failure to report, as income, the taxpayers' dollars that were spent to enhance the value of Mr. Nixon's private vaction resorts at San Clemente and Key Biscayne; and the failure to report, as income, other emoluments received from the Government, in excess of those provided by statute. In sum, the President's tax returns grossly understated his income, and grossly overstated his deductions. No other taxpayer could have hoped to avoid prosecution for such gross and callous disregard of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. Nixon's defenders put the responsibility for all of these irregularities on the shoulders of members of the White House staff, the President's tax consultant, and the President's tax lawyer. But it was Mr. Nixon, himself, who signed the fraudulent tax return, and it is Mr. Nixon, himself, who should be held accountable under the law. Every lawyer on the Judiciary Committee knows this—and so should Mr. Nixon, whose legal specialty happened to have been tax law.

The President's handling of his tax returns, which could have resulted in the defrauding of the U.S. Treasury of more than $400,000 in taxes had the irregularities not been brought to light, warrants consideration by the full House as an impeachable offense. It is one more piece of evidence of this President's utter disdain for the laws which govern other citizens; it demonstrates his total insensitivity to the nature of our income tax laws which rely so heavily on the integrity of the individual taxpayer; it is, in my opinion, a crime against the State and an affront to the law-abiding, taxpaying American people. If any action of a President cries out for the impeachment remedy, this one does.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the full House of Representatives will have an opportunity to consider, and pass judgment, on the evidence in this case—either as a separate article of impeachment, or as an addition to one of the other articles which are to be transmitted to the House. Beyond that, at such time as the Special Prosecutor deems it proper to take criminal action, it is my hope that this matter will be brought to the attention of the appropriate grand jury. I believe, that both in the Congress and in the courts, the issue of President Nixon's tax returns must be resolved—and resolved in such a way that the American people can have the assurance that the laws of our land are being faithfully executed.

DR. RAYMOND L. BISPLINGHOFF LEAVES THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, which has oversight responsibilities for the National Science Foundation, has recently received word that Dr. Raymond L. Bisplinghoff, NSF's Deputy Director since 1970, has submitted his letter of resignation to the President, effective September 30, 1974. Dr. Bisplinghoff will become chancellor of the University of Missouri at Rolla beginning October 1. Once known as the Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy, Rolla is the university member of the University of Missouri that is principally oriented toward science and technology.

Ray Bisplinghoff was appointed NSF Deputy Director in October 1970, following an outstanding earlier career in aeronautical engineering and administration at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and in Government service with NASA. He is a member of both the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering; a fellow of the American Astronautical Society; a fellow of the Royal Aeronautical Society; and a member of the International Astronautical Federation—to name only a few of a long list of distinguished honors and affiliations.

He has helped Dr. H. Guyford Stever, NSF's Director and the President's Science Adviser, administer the National Science Foundation during a period of significant growth in its responsibilities, and has played a key role in guiding the Foundation into new areas and expanding its contribution in traditional ones. Coming to NSF soon after extension of the Foundation's authority to support applied research, Dr. Bisplinghoff made important contributions to the establishment of the program of Research Applied to National Needs—RANN. Following this, he supervised the formation of four additional units—the Programs of National R. & D. Assessment and Experimental R. & D. Incentives, and the Offices of Energy R. & D. Policy and Science and Technology Policy.

A native of Ohio, Ray Bisplinghoff attended the University of Cincinnati, where he received the degrees of A.E.—aeronautical engineer—in 1940 and M.S. in physics in 1942. His work toward the Ph. D. in physics was interrupted by the war. He received the Sc. D. degree from the Eidgenossische Technische Hochschule, Zurich, Switzerland, in 1957.

At the time of his appointment as Deputy Director of the National Science Foundation in the fall of 1970, Dr. Bisplinghoff was dean of the school of engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His career at MIT has spanned more than two decades, commencing in 1946 with an assistant professorship in the department of aeronautics and astronautics, moving on eventually to department chairman in 1966, and then to the dean of the engineering school in 1968. The years at MIT were interrupted while he served as Director of NASA's Office of Advanced Research and Technology, Associate Administrator of NASA for Advanced Research and Technology, and special assistant to the NASA Administrator, during the period 1962–66. Upon his return to MIT in 1966, he continued to serve as consultant to the NASA Administrator.

Dr. Bisplinghoff is the author of three scientific books. He has served as a member of many important committees and governmental boards, scientific societies, and industry groups, both here and abroad, and in numerous consultant roles. In 1967 he received NASA's Distinguished Service Medal and in 1973 the Distinguished Service Award from the National Science Foundation. He is also the recipient of the Distinguished Alumnus Award, University of Cincinnati, 1969; NASA Apollo Achievement Award, 1969; Carl F. Kayan Medalist, Columbia University, 1961; and the Godfrey L. Cabot Award, 1972.

On behalf of the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development I express our very deep appreciation to Ray Bisplinghoff for his extremely valuable contributions to the advancement of science and science administration, both in university and Government circles. We are sorry he is leaving the Washington scene, but we congratulate the University of Missouri at Rolla upon its wise selection of a new chancellor.

WAR AND IMPEACHMENT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House Judiciary Committee considered, and rejected, an article of impeachment that accused President Richard M. Nixon of violating the Constitution in the pursuit of an illegal war. There were other aspects to this proposed article, but the purpose of it was to clearly establish that the power to make war is one reserved to the Congress, and the actions of President Nixon exceeded his power under the U.S. Constitution, and he is therefore impeachable.

The debate on this article opened up the ugly wounds that the undeclared military actions of the United States in Indochina created. I believe that the debate on this article was a healthy ventilation of this issue, and the country was served well by the Representatives who pressed for this article. This was not a partisan effort, as the accusations against President Johnson clearly showed. Nevertheless, President Nixon carried his authority beyond that of President Johnson, and he deliberately

concealed his illegal acts. Most of us who opposed the war would like to see a true amnesty result from that war. This article was an attempt, not to relieve the war, but to define, for the future, the limits of Presidential power to make war.

One of the main arguments used against this article was that the Congress shared in the responsibilities for the war. On the contrary, adoption of the article on illegal warmaking would guarantee that future wars would truly be the responsibility of the Congress, as demanded by the Constitution. If we are to go to war, to kill in the name of the United States of America, then the Congress should be willing to accept its constitutional responsibility and knowledgably vote for or against that course of action.

Mr. Speaker, the American Report published an article on July 22 that predicted yesterday's vote in the House Judiciary Committee. This news article describes very aptly the seriousness of the now-rejected article of impeachment on illegal warmaking. I commend it to my colleagues:

[From the American Report, July 22, 1974]

IMPEACHMENT AND THE WAR: WHY NIXON WILL GET AWAY WITH MURDER

"I impeach Warren Hastings of high crimes and misdemeanours. I impeach him in the name of the Commons' House of Parliament, whose trust he has betrayed. I impeach him in the name of the English nation, whose ancient honour he has sullied. I impeach him in the name of the people of India, whose rights he has trodden under foot, and whose country he has turned into a desert."

That quotation, taken from a speech delivered by Edmund Burke in the High Court of Parliament in February, 1788, appears on this page of *American Report* for the second time. On the first occasion, in our issue of Feb. 4, 1974, it was printed in 30-point type (three times the size of this) and accompanied by illustrations which suggested that what Burke said in 1788 about Warren Hastings (a former Governor General of colonial India) needed to be said this year about Richard Nixon.

It wasn't a gimmick. The passage from the Burke speech was a key element in an article ("Is There an Edmund Burke in the House?") by attorney Peter Weiss which we regarded as one of the most significant the paper has ever published. Weiss demonstrated: 1) that the House of Commons impeached Warren Hastings in 1787 for acts against the people of India which were identical in nature with actions in Indochina ordered or sanctioned by Richard Nixon; and 2) that the framers of the Constitution added the phrase "high crimes and misdemeanors" to the impeachment clause precisely so that the House of Representatives could bring a President to account for crimes like those of Hastings.

Last February, that kind of argument was highly relevant to the shaping of the Judiciary Committee's inquiry into impeachment. We therefore promoted the article heavily, sending copies of the issue to scores of non-subscribers: Members of Congress, lawyers, professors of law and political science, columnists and editorial writers. This effort failed. Neither our regular readers nor our one-time guests responded in anything like the volume we expected.

In light of what has happened since February, this sequence seems to us to deserve reflection now. True, Nixon's conduct of the Viet Nam war has never been wholly ruled out of consideration by the Judiciary Committee, but in every listing of possible articles if impeachment it appears only briefly, always last on the list—included, it seems, only out of grudging deference to the handful of Committee members (Drinan, Waldie, Holtzman, Mezvinsky) who think it matters. It will be surprising indeed if any war crimes count survives the final winnowing process in the committee. Even Nixon's long-sustained, savage bombing of neutral Laos and Cambodia—wholly unauthorized by Congress, wholly unknown to the American people—will rank, it seems, with the purchase of earrings for Pat out of campaign funds.

How can this be so? Members of the Committee surely understand that they are not only making history but also creating law, since the precedents they are setting will inevitably serve as guidelines to future Presidents, courts and Congresses. It will be a bitter irony if the process launched to curb the arrogance of the Presidency ends by assuring its unrestricted power in military affairs and foreign policy: freedom to make and threaten war at will.

Surely the Committee knows also, as Peter Weiss suggested that for millions of Americans the excesses and illegalities of the Viet Nam war, the brutalities committed in their name, were for many years the central issues around which their political and moral consciousness evolved. They were not, of course, a majority, but they were not a scattered few, and for them My Lai and its cover-up were infinitely more seriously than the antics of Gordon Liddy and Howard Hunt. If their deep grievance and their doubt about America were to be healed, they needed a hearing. Why aren't they getting it? By now, every decision of every player in the cast relating to Watergate and its cover-up has been rehearsed and re-rehearsed dozens if not scores of times; we have still to witness any close examination of the decisions that wiped out hundreds of villages, devastated thousands of acres, killed peasants by the tens of thousands. Again why?

The answers, we suggest, are not difficult to perceive; for many of us in the peace movement, they are difficult to face.

The most obvious reason why the majority of the Judiciary Committee, the House and the Senate, wish to keep the war out of the impeachment process is that they themselves and a majority of their constitutents share responsibility for Viet Nam. If the House were to impeach Nixon for war crimes, it would impeach itself—and simultaneously accuse the voters who elected them. There is an exception, the secret bombings; obviously Congress and the people could not be held responsible for actions of which they had no knowledge. But no debate linking those bombings with impeachment could insulate the issue; and Congress knows a can of worms without opening it.

On a more technical plane, any effort to impeach a sitting President for exceeding his authority in connection with the making of war, or for sanctioning methods of warfare contrary to international law, would instantly encounter a legal-historical tangle. Many Presidents have made war without asking the approval of Congress; none has been impeached for doing so. As for barbarity, not even the Christmas bombing of Hanoi rivaled in ferocity the dropping of the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima, and no one credibly urged the impeachment of Harry Truman for that act, perhaps the cruelest in the history of war.

The ultimate, unhappy truth of the matter is that the American people, like most other peoples in this and other eras, do not greatly care what their leaders do to other nations in war, and will not closely study why they do it. In contemporary America it is not possible, as it was in Burke's day, to indict a general or a governor or a President for acts of tyranny against distant, dusky foreigners. Yet, a minority will protest such acts; and no, their protest will not change the course of policy. In Viet Nam, it was not political revisionism or moral revulsion that brought about withdrawal. It was, rather, our costly, bloody failure; and the "enemy's" consent to let us call retreat success.

In a sense, this reading of the Judiciary Committee's attitude toward war crimes is a playback. It is probable that at least three-quarters of the readers of *American Report* agree that Richard Nixon was indeed guilty of high crimes and misdemeanors for his conduct of the war in Indochina. The reason the Weiss article nevertheless drew so little response; it seems likely, is that readers instinctively knew this scenario would not play in Peoria. Anyone who has been watching American politics or taking part in the 60's and 70's should understand now the problem American poses for the world. After the Bay of Pigs, the invasion of the Dominician Republic, Tonkin Gulf, the reaction to My Lai, the Democratic convention of 1968; the endless revelations of duplicity, corruption, ruthlessness in Saigon, the Christmas bombing—after a decade and a half of education, we should know that the American people can tolerate intolerable things. Such a truth is ugly and unwelcome, but hiding from it isn't healthy.

A U.S. PORTFOLIO IN THE U.S.S.R.?

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Zbigniew Brzezinski, on leave from Columbia University, is director of the Trilateral Commission, a private American-European-Japanese organization concerned about world problems. At Columbia, Brzezinski is Herbert H. Lehman Professor of Government and Director of the Research Institute on Communist Affairs.

One of our most prolific writers on the Soviet system, Brzezinski has contributed a thoughtful article to the August 5, 1974 issue of the New Leader, "The Economics of Détente; A U.S. Portfolio in the U.S.S.R.?"

Professor Brzezinski—he also has served in a policymaking position in the State Department—concludes his essay with the thought that only a comprehensive understanding with the Soviets—a political, strategic and social understanding—will provide a solid base for enduring agreement. Mr. Speaker, I share these sentiments. Until we achieve this broad agreement we must proceed with détente, but we must proceed cautiously.

THE ECONOMICS OF DÉTENTE—A U.S. PORTFOLIO IN THE U.S.S.R?

By Zbigniew Brzezinski

It is rightly said that there is no alternative to détente. I can assert this in good faith, for as far back as 1960 I was directly involved in developing the idea of peaceful engagement with the Communists as the only acceptable means of ending the Cold War. Subsequently, I promoted this concept while serving in the State Department, often over strong internal opposition. During the 1968 Presidential campaign, I suggested to the Democratic contender, Vice President Hubert

H. Humphrey, that he publicly propose annual summit meetings between U.S. and Soviet leaders—a proposal he did make, and one that President Nixon later implemented. Finally, on leaving government service in 1968 I published a comprehensive plan for East-West negotiations designed to establish a framework for eventual reconciliation.

I emphasize these points not out of vanity (though I do take pride in them) but because I believe firmly that a protracted and unchecked Cold War entails risks no sane statesman can afford to underestimate, and is prohibitively costly as well. President Nixon and Party Chairman Leonid I. Brezhnev therefore deserve credit for resuming the efforts of Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson and of First Secretary Nikita Khrushchev—initiatives that were interrupted by the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1968—to counterbalance the competitive aspects of our relations with cooperative arrangements.

Still, if there is no alternative to détente, it is also true that the word can mean different things to different people. The Soviets have made it quite plain that they have a very clear concept of the kind of détente they desire and—by and large—they have so far succeeded in shaping U.S.-Soviet relations according to it.

Moscow openly views détente as a limited and expedient policy, in no way aimed at terminating the tensions of the Cold War. Indeed, the Soviet rulers have emphasized over and over again that, far from abating, ideological conflict is to intensify during times of "peaceful coexistence." But this, they feel, should not interfere with economic cooperation. As Professor Marshall Shulman of Columbia University ably stated in his testimony before the Senate Banking Committee last April 25: "Rather than face the politically painful choice of instituting fundamental economic reforms, the Soviet leadership has opted for a massive effort to overcome its shortcomings by increasing the flow of trade, advanced technology, capital, and management experience from abroad."

From the American perspective, to be sure, a circumscribed détente is better than nothing, and can be regarded as a necessary way station on the road to a fuller accord. Yet we must recognize that the present arrangement is potentially quite unstable. Ideological hostility, artificially kept alive by impediments to wider contacts, could become a source of renewed strain. And given its limited scope, the Nixon-Brezhnev understanding could easily be reversed should individuals ever come to power, either in the U.S. or the Soviet Union, who were unsympathetic to the present accommodation.

Most significantly, were the existing détente to break down after a period of sustained U.S. investment in the Soviet economy, accompanied by heavy Soviet indebtedness, an undesirable state of affairs could develop. Economists must judge whether large-scale trade would in time leave the United States more dependent on Soviet raw materials than the USSR would be on American markets. *But one can certainly conceive of a Soviet leadership being tempted to use its indebtedness to the United States and American dependence on Soviet raw materials for political purposes. Paradoxically, the very size of the Soviet debts would give the Kremlin additional leverage.* (I might add that the availability of American credits to the Soviets would enhance their ability to make similar commercial deals and obtain the same sort of leverage with Western Europe and Japan.)

Clearly, it is in our national interest, and that of peace in general, to seek a more inclusive, more enduring détente, one that is not restricted to economics nor offset by officially sustained enmity. A comprehensive agreement should encompass broad cultural and political accommodation; the shaping of closer social ties; the expansion of global collaboration to cope with the many new international problems; the adoption, both in principle and in practice, of true reciprocity in our relations; and the rejection of the harmful and antiquated notion that ideological and class struggle are properly part of détente. Unfortunately, in at least five areas the Soviets' current behavior is not consistent with progress toward these goals:

IDEOLOGICAL HOSTILITY

As noted, Moscow's intensification of Cold War animosities not only contradicts the spirit of détente, but poses a potential threat to it.

STRATEGIC SECRECY

Surreptitious military planning, development and deployment by the Kremlin stimulate legitimate anxiety in Washington about the extent and depth of its commitment to peace. Consequently, our policymakers are obliged to consider whether détente is not seen by at least some Soviet leaders merely as a breathing spell, designed to lull the U.S. into a false sense of security while the USSR attempts to move from strategic parity to a position that could be exploited politically. For this reason, an equitable SALT II agreement is a major litmus test of Moscow's intentions.

For this reason, too, current U.S. research and development aid—and I use the word "aid" advisedly—seems to me difficult to justify. I am thinking particularly of the American-Soviet space venture, which has become a vehicle for the one-sided transfer from the U.S. to the USSR of a technology that has obvious military applications. I am also troubled by the Department of Commerce's efforts to modernize the Soviet Air Control System—something that will significantly strengthen Moscow's airlift capability, especially against the Chinese. Nor can I square our concern for human rights with our apparent willingness to sell the Soviets lie detectors and voice-print detection equipment—fortunately blocked because of Congressional outrage.

INDIFFERENCE TO GLOBAL PROBLEMS

The USSR appears remarkably insensitive to matters that cry out for greater cooperation among the advanced nations. Though one of the key beneficiaries of increased commodity prices throughout the world, it remains largely unresponsive to the needs of less developed countries now burdened with huge food and energy costs. In addition, the Soviet rulers have shown a tactically cynical nonchalance to the threat of nuclear proliferation triggered by India's atomic explosion.

HUMAN RIGHTS

The Communist record here leaves much to be desired. While President Nixon and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger are correct in saying we cannot insist other governments alter their systems to please us, to assert that proposition is to skirt the real issue. It is a political fact that many Americans are deeply concerned about those Soviet citizens wishing to leave the Soviet Union, and in that sense the question is not only a domestic one; it affects adversely and directly Soviet-American relations much in the same manner that any U.S. limitations on the right of Americans wishing to leave for the Soviet Union—were such limitation to exist—would affect American-Soviet relations. (I should note as well that the spurious argument of domestic nonintervention did not prevent—justly—the Soviet leaders from condemning anti-Semitic practices in Nazi Germany, nor, more recently, from changing their stand on Chile in the wake of Salvador Allende's overthrow.) Moreover, in the light of this country's traditions, adopting a posture of amorality means sacrificing something very precious, something that should not be sacrificed lightly.

RECIPROCITY OF TREATMENT

U.S. diplomats, businessmen and tourists are subjected to incomparably greater restraints in the USSR than are their counterparts in the United States. American newsmen and scholars have been harassed and excluded from the Soviet Union—in marked contrast to the welcome extended here to Soviet specialists. Whereas Soviet citizens are free to lobby and to promote joint U.S.-USSR lobbies in this country, American access, even to the Soviet elite, is severely restricted. Almost every day some new example of this asymmetrical treatment emerges, such as Moscow police physically barring people from entering the American embassy. Actions of this kind are a basic violation of the concept of détente.

(The above list, I might point out, does not include any reference to divergent U.S. and Soviet positions on important regional disputes, as in Europe or the Middle East. It is only natural that the two major powers, in different geopolitical situations, would have diverse and occasionally conflicting estimates of their vital interests.)

These five areas should be borne in mind when formulating U.S. policy on business investment in the USSR and U.S. credits for Soviet economic development. Although it may be argued that some commitments should be made to encourage accommodation, in my opinion the current level of U.S. concessionary credits is sufficient under the present circumstances. Future progress on the broader issues would of course justify more extensive American commitments.

With regard to the debate over granting the USSR most-favored-nation status (MFN), Congress might consider the following compromise solution since it is in the U.S. interest that a Soviet-American trade bill be passed: The Soviet Union could initially be given MFN for a two-year trial period. The grant would automatically terminate at the end of that time and its renewal would require affirmative Legislative action. This would permit Congress to make a fresh determination based on observation of Soviet behavior during the interim.

In reaching a decision on any of these matters, however, we should remember that U.S.-USSR trade arrangements are politically weighted on the Soviet side because its economy is controlled by the state. America's relatively free market system makes it difficult to infuse a sense of national purpose into business transactions, yet unless we attempt to do so, the USSR will derive important political advantages from its economic relations with us. Thus Congress should explore the idea of creating a formal instrument, perhaps a joint Executive-Legislative coordinating organ, to monitor this crucial area and insure that American interests are not slighted. It simply does not follow that what is good for U.S. business is automatically good for the United States.

In the broadest terms, the U.S. has three options in its economic relations with the USSR: (1) To restrict trade and investment by political means; (2) not to restrict them; or (3) to actively promote them by political means. Unquestionably, détente has advanced sufficiently to warrant the discontinuation of the first course, and this has already been done for the most part. But I cannot help wondering if we have come far enough yet to justify exercising the third option, which would mean providing Moscow with credits at concessionary rates and making a determined effort to encourage massive U.S. investment in the USSR. In my view, Washington's approach ought to be closely calibrated with accommodation on the larger political-strategic issues, and should not outrun it.

Here I can only endorse Henry Kissinger's statement of October 8, 1973, while deploring the White House's failure fully to apply it: "This Administration has never had any

illusions about the Soviet system. We have always insisted that progress in technical fields, such as trade, had to follow—and not reflect—progress toward more stable international relations. We have maintained a strong military balance and a flexible defense posture as a buttress to stability. We have insisted that disarmament had to be mutual. We have judged movement in our relations with the Soviet Union, not by atmospherics, but by how well concrete problems are resolved and by whether there is responsible international conduct."

Unless we apply the Secretary of State's injunction very precisely and most deliberately, we run the risk of perpetuating the USSR's existing system and ideological attitudes. That is, we would reduce internal pressures for economic modernization and political decentralization and political decentralization without really altering the external American-Soviet relationship. The central point to remember is that a comprehensive undertaking—political, strategic and social—is the only solid base for an enduring agreement and until we obtain it, we would be wise to proceed cautiously, not allowing the economic association to become détente's primary blossom. In brief, the time is not yet ripe for a high-risk U.S. portfolio in the Soviet Union.

STATEMENT OF RABBI BARUCH KORFF

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the purpose of calling to the attention of all Members of this House a full page advertisement that appeared in last Thursday's edition of the Birmingham News. The advertisement, and I assume it was an advertisement even though it was not labeled as such, contained a statement by Rabbi Baruch Korff, president of the National Citizens Committee for Fairness to the Presidency. The statement by Rabbi Korff, according to the advertisement, was delivered at the second session of the Citizens Congress, Sunday, July 21, 1974, at the Shoreham Americana Hotel here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I urge each Member of the House to read this article if for no other reason than to see the words of a demagog. This Rabbi Korff, who apparently holds himself out to be a man of the cloth takes the liberty of comparing himself to Tom Paine, one of the architects of the Revolution in 1776. Rabbi Korff calls the impeachment proceedings "a showdown between our traditional form of government and leftist-radical mobbery."

At the time this statement was apparently made, the Committee on the Judiciary had not voted on any article of impeachment, and the votes of several Members obviously were undecided. Listen to these words:

Chairman Rodino has for weeks been ruthlessly forcing the Democratic members of the Judiciary Committee into line.

The rabbi continues:

Frankly, we don't yet know whether he has been able to dominate Walter Flowers of Alabama, James Mann of South Carolina, and Ray Thornton of Arkansas. Time will tell whether their loyalty is to their constituents or to their party chieftains.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that every American citizen has a right to his opinion, and a right to express it, but this vicious assertion goes far beyond decency. For Rabbi Korff's information, I know these men, and I know the agony they have undergone in attempting to decide how to cast their votes, and I know them well enough to know that party affiliation had nothing to do with their decision. The votes cast by WALTER FLOWERS, JIM MANN, and RAY THORNTON were cast because they were in fact, in the highest tradition of public service, representing their constituents, and doing so in the manner they deemed best.

Rabbi Korff goes on to viciously attack those Republicans who he feels might vote for impeachment and alleges they have been somehow rewarded by the news media for their position. And, he attacks other members of the committee, many of whom I do not agree with politically or philosophically, for their stand on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen many distorted articles and heard many distorted statements in my lifetime, but I have never seen anything more vicious than this. Rabbi Korff closes his article with a quote from Tom Paine;

Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is tyranny to malign decent men, it is tyranny to call for laws to be broken, it is tyranny to demagogue. And, it is shameful and deceitful for a man who says he is for fairness to resort to such unfair and unreasonable tactics.

I regret that many Americans who are honest, decent citizens, and genuinely concerned have apparently been misled by this type of individual.

The article follows:

STATEMENT BY RABBI BARUCH KORFF

Over the past year, you have read our messages. We have requested FAIRNESS for the Presidency and have condemned the vicious impeachment campaign of this country's entrenched radical elite.

Now the final crisis is at hand.

We are approaching a Constitutional *Armageddon,* a showdown between our traditional form of government and leftist-radical mobbery.

Do you dislike those words? Do you consider us extremists for saying them? Would you rather we offered you pretty phrases and reassured you that the partisan lynching in Washington was really a political tea party? Not a chance! Like Tom Paine in 1776, *we can no longer equivocate about tyranny.* Like him, we appeal to the common sense of mankind and tell you plainly: *if you value our system of government, you had better act now to defend it or you won't have it long.*

If you have been shocked by our previous revelations about the impeachment lobby—how they have had free access to the tax-supported office facilities of leftist congressmen, how they have been financed by the forced contributions of millions of patriotic union members, how they have secretly determined to nullify the voters' decision of 1972—then this latest expose will horrify you even more. You already know that Chairman Rodino has for weeks been ruthlessly forcing the Democratic members of the Judiciary Committee into line. Frankly, we don't yet know whether he has been able to dominate Walter Flowers of Alabama, James Mann of South Carolina, and Ray Thornton of Arkansas. Time will tell whether their loyalty is to their constituents or to their party chieftains.

But did you know that 4 or 5 Republican congressmen on the Committee are also the subject of a heinous—and very skillful—campaign to secure their votes against the President? Here's the story you won't hear from Cronkite or Chancellor.

The impeachment gang needs some Republicans to create an illusion of bipartisanship. They are desperate to win over a few members of the President's own party, who have disagreed with him over various policy issues, so they can convince the nation that impeachment is not partisan. To that purpose, they have lavished media attention upon a few congressmen—like freshmen William Cohen of Maine—flattering them with laudatory newspaper editorials and, as long as they spoke against the President, rewarding them with prime-time television exposure so valuable in this election year. Haven't you noticed how it is always the same members of the Judiciary Committee who appear on the evening news and the talk shows? Legally, this is not bribery, but it is nonetheless shameful.

And now the pressure is being increased. The radicals don't dare ask the full House of Representatives to vote impeachment along party lines. They already know that dozens of old-line Democrats, patriots in the tradition of Sam Rayburn and John McCormack, will refuse them. They must have some Republican votes as window-dressing. So reporters besiege Republican committee members in the corridors of the Capitol. They press them for commitments against the President. They urge them to make sensational statements against him. They ask defamatory questions, they invite predictions of impeachment, and tailor their conclusions to fit their witch hunt. Thus the media lobby for impeachment.

As the showdown approaches, this is what we face. Bumbling Peter Rodino has become a willing tool of his supposed employee, John Doar. Before being hired by Rodino, he ran an anti-poverty outfit in New York which was the largest single community development grantee in the whole sordid history of the Office of Economic Opportunity? It is no coincidence that, only a year ago, when President Nixon called O.E.O. a travesty against the poor and appointed Howie Phillips to end it, Doar's welfare empire, subsidized by your taxes, fell apart. Doar hates the President for this as much as he lusts after the federal money that is now denied him. This is the rogue who has drawn up articles of impeachment even before the Committee members have seen the evidence. Columnist Joseph Kraft, no friend to the President, happily admitted in the Washington Post on July 21 that, obeying Rodino, Doar purposely created a bland, odorless image of himself and his work. "The aim was to baffle administration charges of partisan bias. Mr. Doar did the job so well that most of the committee were stupefied—even anesthetized." What treachery!

For whom does Doar really work? For the seven members of the Judiciary Committee who had demanded the President's impeachment even before Watergate? For Drinan, Holtzman, and Seiberling, who still weep for the Viet Cong victory of which the President has cheated them? For Edwards, Kastenmeier and Mezvinsky, who are trying desperately through impeachment to divert the voters' attention away from issues of forced busing, abortion, and the subversion of American values? For Waldie, Rangel, and

Conyers, men of no repute and even less regard?

And what will you do about it? Write Doar a letter? Forget it! One does not reason with lynch mobs. But you have a congressman, and he has an office in your district. Collect some friends together and go there. Present your demands in writing for fairness to the President. Don't be stalled. Don't be jived. Don't take "no" for an answer. Your congressman and his staff are paid by your taxes, so make them listen to you. If they walk away, follow them. If they hang up the phone, call again. If they lock their doors, get their home address and meet them there. If they treat you with disdain or condescension, tell them what you think of them! And don't delete your expletives!

For too long we have allowed Congress to listen to an elite—privileged, snobbish, contemptuous of our values and traditions. We have been too quiet, too polite, too respectful. Now, we have learned their ways, we know their tactics. We can scream, too. We can fill offices with angry citizens and chase congressional cowards down the halls of the Capitol. We can interrupt their speeches with the truth. We can boycott their media allies. And with our votes this November we can whip out of the Congress the rascals who have so disgraced that body.

So watch what happens this week. How many Democrats on the Judiciary Committee will recognize John Doar as the paid assassin he is? Will any Republican on the committee sell our birthright of Constitutional liberty for a mess of media pottage? And will you put up with it? Be guided by Tom Paine's advice: "Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph."

ALCOHOLISM: A GROWING HEALTH PROBLEM

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, on July 10 I had the privilege of addressing the first meeting of the new and largely expanded Labor-Management Committee of the National Council on Alcoholism. The co-chairmen of the NCA Labor-Management Committee are Mr. George Meany, President of the AFL–CIO, and Mr. James M. Roche, chairman of the Board, General Motors Corp. The expanded committee comprises some of the top labor union and corporate presidents in the United States.

The National Council on Alcoholism was founded in 1944 and during the 1950's and 1960's made the fight against alcoholism in industry one of its top priorities. However, in those days the stigma of alcoholism still prevailed, and while there were limited successes in some industries, there had to be a major attitudinal change on the part of the American public before real progress could be made.

At the luncheon both Mr. Meany and Mr. Roche pledged their full cooperation to developing in the voluntary sector a massive program to detect and treat alcoholism in industry. We in the Federal Government must do our share, because the rising consumption of alcohol is reaching epidemic proportions in the United States. We passed the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act in 1970 and renewed it again in 1974. But passing the law is one thing—getting it implemented is another. That is why I was so delighted that these leaders from both labor and industry have joined hands on their own initiative to see that alcoholism treatment and prevention programs eventually reach into every assembly line and into every corporate executive suite.

The very same day this luncheon was held Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sent to Congress the second special report on developments since the first report was released in February of 1972. The 219-page report was prepared by a 38-member task force of distinguished alcoholism authorities from all over the country.

Interestingly enough, the massive report singled out alcoholism programs in business and industry as one of the most effective segments of the work of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and stated that such programs report the highest rates of recovery. However, the report in its entirety makes for some unhappy reading. In its first report to the Congress in 1972, HEW estimated the cost to the country from alcoholism at $15 billion. At the press conference on July 10, 1974, Secretary Weinberger, referring to alcohol misuse and alcoholism as "an epidemic health and social problem," announced that the report of the 38 experts made a conservative estimate of the cost of alcoholism of $25 billion annually to our country.

The largest single area of cost—amounting to $9.35 billion—was the lost production of the goods and services which could be attributed to the reduced production of alcohol-troubled male workers. The cost of the lost production of women and of alcoholic persons who are institutionalized or living on skid row is not included in the $9.35 billion estimate. Other highlights of the HEW report to the Congress can only be briefly summarized:

First. A Gallup poll of June 9, 1974 reported that the proportion of adults who drink is at the highest point recorded in 35 years of regular Gallup poll audits of America's drinking habits. It reported that 18 percent of those 18 years and older—some 25 million Americans—sometimes drink to excess and more than they think they should.

Second. Excessive use of alcohol, as reported in studies from all parts of the world, is related to certain cancers, particularly those of the mouth, pharynx, larynx, esophagus, and primary cancer of the liver. A heavy drinker who does not smoke has approximately the same increased risk of developing cancer of the mouth and throat as a heavy smoker who does not drink. When heavy drinking and heavy smoking are combined, the risk jumps enormously—to 15 times greater than among people who neither drink nor smoke.

Third. The increase in junvenile drinkers is staggering. The study reports that one out of every seven high school seniors admitted to getting drunk at least once a week. At the present conference Dr. Morris Chafetz, Director of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, said the increase in heavy teenage drinking "just blows my mind. It worries me greatly."

Fourth. Dr. Charles C. Edwards, the Assistant Secretary for Health, emphasizing the report's conclusions that alcoholism is an illness that can engender other serious diseases, said, "the time has come to bring the treatment of alcoholism into the mainstream of our Nation's health crew systems."

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

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

There are indeed many misconceptions today about the effects of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment. As one who worked actively for the passage of this amendment in the Congress I am most concerned about this. The following article excerpted from the March issue of Ms. magazine I think clears up some of these misconceptions and I would like to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time for the benefit of my colleagues:

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

(By Lisa Cronin Wohl)

Phyllis Schlafly was in her glory. There she was on William Buckley's talk show, "Firing Line," waging holy war against the Equal Rights Amendment—and doing just fine.

"The proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment have given up claiming that ERA can do anything for women in the field of employment," she asserted, gracefully balancing the stack of "evidence" she held on her lap. "Even when Dr. Emerson came to testify at the Missouri hearing, he conceded that ERA will do nothing for women in the field of employment which is not already done by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972."

ERA won't bring equal pay, she implies—a telling point. Score one for Schlafly, right?

Wrong. "Dr. Emerson," who is an attorney, a Yale Law School professor, and calls himself *Mr.* Emerson, conceded nothing of the kind.

"No, I didn't say that at all," he told me. "That's absolutely incorrect. Obviously ERA would do a great deal to improve opportunities for women workers."

But the television audience didn't have a chance to hear Thomas I. Emerson's correction. Schlafly emerged unscathed, still smiling and one step ahead of the facts.

Carefully choreographed performances like this have lifted Schlafly to her current eminence as a leader in the fight to prevent ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. A veteran of right-wing causes, she is the author of *A Choice Not an Echo*, a tract boosting the 1964 Presidential campaign of Barry Goldwater. And in 1960 she was termed a "very loyal member of the John Birch Society" by its director Robert Welch—a claim she says she denied at the time.

Now she has surfaced as chairman (yes, chair*man*) of STOP ERA, a national organization opposing the Amendment. As such, she has addressed state legislatures across the country, appeared on national and local television programs, and given countless radio and newspaper interviews.

In her wake, she has apparently left thousands of frightened women who fear ERA will destroy the American family, legalize rape, send mothers into combat, require unisex bathrooms, and force contented housewives into jobs they don't want. One apparent victim of acute Schlafly-shock even thundered that, after ERA, women and men could be "squatting over open latrines"—as if ERA were a chemical that would corrode modern American plumbing.

None of the above is true. Nevertheless, partly as a result of such scare tactics, the ratification of ERA, which had seemed a sure thing in 1972, slowed down in 1973. A total of 38 states must ratify ERA before it becomes the 27th Amendment to the Constitution. Last year four states ratified, bringing the total to 30; 13 failed to ratify (two of them by only a one-vote margin), and one state, Nebraska, attempted to rescind ratification, a maneuver of dubious legal effectiveness.

"Not too bad a track record for an amature," Schlafly says as she smiles sweetly to reporters.

More about that "amateur" standing later. First, let's note that Schlafly can't take all the credit. Some state legislators are adamantly opposed to anything that smacks of women's rights. They would vote against ERA with or without Schlafly.

More ominously, the Equal Rights Amendment has become a rallying point for right-wing extremist organizations around the country. The John Birch Society, the Ku Klux Klan, the National States Rights Party, and other radical right groups have sent their members—some organizationally identified and some not—into the fray. They tend to mirror Schlafly's views, tactics, and arguments; and ultraconservative backing has been a factor in creating her reputation for superhuman effectiveness.

"The claim that American women are downtrodden and unfairly treated is the fraud of the century," she avers. "The truth is that American women have never had it so good. Why should we lower ourselves to 'equal rights' when we already have the status of special privilege?"

In Schlafly's America, every woman enjoys the "right to care for her own baby in her own home while being financially supported by her husband." Never mind that 43 percent of American women over the age of 16 work full time outside the home and that 70 percent of women workers have to work because they are single, widowed, divorced, or married to men who earn less than $7,000 a year. No matter that 61 percent of poor people in this country are female. Schlafly and the lawmakers are in television-commercial land, where the lady in the high heels and $100 skirt delicately mops her vast and already spotless kitchen floor.

Schlafly paints ERA as the product of "liberationists," who are "a bunch of bitter women seeking a constitutional cure for their personal problems." The "libbers," she charges, are using ERA to wage "a total assault on the family, on marriage and on children." Naturally, she doesn't dwell on ERA's backing from the League of Women Voters, the Homemakers of America, the National Coalition of Catholic Nuns, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and dozens of women's groups that are hardly considered radical.

Schlafly plays skillfully on the insecurities of women who are dependent on their husbands, as well as on the role images of male legislators out to "protect" womankind. She uses her discussion of the issues to manipulate the emotions of her audience.

Holding up a fat green copy of *American Jurisprudence 2d*, a legal encyclopedia, Schlafly proclaims the book proves that today in every one of the 50 states, a married women "has the legal right to be supported by her husband."

"This is regardless of her own separate means," Schlafly says. "He can't make her go to work if she doesn't want to. She has the legal right, and these are the laws which will be invalidated by the Equal Rights Amendment."

Here Schlafly addresses a complex and rapidly changing area of the law with oversimplifications that do no service for the women she claims to defend. The issue of homemakers' rights has given her perhaps her most successful arguments and it's important to examine Schlafly's statements carefully. The law does provide a right of support to wives, but too often women wake up to find that this right gives them as much effective protection as the emperor's new clothes.

Most families, of course, work out arrangements for sharing financial, child-rearing, and housekeeping responsibilities, and these agreements are enforced by love and custom—not the law. If a husband becomes a gambler, an alcoholic, or simply lazy, a dependent wife is in serious trouble. At best, if she can get help from a court, it is likely that she would get only a bare minimum of support. In fact, in many cases wives do not get help at all.

Schlafly's toting that heavy copy of *American Jurisprudence* doesn't mean that she is in fact citing weighty and dispositive evidence. She describes the series as "authoritative" and "the most comprehensive modern text statement of American law." But good lawyers would not rely on *American Jurisprudence's* statement of the law without substantial further research.

But Schlafly has other sources. "In Illinois," she told William Buckley's "Firing Line" audience, "the court said the husband had even to buy [his wife] a fur coat—a beautiful silver mink coat. And he had that obligation to do it because it was his obligation to support her, even though she had separate means—she had a $10,000 income of her own—and even though she had four other coats."

A court-ordered mink coat sounds terrific, doesn't it? Where do we sign up?

Unfortunately, according to Professor Judith Areen, associate professor of law at Georgetown University, Schlafly is being "absolutely misleading." Areen explained that the case [Lewis Berman & Co. *v.* Dahlberg, 336 Ill App. 233 (1948)] involved a wife who had charged a fur coat at a store. Her husband had to pay the bill because under the Illinois Family Expense Statute, it is assumed that he consented to her purchase.

That law, like others in the support cases Schlafly cites, is designed to protect creditors or the state—but certainly not the wife. If the wife had not charged the coat, but had simply gone to court and asked for one, she would have lost. And if her husband had canceled all her charges (as he probably did) afterward, that law wouldn't insure her rights to another fur coat.

"What Schlafly didn't say was that under the same law, if the *husband* had charged the coat, the *wife* would have had to pay," Professor Areen added. "That law wouldn't change at all under ERA."

Furthermore, while big alimony and child-support payments may be a reality in Schlafly's wealthy social circles, the average woman facing a separation or divorce soon finds that the "absolute" right to support shrinks to a slim reed indeed.

"Alimony is granted only in a very small percentage of cases," the Citizens Advisory Council on the Status of Women reports, noting that despite the lack of research, a 1965 survey of judges by the American Bar Association showed that temporary alimony is awarded in less than 10 percent of cases and permanent alimony in as few as 2 percent of cases. Moreover, the council continued, "fathers by and large are contributing less than half the support of the children in divided families" and "alimony and child-support awards are very difficult to collect."

You don't have to be a lawyer to figure out why this is true. Most families barely scrape along on one income. Obviously, when the family divides into two households, extra income is needed, and that means the wife usually must work outside the home. Furthermore, most judges are reluctant to impoverish a husband, and often award wives token child-support payments that do not reflect the actual cost in time and money it takes to bring up children. And one study cited by the Citizens Advisory Council showed that 10 years after the divorce, 87 percent of ex-husbands had skipped out on even these meager obligations.

ERA, Schlafly says, "will make a wife equally responsible to provide a home for her family and to provide 50 percent of the financial support of her family." Her statement can terrify housewives who fear they will be forced to go out and earn half the dollars their family spends. This is not the case.

ERA will not interfere with private marital arrangements. The Amendment will change support laws to provide a reciprocal right of support between husbands and wives. Some states, such as Pennsylvania and Schlafly's own home, Illinois, already have reciprocal rights of support. And no one has seen a flood of destitute, abandoned housewives going into the unemployment offices. Furthermore, contrary to Schlafly's assertions, courts already often consider a wife's separate means or earning capacity in settling support disputes. The fact is that whatever effective protection dependent wives now enjoy will not be destroyed by ERA.

Far from depriving the homemaker of her rights, ERA probably would enhance her status. At present, the financial value of the homemaker's contributions as housekeeper, child-raiser, hostess, chauffeur, and general factotum is not legally recognized.

However, ERA "will require state laws to recognize the contribution of the homemaker who takes care of her home and family," according to Common Cause. "The ERA would entitle the homemaker to financial support in compensation for her services as homemaker. In this way, the ERA will actually strengthen the dignity of the homemaker because support laws will be based on the actual earning power and contributions of each spouse, instead of being based simply on sex."

But while ERA backers are mired in the details and complexities of the reality of homemaker's rights, Schlafly has lit a new firecracker. This time it's the draft.

The ERA will "positively, absolutely, and without the slightest shadow of a doubt make women subject to the military draft on the same basis with men," she warns the legislators, her eyes flashing a steely glint. "Women will be sent into combat and onto warships with men and will be required to carry the same forty- or fifty-pound packs. Mothers will have to be drafted on the same basis as fathers."

But doused with facts, this little bomb goes off not with a bang but a fizzle. For one thing, we now have a *volunteer* army. *No one*, male or female, is being drafted.

Yes, we might have another war and reinstitute the draft. But in the event of a nuclear war (which Schlafly in her other writings says is imminent), questions of

the draft become somewhat academic. No one would be safe.

The argument that ERA backers jokingly call the "potty problem" is at the same juvenile level. Schlafly and cohorts warn that ERA would outlaw separate bathrooms and sleeping facilities for men and women in public places. However, nothing in ERA prohibits sex-segregated bathrooms, and proponents argue that the Supreme Court has enunciated a constitutional right to privacy between the sexes. Anyway, don't these people use single-sex bathrooms on airplanes?

* * *

Schlafly's methods are in the best traditions of a propagandist preying on the fears of the ill-informed. She has a reputation for guts—for taking on all comers, which seems to give her a certain credibility. (However, she twice refused to be interviewed by me, even when I suggested she come armed with tape recorder and witnesses.)

Her performance relies heavily on an adroit combination of facts, half-truths, overstatement, and misrepresentation. She puts opponents on the defensive and then, with supreme self-confidence, repeats simplistic statements over and over. Most of us find it hard to believe that a respectable-looking matron might be careless with the truth. To cite a few examples:

In Georgia, Schlafly warned that ERA would eliminate dower rights—a legal provision that allots a man's estate to his widow. In fact, Georgia had abolished dower rights several years earlier.

Schlafly threatens that ERA will do away with so-called protective legislation for women workers. In fact, this legislation, although often well intentioned, tended to protect women from advancement and better-paying jobs. (For example, a law "protecting" women from overtime prevented women from earning time-and-a-half pay rates on an equal basis with men.) Such laws are already being invalidated under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. And under ERA, when a law is truly protective, it can be extended to both sexes; when it is discriminatory, it will be eliminated.

Yet, for all the error of her words, Schlafly's arguments are widely promulgated. They have been reprinted—often word for word—in various ultraright publications, from H. L. Hunt's *Life Line Freedom Talk;* to the *Manion Forum*, run by Dean Clarence Manion, a John Birch Society National Council member; to Birch Society publications. Her arguments also appear in local newspapers. Sometimes the story is attributed to her; sometimes a local by-line is used, giving the material grassroots flavor.

Some experts believe that Schlafly and her ultraconservative admirers are concerned with far more than the well-being of women. "The right is always looking for issues of this kind that have some popular appeal and that will bring them into contact with segments of opinion in the mainstream," explains Irwin Suall, director of the domestic fact-finding department of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith, which carefully monitors extremist groups of all political persuasions. "Then, within that broad context, they try to press their own personal point of view on other issues.

"There is no doubt that the John Birch Society latched onto ERA because they sensed an issue they could exploit," Suall continued. "They got in relatively late after some of their own members had already come out against it. They saw it as an avenue to expand their influence."

Evidence in support of this speculation comes from Washington *Star* reporter Isabelle Shelton. "In state after state," Shelton wrote in a recent article, "labor found that the troops Mrs. Schlafly had organized for a blitz campaign against ERA would stay behind [while she was off in search of more conquests] to use their newfound legislative know-how to fight some of labor's pet programs."

(Until recently, Schlafly has made ample use of the fact that the AFL–CIO was divided on ERA to assert that America's workingwomen don't want the Amendment. That claim evaporated in October when the nation's largest labor organization unanimously endorsed ERA at its tenth convention—thanks largely to extreme pressure from women in the rank and file and the few women in leadership positions.)

The John Birch Society, of course, thinks ERA is a left-wing plot and admits a full-fledged effort to stop it. "It's safe to say that, where ERA was defeated, the Birch Society was involved," said John F. McManus, director of the society's public relations, in a telephone interview.

According to McManus, the Birch Society's first mention of ERA came in a November, 1972, article in *American Opinion* by Birch National Council member John G. Schmitz. Later, the Society's founder and director, Robert Welch, urged members to "plunge in and help relegate this *subversive* proposal to early and complete oblivion."

McManus reported that Birchers responded enthusiastically to Welch's call. "Many of our members have formed local groups and have taken on the job of organizing," McManus says, "because Birch members know how to organize." Birch telephone networks also have called legislators at strategic moments to urge them to vote against ERA, McManus said. The networks are not necessarily identified as Birch-organized.

Although the society's headquarters publicizes its opposition to ERA, the identity of its state and local organizers is carefully concealed. The Birch origins of only a few local groups—such as Utah's HOTDOG (Humanitarians Opposed To Degrading Our Girls) and Wisconsin's POW (Protect Our Women)—have been revealed by the society.

McManus defended the secrecy, saying, "We have a policy of allowing our members to choose their own techniques. We're anxious to be identified because we want people to know what the John Birch Society is doing. But if a local citizen wants not to be identified, that's his affair."

Helping the "local citizens" are 85 full-time paid Birch organizers (called coordinators) across the country. "We're using their talent and organizational abilities to oppose ERA," McManus said. The Birch connections of these coordinators are also kept quiet.

McManus denied that the national Birch organization has sent funds to anti-ERA groups. While denying the existence of a specific ERA war chest at the national level, McManus said, "Any money that has been spent has been raised at the local level. I don't know how much the local societies have spent but I doubt if it's been very much."

He did, however, say that the 85 full-time organizers spend a substantial part of the society's $8-million-a-year budget. Presumably, some of that money could find its way into anti-ERA work.

"Quality is much more important than quantity," he continued, denying a heavy financial commitment. "You don't need a whole lot of literature, but a few pieces mailed to the right people or just sitting down and talking to the right person can be very effective."

Schlafly's alleged John Birch Society connections have been a subject of considerable controversy. In the *John Birch Society Bulletin* in March, 1960, Birch Society founder and director Robert Welch praised Schlafly as a "very loyal member of the John Birch Society." His words have haunted Schlafly ever since.

She steadfastly denies that she is currently a Birch member, and has said that she was not a member in the past. However, her statements about her 1960 status have been less than satisfying, and have led to speculation that Schlafly may have been in fact an early society member but withdrew later to broaden her personal appeal and thus advance her political ambitions.

When I phoned Schlafly to ask for an interview, she declined, and refused to answer a specific question about her alleged Birch Society membership or to help me check other facts about her career.

I asked McManus of the Birch Society whether Welch stood by his 1960 statement calling Schafly a "loyal member." "There is nothing said in the *Bulletin* that [Welch] doesn't stand by," McManus answered firmly.

However, there can be no doubt that Schafly has had a cordial relationship with the society.

For example, unlike Senator Goldwater, who denounced the John Birch Society and rejected its support in his 1964 Presidential campaign, Schlafly has defended the society from attack. In 1965, according to newspaper reports, she charged that Republicans who denounced the John Birch Society were "guilty of diversionary and divisive tactics."

She herself refused to take such a step in 1967 when her alleged Birch connections became an issue in her bitterly fought but unsuccessful battle for the presidency of the National Federation of Republican Women.

After candidate Schlafly denied that she held Birch membership, Elizabeth Fielding, then the federation's director of public relations, demanded to know why she didn't "denounce the Birch Society . . . as Barry Goldwater has." Fielding offered to call a press conference right away so that Schalfly could do so. But Schlafly, who often paints herself as a Goldwater conservative, declined to follow Goldwater's lead.

For its part, the Birch Society, while not always totally in agreement with Schlafly, has generously pushed her career. *A Choice Not an Echo* became a best-seller at least in part due to promotion and distribution by the society. Later the society called another book "an excellent small volume," while another was "recommended for all adult education courses in national survival" in an *American Opinion* review. Robert Wech urged members to buy yet another Schlafly tract, saying, "You can order it from us by mail; and it is, or soon will be, on sale at practically all our bookstore units."

Recently, of course, Welch's complimentary mentions of Schlafly's anti-ERA activity have been frequent. In December, 1972, Welch recommended a Schlafly newsletter on the ERA, calling her statement "another excellent educational weapon recently added to the anti-Amendment toolbox." In February, 1973, Welch praised the anti-ERA efforts of Schlafly and Jacquie Davision. (Davison heads Happiness of Womanhood, Inc., and plans to defeat ERA and then promulgate the doctrine of "Fascinating Womanhood," which goes something like: "If you make your man your king, then you are a queen," etc.) And significantly, in 1973, Schlafly and her husband J. Fred Schlafly appeared as featured speakers at the Birch Society's annual God, Family, and Country Rally.

Schlafly has repeatedly declared that she does not receive "one dime" from the Birch Society or other far-right groups. Indeed, she told St. Louis *Post Dispatch* reporter Patricia Rice that the STOP ERA fight "hasn't cost me anything."

"I do it right out of my kitchen," she told Rice. "I don't go anywhere to give speeches unless they pay my fare. When I get there, they pass the hat. They buy reprints of my report or they run off copies themselves."

Schlafly's pin-money explanation is too vague to satisfy observers who have seen her anti-ERA blitz in action. For one thing, her

kitchen must be pretty crowded since she reportedly has two paid secretaries.

Who, for example, paid for Schlafly's visit to Nebraska last year during that state's rescission fight? The most visible anti-ERA group was the Omaha Unit of Pro America, Inc., an ultra-conservative national organization. Schlafly stayed overnight with the group's president, Mrs. T. A. Bjorge. However, Mrs. Bjorge told me that Pro America did not pay Schlafly's plane fare and she was not aware of anyone passing the hat to raise Schlafly's expenses. And although large quantities of anti-ERA literature appeared in Nebraska, Mrs. Bjorge said Pro-America spent less than $100 on the struggle.

The National Organization for Women has charged that the insurance industry was a key funding source in the Nebraska anti-ERA fight. (ERA would prohibit many insurance-industry practices that discriminate against women, and would therefore cut into the companies' profits.) NOW points out that State Senator Richard Proud, who led the rescission move, is an employee of Mutual of Omaha and that other anti-ERA leaders had insurance-industry connections. Mutual of Ohama has denied any participation. Of course, Schlafly would not agree to an interview, I could not determine for sure who, if anyone, paid for her Nebraska trip.

Schlafly also denies using her own Eagle Trust Fund to fight the ERA Eagle members pay $5 a year for dues and a subscription to "The Phyllis Schlafly Report," her newsletter. Schlafly puts the number of Eagle subscribers at "under 10,000."

Schlafly could end the speculation and the charges of right-wing funding with a publicly audited account of STOP ERA and Eagle Trust Fund finances. NOW is making available such an accounting of its own ERA war chest, but so far Schlafly has failed to do the same.

Despite her lack of success in previous bids for national attention, she has come far fighting the ERA. Because she or her followers demand equal time on each occasion that an ERA proponent makes an appearance on radio or television, Schlafly has made it out of the minor leagues of obscure right-wing publications and into the national media.

In some ways, she might be called an artificial creation of the fairness doctrine: wherever the pro-ERA views of the vast majority of Americans are presented, Schlafly—the only nationally known spokeswoman against it—is brought out in the name of objectivity.

Schlafly is using her newfound celebrity to promote her conservative views. Recently, CBS gave her a regular national forum as one of its commentators on "Spectrum," a network radio and television editorial series.

Schlafly can expect stiffer opposition on women's issues in the future. ERA backers are now gearing up with an educational campaign to counter Schlafly-style rhetoric in states that haven't ratified.

As the proponents look up the cases Schlafly cites and check on her facts, she will doubtless move onward to new cases and new facts.

In fact, Phyllis Schafly's description of the ERA as a "terminal case" should encourage ERA backers. In 1971, for instance, she urged Nixon to bow out in favor of Reagan: she had a poll, she said, proving that Richard Nixon could not win.

So much for the Schlafly instinct and research. Once we understand her methods, we can cure Schlafly-shock. Women across the country have been working hard for ERA. And this Amendment—the most important legislation for women since suffrage—can and will be passed.

(Lisa Cronin Wohl is a free-lance writer. She supports the ERA, but does not plan, as Schlafly fears, "a total assault on the family, on marriage and on children.")

CONSUMER ADVOCATE FLORENCE RICE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, consumer education is a hot issue these days. In minority communities, it has always been an issue. Because they lacked both information and power, blacks and other minorities allowed themselves to be taken advantage of by companies and stores. But things are changing. As in other areas of politics and power, blacks are making headway in the field of consumer education. In New York City, the driving force behind this progress is an energetic, committed consumer advocate named Florence Rice.

Ms. Rice has been working to protect consumers for more than a decade, and has achieved tangible success in increasing their awareness of how to protect their interests. I commend Ms. Rice's efforts, and urge my colleagues to read the following article about the opening of her second consumer education center:

PRAISE FOR HARLEM "PEOPLE'S ADVOCATE" MARKS OPENING OF SECOND CONSUMER OFFICE

(By Charlayne Hunter)

In a small, cramped storefront in Harlem, Federal, state and city officials and a few "arch-enemy friends" joined Florence Rice yesterday in opening her second consumer-education center uptown.

Mrs. Rice, who organized the Harlem Consumer Education Council, Inc., in 1963, and has been active in a range of consumer problems since, was praised as a "pioneer" and a people's advocate" and as someone who "puts any money she gets back into the community."

In turn, she pledged to continue her battles in the consumer arena, particularly her long-standing ones with the utility companies.

Before the informal opening ceremonies, guests who preferred the heat outside to the heat inside talked about Mrs. Rice and her tireless efforts, often without remuneration, on behalf of poor people.

AIDED BY URBAN COALITION

"Any money she gets she puts back into the community," said Luther Gatling, executive assistant to Eugene Callendar, president of the New York Urban Coalition. Both he and Mr. Callendar said that the coalition had been helping Mrs. Rice for the last year, and that they planned to help her draw up a proposal to some foundations.

"She needs at least $50,000 a year to do just the bare-bones work in consumer education," Mr. Gatling said.

"She can't get any money because of what she's doing" Mr. Callendar said. "She's a real people's advocate" before the state Public Service Commission and the Federal Trade Commission. "If you have a problem with your phone bill or your gas bill, you don't call Con Edison or the phone company, you call Florence."

Others, who asked not to be identified, said that Mrs. Rice had turned down offers of grants from Consolidated Edison and the telephone company.

IRKED BY DUNNINGS

Mrs. Rice, who over the years has been outspoken at hearings and public forums about billing practices and complaint procedures of the major utility companies, said that she had found that "people in this area"—Upper Manhattan—were "still having to pay exorbitant deposits, and there's a lot of estimate billing and people getting dunning letters saying they've got to pay immediately."

Among those attending the opening at 1956 Amsterdam Avenue at 157th Street were Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz, Richard Givens, region Federal Trade Commissioner, and Consumer Affairs Commissioner Elinor Guggenheimer, both of whom pledged their support to Mrs. Rice's efforts.

Also present were representatives of the Public Service Commission, the Telephone Company and Con Edison, which Mrs. Rice described as "my arch-enemy friends."

"We're going to take care of Florence's people," said Waymon Dunn, deputy assistant to the chairman of Con Edison.

"We're going to take care of all the people, honey, because I'm going to send them to you," Mrs. Rice replied.

Mrs. Guggenheimer said, however, that she was "worried about consumer offices that are not hooked into offices that help them do something."

"A lot of them are confusing the consumer about where you can get governmental action, and where you can go and talk to a friend," she said. Florence is education. She isn't saying that she's the complaint resolution center."

One such agency, a branch office of the Manhattan District Attorney's office at 55 West 125th Street, was established last month, specifically to handle cases involving thefts by deceit and defrauding consumers.

122 CASES IN MONTH

Figures released by District Attorney Richard H. Kuh yesterday showed that the agency had handled 122 complaints in its first month, 16 of them involving allegations of crime.

Of that number, 13 are being investigated further on possible charges of harrassment, fraud, false advertising and larcency. The remaining number involving civil problems were referred to "more appropriate agencies," along with WMCA's Call for Action program.

"A starting volume of 30 complaints a week between June 10 and July 9 demonstrates that district attorneys throughout the country should take their offices to the people," Mr. Kuh said in a statement released to the press.

Mr. Kuh estimated that the figure "will spring upward," as more people learn about the office, which is on the 11th floor of the Charles A. Vincent Building on 125th Street near Lenox Avenue. It is open daily from 9:30 A.M. to 6 P.M., and on Saturdays until 1 P.M.

LUBBOCK, TEX., JOB TRAINING PROGRAM A SUCCESS

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Leon Sullivan has done an outstanding job in behalf of the underprivileged youth and citizens otherwise of our country. He established what is known as the Opportunities Industrialization Center—OIC—back in 1963 from a pilot project in job training and placement in Philadelphia. OIC has grown to include centers in 6 foreign countries and boasts some 110 centers in 43 States. The job retention rate for graduates is an amazing 85 percent.

The July 1974 issue of the Reader's Digest carries an article about Dr. Sullivan and the OIC program. Reference is made in the article to a very successful OIC unit in my home town of Lubbock, Tex. I quote the following excerpt from the article:

Out on the Great Plains, at Lubbock, Texas, I found OIC operating in an abandoned supermarket converted into a big open classroom, with a day nursery for small children. Sparked by the Rev. Allen L. Davis, the Lubbock OIC serves blacks (48 percent), Chicanos (36 percent) and whites (16 percent). About a quarter are on welfare. One ex-student is a 46-year-old father of eight, who is now working his way through college as a printer, after getting his start at OIC. A mother of five, with a tenth-grade education, trained at OIC to be a sales clerk, and is now earning $320 a month instead of drawing $105-a-month welfare.

I would like to commend Dr. Sullivan, Reverend Davis, and many others who have worked long and hard over the years in behalf of those who want to help themselves.

REVITALIZING THE SYSTEM

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by Richard Trout, TRB, which appeared in the July 20 edition of the New Republic. Mr. Trout raises an issue which should be of central concern to our country—the absence of governmental responsibility and accountability.

The United States is now suffering from fundamental problems which demand immediate and effective action. We face a skyrocketing inflation combined with high unemployment, an environmental crisis, shortage in energy and food, and an executive branch which has lost its ability to lead. Our Government in turn, has proved unable or unwilling to deal with these pressing issues. One party controls the executive while another controls the legislature. The result is a mutual check which either leaves legislation at a standstill or waters it down to such a degree that it lacks any authority.

Mr. Trout presents a convincing argument for establishing a more responsive governmental system. In every other democracy in the world, government is held accountable for its actions and for inaction. Thus, if it meets with popular disapproval it will quickly and efficiently be removed from office and be replaced by a party which has a public mandate to act.

Mr. Trout poses the question, "Who's in control?" This question can only be answered through responsive and accountable leadership. Until such change comes about, we must brace ourselves for more of the same, ineffective leadership which is unable to deal with our country's basic problems.

I would commend TRB's column to the attention of my colleagues, and the text follows:

[From TRB, July 20, 1974]

TURBULENCE AHEAD

With a parliamentary system like Canada's the United States could have dealt with Watergate two months after it was discovered. With our rigid government we have instead reached a point of public helplessness that is demeaning to a great nation. It is not merely demeaning but dangerous. We face extraordinary shocks on the economic front and the President evidently does not know what to do, nor is there any quick way of replacing him. There is impeachment, of course, but that is reserved for high crimes and misdemeanors and simple economic muddleheadedness does not meet the formula. There is no lack-of-confidence vote in our system that can get an election and oust an inept leader, there is no arrangement whereby a political part itself can readily change its spokesman as the Progressive Conservative party in Canada is now preparing to do with the unfortunate Robert Stanfield after his defeat in last week's election. No, we are helpless, as James Sundquist of Brookings put it, recalling the discredited British Prime Minister who sought to appease Hitler. "Under our system, a Neville Chamberlain would stay in office for his full term even if that meant losing a war, and the very freedom of the nation."

We need a more flexible system. For example, Sen. William Fulbright, who has headed the Foreign Relations Committee longer than anybody else, is a national asset. But he was defeated in a local primary and must go. Why should a man like Fulbright—or some equivalent senator in the same fix on the conservative side—be lost under a rigid system, and not run from some other constituency, from some safe seat, to give Congress the benefit of his continuing experience?

It is stunning to cross the line that separates the United States and Canada and find the idea of transferable legislative constituencies unthinkable in the former and taken for granted in the latter. Mr. Stanfield has just run from a district in central Halifax in Nova Scotia—he doesn't live there. Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau is elected from the Mount Royal district of Montreal—he doesn't live there either. They are glad to have famous men to elect.

There are two dangers of Watergate, one that Mr. Nixon will ride out impeachment, in which case the great sword that the Founding Fathers forged for the Constitution will rust and be forgotten; the other that he will be impeached, and the Nation will say, "See, now we have solved the Nixon problem and we can forget Watergate as soon as possible!" Of the two, the latter possibility could be the more dangerous if it throws away the experience we have gained and what might be the last chance of some permanent reform.

The dominance of the presidency over Congress and courts seems likely to be checked now for a while whatever happens, because Mr. Nixon has overreached himself and been too arrogant. But the same process is apt to begin again after a while because the Nation needs a strong leader, and will achieve it in one way or another.

Suppose the future man in the White House had the charisma that Mr. Nixon lacks, the demagoguery of Huey Long, the effrontery of Joe McCarthy, the racism of George Wallace, and pushed his power in the paths Mr. Nixon has pointed out—impoundment, executive privilege, national security, warrantless wiretaps, sale of ambassadorships, falsification of cables, favors for campaign funds, burglary, spying and all the rest. Could we depend on the device of impeachment alone to handle the matter? Really, wouldn't it be simpler to adopt a collectized parliamentary government or some partial adaptation of it? Half a dozen proposals are now in Congress.

The United States would never accept parliamentary "instability," it is argued, like that in Canada; it breeds coalition governments. It is odd to hear the latter argument advance. Prime Minister Trudeau has just been reelected with a fresh mandate, and presumably he can govern for the next four years with collective party responsibility.

Things are different in Washington. I do not mean Watergate. One party controls the White House, a rival party controls the legislature and the emphasis is on negativism. Ah yes, you say, but this is the exception. Not at all. In the last 46 years the control of Congress and the White House has been split 16 years, or one-third of the time.

Often you hear it said with smug self-satisfaction, "So what? Divided government is good; one party will watch the other; the sound men of business will be the real rulers; this means less government interference. The fewer laws the better."

Business certainly is powerful. But in the real pinch can government act? You could find no better example than the terrible problem of inflation at the present time. All around the world today the economic warning signs are flashing: "Buckle seat belts, turbulence ahead!" It is the most serious international inflation in history. How badly America needs a leader it can trust!

Last week Herbert Stein, chairman of Mr. Nixon's Council of Economic Advisers, called the American economy "very strong," but also acted like the watchful airline hostess who doesn't want to frighten anybody but wants to be sure everybody is tucked in:

"We have no easy way out of this. I think we have to be prepared to continue for a long time. I think in terms of years, not months—three, four years, and more or less indefinitely, we have to follow a policy of much greater discipline."

In Herbert Hoover's Great Depression there was a Commerce Department economist named Julius Klein. Mr. Hoover would see prosperity just around the corner, and Klein would explain why. The similarities are rather striking:

Said Julius Klein in '29,
"I'm confident there's no decline!"
Said Herbert Stein, "Hew to the line,
We'll all be fine by '79."

Dr. Stein says the real blame for inflation is with the American public—they rejected "tax increases." It is an astonishing statement for the aide of Mr. Nixon who pledged in 1972: "My goal is not only no tax increase but no tax increase for the next four years."

Tighten your seat belts, turbulence ahead. Who's at the controls?

TRIBUTE TO ERNEST AND ROSE SAMUELS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent event that took place in the State of Israel was a most appropriate form of recognition for one of our unique men in the 13th District of Florida.

At a time when most see the tranquility of retirement, Ernie Samuels has not sought but has accepted many responsibilities in our community. As

chairman of the Condominium Executive Council of Florida, he was a leader in the legislative battle for the rights of his fellow condominium owners. He has also been a leader in the effort to protect our air and water.

In light of his concern for the environment, it is fit and proper that to honor his successful fundraising effort for Israel in the October fight for survival, there now exists in Israel a Point East Ernest and Rose Forest.

The text of the news items as it appeared in the Jewish Floridian of July 12, 1974, is as follows:

JNF POINT EAST PILGRIMAGE TO ISRAEL

A most impressive pilgrimage, comprised of 47 delegates, traveled to Kfar Hachorshim to dedicate the Point East Ernest and Rose Forest in the Governor Askew Park Forest. This memorable event will linger for a long time as a testimonial of love and respect to the great leader of Point East, Mr. Ernest Samuels, who has become a legend in his own time in this great condominium.

Attending the ceremony from Miami Beach was Judge Zev W. Kogan, President, JNF Southern Region, who came especially to pay tribute on this great occasion to Mr. & Mrs. Samuels, and to share with them and with the pilgrimage the joy of this great day. Representing the Keren Kayemeth was Mr. Tidhar of the American desk.

It is good that Ernie and Rose were accompanied by so many of their supporters and workers from Point East, who have helped him make that condominium development maintain a leadership position in south Florida.

CONGRESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of an editorial which was delivered over WGSM radio on July 20, 1974. The editorial points out several major congressional achievements during the last session and helps to document that we have been diligent and constructive in our work. Editorials like this will help to dispel the post-Watergate myth that Congress is not doing anything positive. I am sure that the following editorial will be of interest to my colleagues:

CONGRESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

Congress never had it so bad. The public seems to have the idea that their Representatives aren't doing anything. Perhaps because the President keeps talking about getting back to the business of the country as though nothing's happening in the Senate and House and because the nation is leaderless at the Executive level.

Worst of all, Watergate, for some unknown reason, seems to have rubbed off more on Congress than on the President where it belongs. A recent poll show 72% of the American people thought Congress was doing a bad job. The truth probably is most people don't know what kind of a job Congress does. During this session the Congress passed a milestone bill, called the Budget Control and Anti-Impoundment Act, which not only has a built in spending limitations and priorities, but provides that each governmental program must be cut a pro rata percentage whenever expenditures exceed revenues.

The President can no longer pick out a program, supported by the Congress that he opposes and withhold funds, arbitrarily, from that one area of concern. Two full Congressional Committees worked an entire year on that legislation also called the Percy/Ervin/Muskie Bill. There were few public hearings or emotional exchanges, little radio and television coverage. Private interests were well represented at the hearings, but no public hearings. This is legislation important to every citizen, to everyone who pays taxes.

Other Congressional accomplishments include the War Powers resolution which provides that no United States troops can be committed to foreign wars, by any President, for more than a short period, without Congressional approval. Additionally, Congress passed a pension reform bill, insuring private pension plans, a Social Security increase of 11%, the 55 mph speed limit, the Alaskan pipeline, unprecedented funds for energy research and a new agriculture bill that is sending farm subsidies down from 4 billion dollars to 2 billion dollars this year and 460 million next year. What it really says to farmers is—Grow as much as you can.

Still on the Congressional agenda, among pressing concerns undone, remain Election Campaign Reform and Internal Congressional Reform, but the Congressional Report Card is not nearly as empty or as poor as the American people seem to think. With 254 sub-committees and 37 standing committees, it's sometimes difficult to separate the legislative wheat from the chaff. Certainly, a limitation of Presidential war powers, budget control and increased food supply are commendable and progressive moves for which Congress should receive credit rather than criticism.

ROY EARL MULLIN—GO-FER FIRST CLASS

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce today that I am losing the senior member of the staff team which I have relied upon so strongly during two campaigns and my first term in office.

I am speaking of Roy Mullin, whom few of you know because he works in my district office in Grand Prairie. We are losing Roy through circumstances none of us could have anticipated, knowing him as long and well as we have. Roy has been accepted for enrollment by a major university.

We just sort of acquired Roy. Shortly after I announced as a candidate for Congress in 1972, he wandered into the campaign office and said he wanted to help. For a while, because of the braces on his teeth, his long hair and big glasses, we wondered whether he really was of our world.

But, by virtue of "just being there," Roy ascended to the exalted role of go-fer. He would go for this and go for that or for anything we needed. It took a while for his talent to sink in—you all know how hectic campaigns can be. But we came to realize that Roy had an uncanny ability to solve problems.

One time we needed a television set, for example.

Mature, educated, sophisticated people ranted and raved about this need while Roy stood, nurturing his Prince Valiant hairdo, in the corner.

The campaign leaders never solved the problem of the television set, because suddenly one appeared.

"Where did it come from?" we asked.

An extensive search turned up Roy. When pressed upon just how he solved the momentous problem of the day, Roy said, "Well, I just went down to the Seven/Eleven and rented it."

Roy's simple and direct approach to problem-solving flowered and flourished and we came to appreciate it. All we had to do was tell Roy what we needed, carefully avoid specific questions about how he was going to do it, and whatever it was would get done.

All this talent, and Roy didn't cost anything! All we had to do was feed him. Now that, Mr. Speaker, was something else again. Roy is stringbean thin, but he has the greatest capacity I have ever seen for hamburgers, peanut butter, balogna, pie, cake, beans—food, any kind of food!

All over the 24th District, they looked forward to my appearance at bake sales—not for me, or a chance to visit with a candidate, but because Roy would buy them out! If they were serving free food, we would get kicked out.

When the campaign was over and done—and successful—Roy received his reward. He was assigned to temporary duty in Washington for familiarization and to attend the swearing in ceremony as I became a Member of this body.

When Roy returned to Texas, it developed that our office could not function without him and his special abilities. Since he continued to haunt our office each day after school and on Saturdays, I gave him a part-time position on the staff. The position paid very little money but carried an elevated title as "congressional go-fer, first class."

There has never been any doubt that he has fulfilled all his responsibilities in an outstanding way—despite the fact that his memos sometimes are a little sticky with peanut butter.

Roy has made another important contribution to my operation. My administrative assistant, executive secretary, district coordinator, legislative assistant, field assistants, case workers, and secretaries, have all at one time or another been humbled when Roy invoked his privilege of seniority. He even wrote me a memorandum once, reminding me of his senior status on staff.

I hope you can tell how much we all love and respect Roy Mullin from the light nature of these remarks. One has to respect a man to kid him.

To me, Roy is an outstanding example of the kind of young people we have so many of, and hear so little about. These are quiet young people who look at the world they live in and decide to get involved, to do what they can, and to make an opportunity to learn more about the system which governs, and how it operates.

Roy was in high school when he decided to get involved in a political campaign. I am eternally grateful that he

picked mine. I probably learned more from Roy than, he has from me.

Mr. Speaker, we now have a vacancy in our Grand Prairie district office for one "congressional go-fer." Starting salary will be low and the working standards will be high—Roy Mullin established them. I do not really think that it will stay vacant long because there are many other young deserving youngsters that are also seeking to become involved within the system. After proving himself, he too will be eligible for inservice promotion to "Congressional Go-Fer—First Class."

HELP FOR TENANTS AT LONG LAST

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, a major problem facing the urban dweller has been the inability of municipalities to maintain quality housing. In New York Ctiy, by the end of 1968, 18 percent of the total stock and 29 percent of the rent controlled stock was classified as substandard. This was unacceptable in 1968 and intolerable today. Many structurally sound buildings are in disrepair, and more are on their way to this unfortunate state. New housing cannot meet all the needs of housing and is not a solution in itself.

One need only drive through the city to find former beautiful neighborhoods decaying merely because owners of property have failed to maintain them. Apartment houses are becoming slums because landlords have refused to keep them in a state of repair and because the cities have insufficient funds to enforce housing codes.

As a result, neighborhoods are being torn down and in their place, erector-set type projects are being built, which are slowly becoming the slums of the future. If we are to preserve the middle class neighborhoods of our cities, we must prevent landlords from milking the property and force them to keep them modern, attractive, and in keeping with the needs of the neighborhood.

Unless we do this, the Boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens will soon look like the war torn areas of the Bronx, and this must not happen.

To this end, I, together with every New York City member of the congressional delegation, from both parties, have introduced a bill which will once and for all afford the tenants of our city a place to bring their complaints, provide them with a code of uniformity, and laws that will strictly enforce the preservation of existing housing.

More specifically, the major provisions of this legislation are as follows:

First. The training, employment and compensation of housing inspectors and personnel;

Second. The establishment of housing courts for dealing with building violations, other controversies and criminal penalties; and

Third. The development and improvement of housing codes and related code enforcement programs.

The allocation of the distribution of funds will be 90 percent Federal and 10 percent State, city, or municipality. The appropriation for this legislation is $400 million.

This legislation is desperately needed by cities and municipalities throughout the country, more particularly by New York City, more particularly by the Borough of Brooklyn. If we are to preserve the neighborhood, we must once and for all prevent its decay. This legistion will be the first giant step in that direction and I urge my colleagues to join with me in its support.

ALL IS SILENT

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, our country has recently seen the end of our involvement in the longest war in the history of this country. The cost in lives of young and brave men, as well as in the money which was so desperately needed for programs to improve the lives of our citizens here at home, is incalculable. Our country has been involved in other bloody conflicts, the memories of which are deeply etched in the minds and hearts of all of us, especially our brave men who were on the fields of battle. One such individual is now a member of our Capitol Hill Police Force and while he keeps watch at his appointed post here in the Cannon Building, his thoughts sometimes take him back to those scenes of horror that he witnessed during World War II. He has put some of these memories into poems which enable us all to feel as if we are walking with him across the battlefield. I include, Mr. Speaker, one of the poems of this Capitol Hill policeman, who prefers to remain anonymous, in the RECORD following these remarks. It is entitled "All Is Silent." I believe that reading this poem will make each of us more thankful for the peace our country now enjoys:

ALL IS SILENT

All is silent. All is silent.
As I walk over the battlefield after a battle,
I see death all over the field on its last rattle.
They lay in slumber in their Death Mask of deep sleep
Looking around at the bodies I wonder why death is so cheap.
Some are lying on their backs, others kneeling in their Death Mask of sleep.
I wonder aloud and ask have they died in vain.
On some of the faces, a tortured mask of pain.
There are tanks and guns and bodies everywhere in sight.
I look and ponder, why does my heart feel feel so tight.
All is silent, all is silent in this desolate place.
They sleep in peace with a Death Mask etched on their face.
There are some gruesome sights; others look like they dropped to rest.
But in this fight they undertook they met death in its sternest test.
In the hot blistering sun, the stench of death is everywhere.
I stand in stunned silence praying to drive this out forever.
All is silent. All is silent. What is there to say.
On the field of death, I shiver in this hot summer day.
I stumble and tumble along like an animal in a trance.
All is silent. All is silent. Please God give them a chance.
They say death is like a thief in the night.
But these comrades of mine died in the broad daylight.
The wounded have long been taken off the field of battle.
The cries of agony I hear like a faint distant rattle.
I walk off the field watching them put the dead in their sacks.
Away from the field under tarpaulins in a triangle the dead are stacked
My heart grieves, I cannot cry, I cannot stay, I must go on to live another day.
I stumble onto another day; I thank the Lord for saving me today.
All is silent. All is silent.

CONGRESSMAN KEMP PRAISES AN INNOVATIVE NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION PROGRAM

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a new education program, initiated by the State of New York on May 24, 1974.

This program is called the Regents Credit Bank. For a small fee, an individual can have this computer system store all college courses, military education programs, and special tests. This service is especially beneficial to those who interrupt their education programs to enter the military or for other reasons. The Regents Credit Bank will make it much easier for these people when they decide to return to school. The information contained in the bank will be made available to the school or employer only at the request of the individual, thus guaranteeing the individual's right to privacy. The bank's primary use will be in the educational systems, but this service can be used for job applications as well.

I bring this program to the attention of my colleagues, as it is the first program of its kind in this country. For many years now New York State has been a national leader in the advancement of new and innovative aids to students and educators, and I want to take the opportunity to commend the New York State Department of Education for this its newest effort on behalf of our educational system and its beneficiaries.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of the statement made by the department of education:

THE REGENTS CREDIT BANK

In our society where a college degree opens countless occupational doors, the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York has recognized the need for certifying the accomplishments of those who have obtained knowledge and skills outside the formal classroom. In September 1972, therefore, the Board of Regents established the External Degree Program, which so far has enrolled over 5,000 students from all over the country. Emphasizing that what a person knows is more important than how he learned it, the program allows qualified persons to earn a college degree without attending classes. Students earn credit toward an external degree in various ways, including college equivalency examinations, courses at accredited colleges, military education programs, and special tests.

To date over 1,200 individuals have received external degrees in liberal arts, business administration, and nursing. Many graduates of the associate in arts program have continued their education in 4-year colleges, while others are using their degrees to satisfy job requirements. A large percent are on active duty in the military, most of them career service personnel.

With the success of its External Degree Program already acknowledged, the Board of Regents has recently expanded services to independent learners by initiating a new evaluation and transcript system known as a "Credit Bank." This unique service is designed to evaluate an individual's educational achievements in terms of college credit, and record them on a single transcript from the University of the State of New York, the comprehensive educational system over which the Regents preside. Originally available only to enrollees in the External Degree Program, the Credit Bank is now open to all interested persons, including members of the armed forces and their dependents, regardless of age, state of residence, or previous educational experience.

The Credit Bank will evaluate scores earned on proficiency examinations such as those offered by the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) and the College Proficiency Examination Program (CPEP), and the United States Armed Forces Institute. The Credit Bank will also consider military service school courses and courses taken in residence or by correspondence from accredited colleges and universities. All evaluations will be conducted according to the academic policies and standards established by the faculty of the Regents External Degree Program.

In operation since late May, the Credit Bank will open a record for any individual for a small fee. It will then provide an unlimited number of evaluations and transcripts for two years. At the request of the Credit Bank member, transcripts will be forwarded to any agency, person, or educational institution.

The Regents expect the Credit Bank to meet the need of employers, agencies, and institutions of higher learning for a formal comprehensive, and academically consistent transcript. Hopefully it will function like the External Degree in aiding job advancement and academic placement.

The Credit Bank should especially help those people who use their local libraries for independent study. These persons, who are interested in preparing for proficiency examinations such as CLEP and CPEP, will now be able to earn college credit directly and keep a record of their achievement until they wish to apply it toward a degree program, external or campus-based. If widely used, the Credit Bank could significantly increase the number of independent learners who devise a program of study centered in the library. The Regents Credit Bank could thus have important implications for libraries as they plan their policies and programs with independent learners in mind.

ALCOHOLISM: A GROWING PROBLEM

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, for many years now there has been a growing realization of the direct and indirect effects which alcoholism has had on this Nation. We in the Congress have tried to do our part in fighting this growing problem, but obviously, it takes more than Federal participation to do the job.

That is why I was pleased to meet with the new and expanded Labor-Management Committee of the National Council on Alcoholism, an organization which operates in the private sector to supplement what the Government is doing.

I think the prestige of the men who head this program indicates the concern of the private sector. The cochairmen of the NCA Labor-Management Committee are Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, and Mr. James M. Roche, chairman of the board of General Motors. The expanded committee comprises some of the top labor and corporate presidents in the United States.

The National Council on Alcoholism was founded in 1944 and during the 1950's and 1960's made the fight against alcoholism in industry one of its top priorities. However, in those days the stigma of alcoholism still prevailed, and while there were limited successes in some industries, there had to be a major attitudinal change on the part of the American public before real progress could be made.

At the luncheon both Mr. Meany and Mr. Roche pledged their full cooperation to developing in the voluntary sector a massive program to detect and treat alcoholism in industry. We in the Federal Government must do our share, because the rising consumption of alcohol is reaching epidemic proportions in the United States. We passed the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act in 1970 and renewed it again in 1974. But passing the law is one thing—getting it implemented is another. That is why I was so delighted that these leaders from both labor and industry have joined hands on their own initiative to see that alcoholism treatment and prevention programs eventually reach into every assembly line and into every corporate executive suite.

The very same day this luncheon was held, Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger, of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, sent to Congress the second special report on developments since the first report was released in February of 1972. The 219-page report was prepared by a 38-member task force of distinguished alcoholism authorities from all over the country.

Interestingly enough, the massive report singled out alcoholism programs in business and industry as one of the most effective segments of the work of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and stated that such programs report the highest rates of recovery. However, the report in its entirety makes for some unhappy reading. In its first report to the Congress in 1972, HEW estimated the cost to the country from alcoholism at $15 billion. At the press conference on July 10, 1974, Secretary Weinberger, referring to alcohol misuse and alcoholism as "an epidemic health and social problem," announced that the report of the 38 experts made a conservative estimate of the cost of alcoholism of $25 billilon annually to our country.

The largest single area of cost—amounting to $9.35 billion—was the lost production of the goods and services which could be attributed to the reduced production of alcohol-troubled male workers. The cost of the lost production of women and of alcoholic persons who are institutionalized or living on Skid Row is not included in the $9.35 billion estimate. Other highlights of the HEW report to the Congress can only be briefly summarized:

First. A Gallup poll of June 9, 1974, reported that "the proportion of adults who drink is at the highest point recorded in 35 years of regular Gallup poll audits of America's drinking habits." It reported that 18 percent of those 18 years and older—some 25 million Americans—sometimes drink to excess and more than they think they should.

Second. Excessive use of alcohol, as reported in studies from all parts of the world, is related to certain cancers, particularly those of the mouth, pharynx, larynx, esophagus, and primary cancer of the liver. A heavy drinker who does not smoke has approximately the same increased risk of developing cancer of the mouth and throat as a heavy smoker who does not drink. When heavy drinking and heavy smoking are combined, the risk jumps enormously—to 15 times greater than among people who neither drink nor smoke.

Third. The increase in juvenile drinkers is staggering. The study reports that one out of every seven high school seniors admitted to getting drunk at least once a week. At the press conference, Dr. Morris Chafetz, Director of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, said the increase in heavy teen-age drinking "just blows my mind. It worries me greatly."

Fourth. Dr. Charles C. Edwards, the Assistant Secretary for Health, emphasizing the report's conclusions that alcoholism is an illness that can engender other serious diseases, said:

The time has come to bring the treatment of alcoholism into the mainstream of our Nation's health care system.

A DAY IN COURT FOR VETERANS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the issue of the reassimilation of veterans has been a concern of American governments

after each of our major wars. For over a half of a million Vietnam-era veterans efforts toward this reassimilation have been severely hampered by use of behavioral stigmas by the U.S. Department of Defense. These stigmas can cost the veteran vital educational and medical benefits as well as preclude the veteran from employment in a position with a secure future.

I, like a number of my colleagues, find it very disturbing that ex-servicemen should be haunted by their past "less than honorable" records. Unquestionably employers should be informed as to whether or not a veteran who is applying for a job with their firm received a dishonorable discharge. Perhaps, too, certain "less than honorable discharges" should be recorded on a veterans discharge papers.

However, the necessity for recording all such "less than honorable" discharges should be reviewed. Why should a veteran's bedwetting problem preclude him from a job with a secure future? It seems to me that employers' hiring processes should be sophisticated enough to determine the qualifications of their prospective employees without requiring such irrelevant behavioral stigmas.

As a product of the efforts of our colleagues, Mr. KOCH and Mr. ASPIN, ex-servicemen and women can now request new discharge papers without the Defense Department's code which connotes the reason for discharge. Representative STOKES has introduced a measure which would prohibit the code from being printed on a veteran's discharge papers. This bill would also limit the number of "less than honorable discharges," as well as improve the discharge and dismissal review process.

For the benefit of my colleagues I would like to present the following article by Robert S. Stokes, a reporter for the Asbury Park Press. Mr. Stokes speaks to this issue and informs veterans that there is a Discharge Review Board before which hearings on upgrading an assigned discharge are conducted.

The article follows:

A DAY IN COURT FOR VETERANS

(By Robert S. Stokes)

In the past decade, more than a half million servicemen and women have left the armed forces stigmatized by official records that give them a sort of social leprosy. Some of these are veterans with "other than honorable" discharges from the service—"undesirables," "bad conduct," or "dishonorable." Some even have "general" discharges that state they are for service "under honorable conditions."

A discharge certificate is given to each discharged serviceman with a title that characterizes the moral rectitude of his service. No such certificate shows special merit. The serviceman who keeps his nose clean merely gets a certificate that can't hurt him. Only those whose records were thought by the military to be special in a negative way are distinguished by this system.

Major employers, at least those with personnel departments, usually ask to see the discharge certificate. They don't have to look far for such records; all they have to do is ask the applicant to show it. For most veterans with "less than honorable" discharges, and even for some with "general" discharges, it's generally difficult to secure a decent job with a secure future.

For these people, many of them drafted to serve in Vietnam, re-entry into American society is tough enough without this kind of handicap. It can cost them important benefits like a Veterans Administration educational loan or grant, a VA-approved mortgage, or sorely needed medical care in a veterans hospital.

Furthermore, the administrative discharge system—which determines the original discharge status—was characterized as a "chamber of horrors" by Douglass L. Custis in a 1971 article in the ABA *Journal*. In citing what he called "kangaroo court proceedings," Mr. Custis (who served in the Judge Advocate General's Corps) decried a procedure "in which the person accused is denied the right to subpoena witnesses on his own behalf, confront and cross-examine the witnesses against him, require the prosecution to adhere to the rules of evidence, or expect the prosecution to shoulder the burden of proving him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt."

What makes the situation of these veterans with "other than honorable" discharges doubly unfortunate is that an established, if not always successful avenue of appeal does exist—a little-known recourse to have these tainted discharges upgraded or modified. The so-called courts of last resort for veterans, located in the Pentagon, are Discharge Review Boards or Boards for Correction of Military Records, one for each branch of the armed services. (Some of those with "general" or "undesirable" discharges are further stigmatized by an "SPN" number on Defense Department Form 214, which all ex-servicemen are given and which major employers and government agencies know enough to ask for.

These members, giving the reason for discharge, are keyed to a widely circulated Defense Department list; they may show that the serviceman was discharged for "homosexual tendencies," bedwetting, use of drugs, or mere lassitude, among other reasons. As of May 1, the Defense Department, at the prodding of Congressman Edward Koch of New York and Les Aspin of Wisconsin, administratively changed the system to allow veterans to request new discharge papers without the SPN code. Those discharged after May 1 will not have SPN numbers on their discharge papers.

On May 15, Congressman Louis Stokes of Ohio introduced H.R. 14827 "to require that discharge certificates issued to members of the armed forces not indicate the conditions or reasons for discharge, to limit the separation of enlisted members under conditions other than honorable, and to improve the procedures for the review of discharges and dismissals." The bill is now in the House Armed Services Committee.

Few lawyers know about this narrow aspect of military law, but those who have handled appeals for upgrading bad discharges for ex-GIs say it represents a rapidly growing field of legal services. Elliott H. Vernon, who returned to private practice in Monmouth County, New Jersey two years ago after serving for more than four years with the U.S. Army's Judge Advocate General's Corps, has represented several servicemen before discharge review boards and has succeeded in having their discharge status modified. "I've found the boards I've appeared before to be eminently fair," says Vernon, "and to have the best interests of the veteran at heart."

Vernon recently appealed the discharge of a former Army enlisted man who spent 18 months in military hospitals for a service-connected injury and was subsequently released from active duty without any consideration of disability compensation. When the Army Board for Correction of Military Records ordered another physical examination of the veteran, doctors found the man physically unfit at the time of his discharge. The Army Discharge Review Board subsequently ruled that the veteran was entitled to compensation for his injuries.

In cases where veterans have been discharged from military service as a direct result of conviction of offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, it's more difficult to get a discharge modified or upgraded. The need for a route of appeal is particularly great today because the "other than honorable" discharge may be capricously given; grounds for such a discharge range from nonpayment of debts to alleged drug abuse.

The main stumbling blocks to veterans seeking changes in their discharge status seem to lie in the location of the boards, the extensive preparation required by the lawyer representing the veteran, and the long wait for a hearing. "Dealing with the military in legal matters," said one lawyer familiar with these appeals, "frankly scares a lot of lawyers off a case like this even if they know the procedure."

Nevertheless, the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records recently reported that 16 percent of "punitive" discharges ("bad conduct" or "dishonorable") have been upgraded as a result of veteran appeals. David Addlestone, director of the American Civil Liberties Union's Military Rights Project in Washington (address given below), says more GIs could have their bad discharges upgraded if there were regional review boards.

"It is very important for veterans to appear in person at these hearings," says Addlestone, "and since they must pay their own traveling expenses to Washington, many of them simply don't apply due to lack of funds."

To give interested lawyers the knowledge necessary to file discharge appeals, the ACLU's Military Rights Project, which has legal advisers with the various state ACLU chapters, is planning to hold seminars in major cities around the country.

"There is definitely a growing need for legal service for GIs with bad discharges," says Addlestone. "These veterans deserve their day in court just as much as anyone else who feels they've suffered an injustice."

The review board procedure basically involves a written request for a hearing, a statement indicating what the veteran wants corrected in his or her record, and the reasons for the correction or modification. Attorneys also submit other documents to support the veteran's claim.

Members of the review boards are either active duty officers or civilian government officials with expert knowledge of military discharge classification procedures. A board examiner presents the case to the review board and the veteran's attorney is usually required to be present to answer questions.

The Vietnam War is over for most veterans, but those who came home with less than honorable discharges wage a never ending battle for economic and psychological survival, a battle perpetuated by the blotch on their military records. For veterans who feel that they received an unjust discharge, the legal profession should attempt to satisfy the right to legal counsel by having the knowledge necessary to represent them. A veteran needs and deserves his day in court.

GLENN HALSEY, MEMBER OF GRAYSON COUNTY, VA., BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, ENDORSES LEGISLATION TO SAVE THE NEW RIVER

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons that I have worked to see that the New River be studied for possible inclusion in the Wild and Scenic Rivers System is that through this legislation the people that are affected will be directly heard. The Department of Interior's regulations provide that public hearings be conducted in the area, and

not just in Washington, D.C., or an area which is inaccessible to most of the citizens.

A major complaint on the Federal Power Commission when it considered the proposed Blue Ridge power project was that it had not made itself available to hear testimony in the affected area. Just one public hearing in the area was held, and it was in Beckley, W. Va., some 144 miles from the project area. This made it nearly impossible for local citizen participation due to the difficulty in travel and location.

Mr. Glenn Halsey, a member of the Grayson County, Va., Board of Supervisors, made an eloquent plea for such public hearings in his testimony before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation. For the benefit of my colleagues, I submit the text of his testimony:

TESTIMONY OF MR. GLENN HALSEY

My name is Glenn Halsey. I am a member of the Grayson County Board of Supervisors serving as Chairman of that Board from 1959 to 1971. The major flow of New River is through my district and the most devastating destruction of farm lands and dislocation of schools, churches and roads will be in my district.

Throughout the years I have had the full support of my constituents in opposing the impounding of New River for the purposes of flushing out the Kanawha River for the relief of the chemical companies around Charleston. Now that has been swept under the rug and we are asked to believe that the project is needed to meet peak demands for electric power. All the time, even now, the Power Company says there is no shortage in their system, no brown-outs and they continue to advertise to solicite more use of power.

We have appealed to our State and Federal officials to help us and are told over and over again that the responsibility for the project lies in the Federal Power Commission and before the Administrative Law Judge. We beg our State and Federal officials to convene hearings at Wilkesboro Federal Courthouse or Abingdon Federal Courthouse in order that the people may be heard rather than the lawyers. One hearing was held at Beckley, West Virginia, a long, hard days travel from Grayson and Ashe. I attended.

My district joins Ashe and Alleghany; my problems are the same as theirs. We are thankful that we have voices strong and courageous enough to speak for us in Washington—even if we are not your constituents, we are one people trying to save an eternal river.

Mr. Chairman, we urge support of this bill to include the New River in the Wild and Scenic Rivers System for study. Maybe while that is being done we can get the support of our representatives in the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for leave to file, prior to June 13, 1974, certain supplemental data and documents relating to the statements I have made.

Thank you.

HARRINGTON AMENDMENT TO CLARIFY POLICE TRAINING PROHIBITION

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, as the Foreign Affairs Committee continues markup on the Foreign Assistance Act, I intend to offer an amendment to clarify the prohibition on police training contained in section 112 of the Foreign Assistance Act. This amendment would resolve the ambiguities now in the statute, while preserving and strengthening the intent of Congress as expressed in 1973.

Currently, section 112 states that no part of the appropriations made available to carry out the act, including Agency for International Development and military assitsance program funds, shall be used to "conduct any police training or related program in a foreign country." However, the term "police training or related program" is not defined in the section. The imprecision of this term has left the act open to differing interpretations, and has allowed for the continuation of programs which appear to circumvent the intent of Congress.

It seems clear that in section 112 Congress intended to end the American subsidization of all training programs in foreign countries which involve instruction of policemen in the skills and tactics normally associated with police operations. The committee report accompanying the Senate version of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973 states plainly of this section:

United States participation in the highly sensitive area of public safety and police training unavoidably invites criticism from persons who seek to identify the United States with every act of police brutality or oppression in any country in which this program operates. It matters little whether the charges can be substantiated, they inevitably stigmatize the total United States foreign aid effort.

In its approval of section 112, Congress appears to have expressed the philosophy that interference with the domestic law enforcement policies of foreign nations is not a proper aim for American assistance programs. Although it seems obvious that Congress intended to halt police training programs in foreign countries, the lack of precision in the wording of section 112 has allowed for the continuation of programs which circumvent this intent. Currently, at the Army School of the Americas, a Defense Department training school in the Panama Canal Zone, 1,340 military troops from 16 Latin American nations, partially supported by MAP funds, are being instructed in areas such as "urban counterinsurgency," "urban counterinsurgency operations," "internal development civic action," and "internal security operations." These courses seem to be providing the kind of knowledge and skills that can be used for police-type operations.

The Department of Defense has issued a memorandum (unclas 8226) containing its interpretation of section 112, which indicates how the intent of Congress has been misconstrued to allow for the continuation of these programs:

Assistance in foreign countries under the Foreign Assistance Act for all phases of civilian law enforcement (other than narcotics control) is prohibited. "Law enforcement" includes apprehension and control of political offenders and opponents of government in power (other than prisoners of war) as well as persons suspected of commission of so-called common crimes. Section 112 FAA does not prohibit assistance, pursuant to Sec 502 FAA to units whose sole function is that aspect of internal security which may involve combat operations against insurgents or legitimate self-defense of national territory against foreign invasion, whether or not such units are called police. "Assistance is, however, prohibited to units which have an on-going civilian law enforcement function as well as a combat function. . . . The prohibition does not apply to units which have a contingency function of supporting the police but which do not have any on-going civilian law enforcement functions.

Thus, according to DOD's interpretation of the law, military forces which serve an unofficial, non-ongoing civilian law enforcement function, are not prohibited from receiving U.S. aid or assistance for police training purposes.

In many Latin American nations the military plays a large role in civilian law enforcement practices. Although these duties may not be an official ongoing part of the military's responsibilities, these civilian police activities are, in fact, often performed by the military forces.

In May 1970 the Foreign Affairs Committee issued the "Report of the Special Study Mission on Military Assistance Training (Latin America)," which contains information on the civilian law enforcement functions of the military in the four countries they visited. Excerpts from the report, which follow, indicate the extent to which the military is, indeed, involved in civilian law enforcement:

Brazil: "Internal security is considered a prime mission for nearly all armed forces units, particularly the Army. While civilian police forces have the primary responsibility for responding to threats of public disorder, they are backed up by military forces as required. . . ."

. . . "traditional role of the Brazilian military in frontier and interior areas where it has engaged a significant part of its manpower and other resources on projects from which civic benefits result."

". . . the Brazilian military's concept of professionalism does not include staying out of politics."

Peru: "As for internal security, the Peruvian armed forces have proved their capabilities by crushing swiftly and effectively a Castroite uprising. Most officers have received some American training in doctrines of counterinsurgency. The emphasis which the United States military missions have given to civic action has been readily acceptable to the Peruvian military. Their own service schools have constantly stressed the importance of the military role in the 'social and economic progress' of the country."

Colombia: "U.S. civic action doctrine also has been generally accepted by the Colombian military. Top generals are convinced that if the insurgents are to be kept within manageable bounds, the populace must know and trust the army as a friend and protecter. Called "a civic action army" by members of the milgroup, the Colombian Armed Forces are engaged in a number of projects aimed at benefiting rural citizens."

Panama: "The internal security capabilities of the National Guard (which includes all the services) have been adequate to cope with the small insurgency organized by supporters of deposed President Arias which periodically surfaces near the Costa Rican border. Our milgroup has promoted increased involvement of the Panamanian forces in civic action. . . ."

Just this week, events in Chile demonstrated the continuing law enforcement role often played by the military in

Latin American countries. A military tribunal convicted 60 persons of essentially political crimes—sentencing four of them to death by firing squad—a stark example of how the military can easily become heavily involved in domestic criminal justice affairs.

All five of the countries mentioned above, whose military forces were involved in civilian law enforcement functions, are currently having troops trained at DOD's military training schools in the Canal Zone. The troops are being instructed in tactics which are easily adaptable, if not identical, to police functions, and which are of questionable relevance to legitimate military defense training. It is clear to me that the Department of Defense has taken advantage of the vague and imprecise wording of section 112 to instruct these military personnel in what are essentially police tactics.

Action needs to be taken to insure that the intent of Congress, with respect to police training, is fully carried out. Accordingly, section 112 of the Foreign Assistance Act should be refined to ban explicitly the kinds of police training activities which are being carried out by the Army School of the Americas in the Canal Zone. My amendment would add the following paragraph to section 112, offering a more specific definition of police training programs:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. —, OFFERED BY MR. HARRINGTON

Page 4, after line 22, insert the following new section:

SEC. 6. Section 112 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151j) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the term 'police training or related program' shall include any training or instruction of any individual relating (1) to that individual's performance of any law enforcement function in a governmental, unofficial, part-time, or full-time capacity, or (2) to that individual's participation in any operation of a police, civilian militia, or intelligence nature in support of a government against any insurgent forces operating against such government. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, this section shall not apply to any program which trains the military police of any of the armed forces of a foreign country solely for law enforcement activities within those armed forces."

This paragraph defines police training to include any training or instruction relating to an individual's participation in domestic law enforcement operations or domestic insurgency operations. It would deny police-related training to any individual who participates in such activities in any capacity—officially or unofficially, full time or part time. Adoption of this amendment would insure that the intent of Congress can no longer be circumvented by an interpretation of the law which excludes part-time police officers from the ban on police training in foreign countries.

My amendment makes no substantive changes in section 112. Rather, it defines the terms contained therein more precisely in order to avoid further misinterpretation and circumvention of congressional intent.

CARPOOLING FOR MINORITY SUBURBAN WORKERS URGED

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Planning Division of the Rhode Island Department of Transportation for their "Plan for the Conservation of Transportation Energy." The program is composed of a much heralded employer-based carpool program, plans for fringe parking construction and improvements to mass transit. It is financed by a $400,000 grant from the Federal Highway Administration.

It must be pointed out that regardless of oil company efforts to convince us otherwise, there is still a compelling need to conserve fuel; and there will always be a need to improve air quality in urban areas. The plan delineated by the Rhode Island DOT is a necessary and important step towards that end. I would recommend that anyone interested in this program contact either Lee Taylor or Francis Dutra of the Department of Transportation, Planning Division, State Office Building, Providence, Rhode Island 02903.

I include the following articles:

CAR POOLING FOR MINORITY SUBURBAN WORKERS URGED

A state-backed car pooling program could assist large suburban employers in meeting their quotas for hiring minorities, a spokesman for BIF Industries said yesterday.

Those comments were among the words of support given the program yesterday by the two employers who are already committed participants in the effort, BIF and Rhode Island Hospital Trust National Bank.

The car pooling plan, called a Transportation Assistance Program for Employers, was discussed during a meeting in the state house.

According to Gene Kopl, BIF spokesman, most minority persons live in Providence and have difficulty getting to plants in the suburbs. Car pooling and public transportation improvements, he said should make it easier to work outside the city.

He said the company's commuter trends reversed when it recently moved its plant from Providence to East Greenwich. Most BIF employees live in the city and commute. He said a trend of that sort will continue to grow even further when former Navy property at Quonset is turned over to industry.

Ronald Andsager, the Hospital Trust spokesman, said his company has taken the position that it cannot close its eyes to the real possibility of another energy crisis affecting the commuting habits of its employers coming into Providence.

The new state-backed program, he said, will provide Hospital Trust with a complete profile of its employes' transportation habits, the kind of transportation they use, public transit opportunities and other pertinent information. He said the car pool-transit effort could provide "an emergency backup transportation system in time of gasoline shortages similar to last winter's crisis."

Facing both companies in trying to solve their own commuter problems are what Andsager called "urban traffic and parking congestion and other transit problems well beyond our control."

GROWTH PATTERNS SEEN AFFECTING CAR POOLS

(By Paul A. Kelly)

The two committed employer participants in a big state-backed car pooling effort are facing the problem from opposite directions. One wants to get its city employes out to his plant in the suburbs while the other is concerned about bringing its workers into the city from their homes outside.

The two test participants are BIF Industries, which moved its plant from Providence to East Greenwich and Rhode Island Hospital Trust, which has most of its employes working in metropolitan Providence.

Their viewpoints on what has been labeled a Transportation Assistance Program for employers were explained by company spokesmen at a state house meeting on the car pooling effort yesterday.

Gene Kopf, BIF spokesman, said the commuting problems of that firm were turned around when it moved to East Greenwich. Many of its employes still live in the Providence area and find themselves commuting out to the suburbs to work while the general run of commuters are going the other way.

Kopf said this is a trend that has been growing as more industries have located in the suburbs. It will grow still more when new industries develop at former Navy property at Quonset Point, he said.

The BIF spokesman said the new employer transportation assistance program, emphasizing car pooling should help employers with equal employment opportunity goals. He said a problem with most minority groups is that they live in Providence and have difficulty getting to jobs in plants in the suburbs. Carpooling and public transit improvements should help them, he said, since it is tailored to improve transportation for those leaving their homes in the city to work outside as well as those commuting to city jobs.

Ronald Andsager, the Hospital Trust spokesman, said his company has taken the position that it cannot close its eyes to the real possibility of another energy crisis that could affect the commuting habits of its employes. He said the car pool-transit program can at least provide "an emergency back-up transportation system in time of gasoline shortages similar to last winter's crisis."

The new program, he said, will provide Hospital Trust with a complete profile of its employes' transportation habits, the kind of transportation they use, public transit opportunities and other pertinent information. He said that while his company has been looking for improved transportation services for its employes "it becomes a terribly complicated problem when you are contending with urban traffic and parking congestion and other transit problems well beyond our control."

TRANSIT PLAN

Commuters who drive back and forth to work—and their employers—should be introduced to the Rhode Island Action Plan developed by the state planning division. Its purposes are to conserve fuel, and to improve air quality in urban areas. These are familiar goals, true, but their importance has grown sharply because of the energy crisis and keener awareness of the importance of clean air.

The serious intent of the plan is underlined by substantial financial support—up to $400,000 from the Federal Highway Administration. The sum is probably the largest ever spent in Rhode Island on a transportation energy conservation project.

The plan's first phase—the Transportation

Assistance Program—begins this week. Participating with the state will be BIF Industries and Rhode Island Hospital Trust Corp., whose employe commuting "characteristics" will be analyzed by computers on the basis of questionnaires. Locations for car-pooling, bus pick-ups, fringe parking facilities, commuter rail service and bus routes also will be studied. Again, most of these transit study areas are familiar. But there should be some surprise when findings about transit service are related to in-depth analysis of commuter attitudes. Many commuters would perhaps leave cars at home, if express service minibuses were available.

Some Rhode Island firms do urge that employes ride buses. Textron workers received a modest subsidy for bus fare—one firm's attempt to reduce expressway congestion. Possibly BIF and Hospital Trust will add to knowledge about the auto use habit that has such an obvious grip on the commuter.

Expressway appearances during rush hours suggest that the scene never will change, that transit programs are destined to fail. Fortunately, in this state, the legislative outlook is not bleak. The sense of responsibility for reliable bus service is keener probably than in the past; witness the purchase of a private bus line with state funds. Also, taxpayers are awakening to their growing support of Transit Authority operations. The state administration refuses to give up a foot of rail trackage without a fight. And there is the specter of further gasoline shortages, and perhaps higher prices.

These concerns, with their significance for the environment and transportation, do relate to the Rhode Island Action Plan, and the employer transit assistance program. The need is to convince employers and workers to participate in transportation programs that are designed for more efficient energy use and for improving air quality.

NEWS RELEASE

BOSTON.— The Regional Administrator of of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency today commended the State of Rhode Island for its initiation of a statewide Carpool-Public Transit Program and urged the cooperation of industry.

In a letter to Governor Philip Noel, John A. S. McGlennon praised the Rhode Island Department of Transportation for establishing the computer carpooling system which is designed to reduce gasoline consumption, improve air quality through a decrease in vehicular traffic, ease traffic congestion, and provide dollar savings to those participating in the program.

Initially, the Carpool Program will be geared to the 4 largest employers throughout the state, or businesses employing at least 250 persons. Eventually the program may be broadened to smaller employers and individuals.

The Rhode Island Department of Transportation at present is testing the program at BIF Industries in East Greenwich and Rhode Island Hospital Trust Corporation in Providence. In August, the Department will open up the program to the 84 designated employers.

The funds for the Carpool Program were provided by a U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration grant of $400,000. While the Carpool Program uses less than one-fourth of this amount, the remainder of the grant will be used for construction of fringe parking facilities and improvements to mass transit.

"I am particularly encouraged to see Rhode Island approaching a computer carpooling system through an employer-based incentive program. Experience from other cities attempting similar projects has shown this program to be both efficient and manageable with the greatest record for success. The success, of course, depends to a large extent on business leaders promoting the program at their facilities," Mr. McGlennon said.

"We can expect that development of an effective carpool program can be of such significant value in reducing automobile associated air pollution that the necessity for strict transportation controls may be minimized for the Providence area. I urge the full cooperation of Rhode Island industry in this program," he concluded.

HOODWINKING—COAST TO COAST

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us are being besieged by organized group pressure to vote in favor of the use of taxpayers funds to finance the election campaigns of candidates for Federal office. Last week one of the most respected newspapers in Maryland, the Aegis, of Bel Air, published an editorial published. "Hoodwinking—Coast to Coast" pointing out the fiscal impact of such proposals. A poll conducted by me in my congressional district earlier this year showed that response to the question "Do you think that tax dollars should be used by the Government to finance the campaigns of candidates for public office?" showed the following results; yes, 26 percent; no, 63 percent; undecided, 9 percent.

I think it is well for us in the House to consider this aspect of Federal financing of elections as we come to the consideration of reform of our election laws.

The article follows:

HOODWINKING—COAST TO COAST

Millions of Americans put a mark inside of a box on their income tax report this year, signifying their intent to place one dollar of their tax payment for the past year into the campaign treasury for future candidates for national office. Many more millions did not choose to do this, meaning that they had to pay a higher income tax than the others.

The idea to raise funds with such a small sum from many people to help prevent obvious abuses which have occurred in past elections when large contributors received wholesale favoritism, is praiseworthy, but we still have doubts if the check-off on an income tax return is fair.

We certainly cannot believe that if, as the result of ten million individual returns signifying a desire to make a contribution to a political party, there has not been created a ten million dollar deficit in the federal budget. And who makes this up—the taxpayer who didn't wish to make the contribution, of course.

A far better way, it would seem, would have been for the political parties to spread the word about the importance of wholesale contributions by individuals and for the parties themselves to do the collecting, rather than Uncle Sam. Obviously, this method has long been available but it has not worked too well. It has usually been easier for a candidate to line up a few generous supporters, rather than scores of small ones.

And so, people in national office have decreed that this new opportunity be extended so that campaigners for national office will have heavier and wider backing. You and I pay and we're told it's a discount off our tax bill. But it really is an extra dollar for a contribution, just like the other guy's extra dollar for the national budget.

If there has to be a fair way to utilize the income tax return system, why not spell it out as an added dollar, over and above the income tax payment? Tell it like it is!

PUBLIC FINANCING'S LAST STAND

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a definite need for campaign reform in our political system. I have introduced two pieces of legislation which would reduce unnecessary campaign spending by linking the ceiling on campaign expenditures to the salary of the office for which the candidate is running. My bill would also propose that all contributions and the names of all contributors be disclosed to the public. The maximum allowable single contribution to a candidate for Federal office would be $5,000, and all cash contributions and in kind services would be prohibited. For my colleagues' interest, I wish to insert the following campaign reform article from the Chicago Tribune:

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 28, 1974]

PUBLIC FINANCING'S LAST STAND

The public campaign financing bill that went sailing thru the Senate has hit a brick wall in the form of Rep. Wayne Hays' House Administration Committee. As a substitute, Mr. Hays has produced a "compromise" measure that pleases no one and, as he may have calculated, stands little chance of passage.

It will be subject to amendment on the House floor, however, and the public financers, led by John Gardner's Common Cause, are preparing to restore most of the public financing provisions that passed the Senate.

The expected floor fight will undoubtedly be the last battle over public financing for some time to come.

The evils of public financing have been spelled out time and again.

It would encourage a multiplicity of candidates, cripple party organizations, and weaken a two-party system already in trouble because of Watergate-induced voter hostility toward all politicians.

It would force the taxpayers to subsidize the waste and extravagance of political campaigns and give them no voice in the allocation of their money. It would hand gobs of money to candidates who don't need it and intrude the federal burocracy into the entire election process.

According to the polls, American public opinion is turning against public financing.

To spark this last-ditch effort, Mr. Gardner has produced a voluminous report telling of the millions spent by special interest groups in the 1972 elections and the millions they have available for use this fall.

We don't dispute this. What we do reject is Mr. Gardner's apparent contention that public financing is the only alternative to election year influence purchasing and peddling and other forms of abuse.

The Senate Watergate Committee, which spent 17 months studying the problem firmly rejects the idea of public financing. In its final report, it said there are other more workable and less dangerous alternatives.

Among them are limitations on campaign spending, limits on the amount and sources of contributions, tighter reporting requirements, and increased tax credits to encourage small contributions.

It is far more sensible to try to correct the abuses in the present system, while preserving its advantages, than to scrap it in favor of a dubious alternative. In the meantime, we look to the House members, who in the past have listened more to their constituents than to reformers like Mr. Gardner, to show the same good sense and defeat this proposition.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, today, in considering the conference report on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, our primary responsibility lies in enacting legislation that will effectively expand the availability and quality of education for our Nation's youth.

The House Education and Labor Committee, on which I serve, worked diligently, in order to report legislation which would effectively improve as many near and far-reaching aspects of our educational system as possible. I could not, and did not, support certain specifics of H.R. 69 because of the disadvantages to my State of Connecticut. I did, however, support the general thrust of the legislation because of my interest in continuing our efforts to improve education. I also supported the effort in the House to insure the protection of the neighborhood school concept, to end the busing which has so badly divided our country.

The House antibusing version was strong; the Senate version lacked any such provision. Recognizing their responsibility to expedite the passage of sorely needed educational reform, the conferees from each body agreed to compromise toward a milder antibusing measure. I was extremely disappointed that the House efforts had been minimized, and I gave much thought toward voting against the conference report.

However, as I have felt in the past on other significant measures, to cast a vote against a major reform bill because of opposition to a single provision would do far more to harm than to benefit the entire situation.

Therefore, I am putting aside my personal feelings toward the busing issue in the context of this legislation. I am instead considering both the immediate and long-range educational needs of our schoolchildren and the fact that a vote against the conference report could be a profound setback for the improvement that has already occurred in our education system. In voting for the conference report on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I am not condoning the compromise of the neighborhood school concept, but I am strongly supporting the basic provisions of the measure we are considering, ones that will continue the constant improvement of our education and will bring us nearer our educational goals.

U.N. BODY MOVES TO TIGHTEN SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTHERN RHODESIA

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, throughout the long debate on the Rhodesian sanctions, it has been charged that sanctions have not been effective, with no one taking them seriously. This, it is said, is an argument for why the United States should not reimpose its sanctions against Rhodesia.

We now know that this is not true. In recent months, nations have taken steps, both individually and collectively, to tighten loopholes in the sanctions.

This has not been the only activity, however. Since the Security Council adopted resolutions 232—1966—and 253—1968—the United Nations has continued to study the problem of strengthening sanctions. In its resolution 333 passed on May 22, 1973, the Security Council called—

For the institution of "effective procedures at the point of importation to insure that such goods arriving for importation from South Africa, Mozambique and Angola are not cleared through customs until they are satisfied that the documentation is adequate and complete and to ensure that such procedures provide for the recall of cleared goods to customs custody if subsequently established to be of Southern Rhodesian origin;"

On governments to "encourage individuals and non-governmental organizations to report to the concerned bodies reliable information regarding sanctions breaking operations;"

On "states with legislation permitting importation of minerals and other products from Southern Rhodesia to repeal it immediately;"

Upon "states to enact and enforce immediately legislation providing for imposition of severe penalties on persons natural or juridicial that evade or commit breach of sanctions by:

"1. Importing any goods from Southern Rhodesia.

"2. Exporting any goods to Southern Rhodesia.

"3. Providing any facilities for transport of goods to and from Southern Rhodesia.

"4. Conducting or facilitating any transaction or trade that may enable Southern Rhodesia to obtain from or send to any country any goods or services.

"5. Continuing to deal with clients in South Africa, Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and Namibia after it has become known that the clients are re-exporting the goods in components thereof to Southern Rhodesia, or that goods received from such clients are of Southern Rhodesian origin."

On "states in the event of their trading with South Africa and Portugal, to provide that purchase contracts with these countries should clearly stipulate, in a manner legally enforceable, prohibition of dealing in goods of Southern Rhodesian origin; likewise, sales contracts with these countries should include a prohibition of resale or re-export of goods to Southern Rhodesia;"

Upon "States to pass legislation forbidding insurance companies under their jurisdiction from covering air flights into and out of Southern Rhodesia and individuals or air cargo carried on them;"

Upon "states to undertake appropriate legislative measures to ensure that all valid marine insurance contracts contain specific provisions that no goods of Southern Rhodesia shall be covered;"

Upon "states to inform the committee of the Security Council on their present sources of supply and quantities of chrome, asbestos, nickel, pig iron, tobacco, meat, and sugar, together with the quantities of these goods they obtained from Southern Rhodesia before the application of sanctions."

Thus, Mr. Speaker, since the above resolutions steadily tighten the sanctions, and as more and more countries pay stricter attention to enforcement, the end of the illegal Smith regime is in sight. Therefore, unless my colleagues wish to back a clearly lost cause and risk the alienation of black African countries—upon which we are dependent for many raw materials—I would urge that they vote in favor of S. 1868—a bill to restore full U.S. compliance with the U.N. sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

SENATE—*Thursday, August 1, 1974*

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, we thank Thee for the night of rest and the opportunities of this new day. In this hallowed moment may Thy Holy Spirit invade our hearts to empower us for our labors. In the crucial days of soul searching, conscience testing, and scrutiny of character help us to be true to truth, true to self, true to those we love, and true to Thee. May the stains upon the few never blemish the virtues of the many. With thanksgiving for all that is good in the past, and with forgiveness for all that is wrong in the present, lead our Nation to a new commitment to Thy law and give us grace to press forward, whatever the cost, to the moral and spiritual renewal of the Republic.

We pray in His name whose law is love. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).