

By Mr. FOUNTAIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. STEELMAN, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 16225. A bill to provide authority to expedite procedures for consideration and approval of projects drawing upon more than one Federal assistance program, to simplify requirements for operation of those projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FRENZEL (for himself and Mr. FREY):

H.R. 16226. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income taxation for condominium housing associations and certain homeowners' associations and to tax the unrelated business income of such organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 16227. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to the payment of pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 16228. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to broaden the planning and operating capabilities of the various States receiving grants under that act so that they might better manage the development of energy-related activities in their coastal zones; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HEINZ:

H.R. 16229. A bill to amend the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973 to exempt from its provisions the period from the 1st Sunday in October 1974, through the last Sunday in February 1975, and to extend the period for the submission of the final report to Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Oklahoma:

H.R. 16230. A bill calling for a domestic summit to develop a united plan of action to restore stability and prosperity to the American economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16231. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 16232. A bill to amend the Lower Saint Croix Act of 1972 by increasing the authorization; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 16233. A bill to amend sections 202 and 203 of title 3, United States Code, to provide for the protection of foreign diplomatic missions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. BURKE of California, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. EILBERG, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MUR-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PHY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROYBAL, Ms. SCHROEDER, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 16234. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to permit Federal, State, and local officers and employees to take an active part in political management and in political campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, and Mr. PHILLIP BURTON):

H.R. 16235. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to permit Federal, State, and local officers and employees to take an active part in political management and in political campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York (for himself, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. SPENCE):

H.R. 16236. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer ownership of two naval vessels no longer needed by the Navy to the city of New York, N.Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 16237. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 16238. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to permit the possession by taxidermists of certain migratory birds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNG of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. McCOLLISTER, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, and Mr. ANNUNZIO):

H.R. 16239. A bill to provide for regulation of business franchises, to require a full disclosure of the nature of interests in business franchises, to provide for increased protection of the public interest in the sale of business franchises, and to provide for fair competition in the negotiation of franchise agreements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 16243. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.J. Res. 1104. Joint resolution to extend by 62 days the expiration date of the Export Administration Act of 1969; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KETCHUM (for himself, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. STARK, Mr. TALCOTT, and Mr. VESEY):

H. Con. Res. 575. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that regulations, requiring a statement of ingredients on bottles of distilled spirits and wine, be not promulgated until Congress has considered the matter fully; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYROS (for himself, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. YATRON):

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DR. ARTHUR A. SMITH ON INFLATION

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I just read a recent survey that said 70

percent of the American people consider inflation the top problem in America.

So many times we pass over inflation lightly. We refuse to realize that the major cause of inflation is right here in Congress. We in Congress are overspending the Nation's budget. Our continued overspending and our continued deficit financing are accentuating and accelerating our inflation difficulties.

H. Con. Res. 576. Concurrent resolution calling for the removal of all foreign forces from Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts):

H. Res. 1284. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the U.S. Government should seek agreement with other members of the United Nations on prohibition of weather modification activity as a weapon of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. Res. 1285. 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. WHALEN:

H. Res. 1286. Resolution providing for television and radio coverage of proceedings in the Chamber of the House of Representatives on any resolution to impeach the President of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YATES (for himself, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LITTON, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. HANNA, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. DULKSI, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. McCOLLISTER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. BYRON, Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina, Mr. ROSE, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. HORTON):

H. Res. 1287. Resolution providing for television and radio coverage of proceedings in the Chamber of the House of Representatives on any resolution to impeach the President of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 16240. A bill to incorporate in the District of Columbia the American Ex-Prisoners of War; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. HOLT:

H.R. 16241. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in the District of Columbia to the Greater Southeast Community Hospital Foundation, Inc., to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 16242. A bill for the relief of Colene D. Ziesman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

465. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Inter-Tribal Council of the Five Civilized Tribes, Tahlequah, Okla., relative to Government intervention in the Navajo-Hopi land dispute, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

We are looking for easy answers. We would rather not have any answers at all and just shut our eyes and hope that it will go away. But inflation is not going away, and it is continuing to get worse.

Let me give you some realistic facts. In the Sunday, July 28, issue of the Dallas Times Herald they had an interesting article by their economic consultant, Dr. Arthur A. Smith. Dr. Smith writes for

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the Times Herald at this time. Before this he was the economist and vice president of the First National Bank in Dallas. At one time he was the head of the economics department at Southern Methodist University. Here is a man who knows the theory and knows the practical side—but what is important is he knows the facts.

Dr. Smith brought out in his article so clearly the fact that it is the poor people and the plain solid average citizen who is getting hit the worst with inflation. Let me quote exactly what Dr. Arthur A. Smith said in the Dallas Times Herald:

We have not yet felt the full impact of the ill effects of inflation. When we do, the jolt will be a severe strain on our economic and political system.

We tolerated for many years small annual rates of inflation, listening to the false doctrine even from high sources that some inflation is good for the economy and that we must have inflation to keep unemployment down.

Now in 1974 we are about to pay for the joyride we have taken. The worst of inflation is beginning to exert itself. Here are some manifestations in the consumer category:

(1) Inflation is reducing the buying power of the masses and lowering their standard of living. Working people's real earnings are 4½ per cent, lower now than a year ago, even though their dollar earnings are up. That much has been lost in the race between rising prices and rising wages.

(2) Retired persons living on fixed pensions and retirement benefits have suffered even worse. They have had a reduction of not less than 10 per cent in buying power in the past year.

(3) Low income families who must spend every cent on food and bare essentials are hardest hurt of all because prices have risen relatively more for them than for any other income category.

(4) Families heavily in debt are beginning to feel the pinch of incomes lagging behind inflation and in time will have to decide where to cut spending in order to meet installment payments or else default. Payment delinquencies as well as outright defaults have been increasing lately.

(5) Thrifty persons who have managed to save have witnessed the buying power of their savings being eaten away over the years by inflation and now they face the realization that what they have saved for is beyond the reach of their accumulations.

HON. TALBOT "SANDY"
D'ALEMBERTE

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Municipal Record in the issue of July 1974 reports that the Honorable Talbot "Sandy" D'Alemberte was named the prominent personality of the month by the Florida League of Cities. Mr. D'Alemberte has had a distinguished record in the legislature and in public service in Florida but his challenging opportunity for public service now derives from his having been recently appointed chairman of the newly created Florida Ethics Commission, a subject in

which we in the Congress are keenly interested. I insert the citation of this distinguished public servant and friend in the RECORD following my remarks:

THIS MONTH THE FLORIDA LEAGUE OF CITIES
SALUTES HON. TALBOT "SANDY" D'ALEMBERTE

This month the Florida League of Cities takes great pleasure in naming the Honorable Talbot "Sandy" D'Alemberte as our Prominent Personality for this month. Mr. D'Alemberte, a past member of the Florida House of Representatives, was born in Tallahassee and now lives in Miami. He was educated at the University of the South, the University of London, and received his LL.B. from the University of Florida School of Law in 1962. He received many honors, including the Florida Blue Key, and has published numerous articles. He is married to the former Lyn Sears of Davenport, Iowa, and they have a daughter. He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1966 and served until 1972. During his tenure of office he received the Allen Morris awards, "Most Outstanding First-session Member of the House, 1967," and "Second Most Effective in Committee, 1969." He was nominated in 1969 and 1970 for the St. Petersburg Times award, "Most Valuable Member of the House."

The newly-appointed Florida Ethics Commission recently held an organizational meeting in Tallahassee, and upon nomination by former Supreme Court Justice Harris Drew, seconded by former Governor LeRoy Collins, Mr. D'Alemberte was unanimously elected Chairman.

With the establishment of this Commission came its responsibility to administer, among other matters, the 1974 legislation, Chapter 74-177, Laws of Florida, requiring financial disclosure by more than 10,000 municipal officers and candidates and tens of thousands of other public officers and candidates. It is because of the far-reaching responsibility of the Commission that we feature the Chairman, Mr. Sandy D'Alemberte, as our Prominent Personality for July.

Sandy D'Alemberte has been instrumental in many significant municipal issues during his past legislative career. He was a leader in the forces to: (1) tighten property tax exemption and reform the assessment procedures; (2) remove ad valorem assessment and collection from cities to counties; (3) revise Article V of the State Constitution to streamline the State court system; and (4) install the 10-mill cap and the development of the State revenue sharing program.

In addition, he was intimately involved in the development and adoption of the 1968 Constitution of Florida, and was in the forefront of the battle for the reorganization of the Legislative and Executive branches of Florida's government.

Mr. D'Alemberte is a determined competitor and a knowledgeable individual with an obvious desire to understand and respond to the public interest. We believe, from our many years of acquaintance, that he will chair the affairs of the Ethics Commission in a fair and impartial manner, and will continue to earn the respect and admiration of many Floridians in meeting this challenging mandate.

THE CHALLENGE FOR VOCATIONAL
REHABILITATION

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House a statement by

August 1, 1974

James S. Dwight, Jr., Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service, and Dr. Andrew S. Adams, Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration.

This joint statement explores both the short-term and the long-range directions for the rehabilitation effort in the United States and outlines the challenges facing us in this field.

I am sure this statement will be of very real interest to everyone who is concerned about meeting the needs of vocational rehabilitation in this country:

STATEMENT BY JAMES S. DWIGHT, JR., ADMINISTRATOR, SRS, AND ANDREW S. ADAMS, COMMISSIONER, RSA

In the years immediately ahead, vocational rehabilitation will undertake a much more difficult and complex role than it has in the past. We see that future as a time of very special challenge for vocational rehabilitation, and we are well advanced toward plans to meet that challenge.

Rehabilitation has been a successful concept for more than a half century, but it cannot be satisfied with past laurels alone. As with every aspect of life, vocational rehabilitation must continue to examine its goals and techniques and find ways to adapt them to changing conditions. In the remaining years of the 1970's, this means greater focus on the quality of rehabilitation, on providing more opportunities for participation in the rehabilitation process to persons receiving services, and on stronger efforts to place more rehabilitated persons in gainful employment, an area in which we have not been as successful as we would like.

Through these initiatives, we believe we can provide a basic set of freedoms and human rights to all physically and mentally handicapped persons. These fundamental rights are:

Employment;
Education;
Housing;
Transportation;
Use of Public Accommodations;
Recreation;
Health Care; and
Access to Cast an Election Ballot.

These are essential freedoms that should be available to all Americans, regardless of handicaps.

On May 28, we took a major step toward assuring those rights for handicapped Americans when we published proposed regulations for implementing the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. As soon as all comments on those regulations are received, we will evaluate them for possible inclusion in the final regulations, which we will publish later this summer.

The new regulations encompass significant new directions for vocational rehabilitation. They focus, particularly, on severely handicapped persons and on increasing consumer involvement in rehabilitation policy and in the design and delivery of services. These new emphases, which Congress placed in the Act, will have a direct effect on the rehabilitation services provided at the State and community levels.

In fiscal year 1975, we will greatly increase services for severely handicapped persons, in response to the new rehabilitation legislation. This means greater attention to quality of services rather than quantity. Meeting the needs of severely handicapped persons will involve longer periods of service per rehabilitation, more money per individual, and more manpower to provide service. We will do everything possible to prevent a significant drop in the aggregate number of persons served. However, this obviously is going to affect State reports, which may look as if less rehabilitation is being provided.

We already have evidence of this trend as a direct result of the priority given to rehabilitation of severely handicapped persons in the current fiscal year. It will require understanding and teamwork among all of those involved in the rehabilitation process to bring about an orderly transition.

Another provision of the new Act is to involve consumers increasingly in the total process of rehabilitation, a process from which they have been excluded too long. The rehabilitation program cannot be shaped in a vacuum from which the handicapped are barred. Handicapped individuals are not contagious; they are not threats to people without handicaps. They are persons whom fate has chosen to bear greater burdens than the rest of us, and they have a legitimate claim on equal rights, including a voice in their own future.

They must be involved to the fullest extent possible in their own rehabilitation programs. Their counsel must be sought on programs that deal with all aspects of rehabilitation, including such matters as architectural barriers, transportation and attitudinal barriers. We believe handicapped persons are too valuable a resource to be ignored in planning the total rehabilitation process.

Our new regulations, therefore, propose to involve consumers in each and every step of their own rehabilitation programs. We recognize that States may have to make administrative changes to achieve this important gain for consumers. Under the proposed regulations, consumers must have opportunities to select services that will help them and to work with rehabilitation counselors in developing individualized programs of rehabilitation.

The regulations also propose to involve consumers in State rehabilitation policy and in the design and delivery of services. We believe it is time for consumers to have maximum feasible participation in policy development. Both States and consumers will benefit from this—consumers because they will have a better understanding of State administrative problems, and States because they will realize more than they do now about the problems of handicapped persons.

The new regulations also require that State VR agencies develop affirmative action hiring policies for handicapped persons to set an example for the rest of the State. When these regulations take effect, we will be evaluating State efforts to serve severely handicapped persons very carefully.

Because we believe such policies should be developed for nationwide implementation by the States, we firmly endorse the same measures within our own agency. We refer specifically to our current efforts to employ qualified handicapped people for positions within SRS as they become available. The importance of this has been demonstrated by the appointment of the Commissioner of Rehabilitation Services. Indeed, such handicapped persons are more than executives. They become symbols for all handicapped people, demonstrating that they, too, may seek unlimited opportunities when reaching for occupational goals.

Another part of our effort is directed toward developing a strong program for employment of handicapped persons throughout all parts of the Federal Government. An Interagency Committee on Handicapped Employees has been formed to assure proper and forceful application of policies to increase employment of handicapped persons. We are working very closely in this project with HEW Under Secretary Frank Carlucci, who is co-chairman of the Committee, and Jayne Spain.

We also support strongly the elimination of architectural barriers that block ease of access for handicapped persons. Everyone should have the right of access to buildings, vehicles and other facilities. This becomes

critical for handicapped persons whose employment opportunities would be greater if barriers were removed.

To set an example for others, we have initiated a comprehensive renovation of our headquarters, the Mary E. Switzer Building, to make it one of the most accessible buildings in the country for handicapped persons.

This year, as has been the case for the past six years, the Advertising Council, Inc., of New York City, has renewed our request for the only national advertising campaign for all categories of handicapped people. The campaign is a fine example of the cooperative efforts of business, industry, State and Federal governments, and the various communications media. It is recognized as one of the 25 top public service campaigns in the nation.

The emphasis this year will be on sound rehabilitation, particularly for severely handicapped people, that can lead to dignified and productive lives. Our expectation is that this year's program will develop a thrust which will produce a more favorable employment outlook for handicapped persons.

The immediate future also will see increased funding for expansion grants and greater emphasis on application of past research and demonstration projects. These plans include:

Turning over to States the results of our Projects with Industry concept and encouraging them to adopt this approach in State programs. The Projects with Industry concept, which directly involves the private sector in creating employment opportunities for handicapped persons, has developed techniques leading to more suitable placements at less cost than the traditional Federal/State program. The placement rate for this program is 65 percent, compared with the traditional program's rate of 28 percent. The companies in the program know that rehabilitated persons make excellent employees, highly motivated, with an investment in their future. We need to utilize this unique source of manpower to a greater extent.

The suitability of placing handicapped employees within State agencies other than rehabilitation agencies also can be demonstrated.

Another grant we awarded this year was for the establishment of a National Industries for the Severely Handicapped, a counterpart to that already in existence for blind persons. Its purpose is to spur employment growth through the production of government-used products and services in special workshops which will be given preference in the award of contracts.

We also have provided a grant to set up organizations to encourage technical competence among handicapped persons. This is expected to provide transitional employment to provide such persons a bridge into private industry and State employment. This important study, to be completed in fiscal year 1975, will examine the role of sheltered workshops in sharpening the techniques and skills of handicapped persons, and it will provide specialists in rehabilitation work and in industry with a better knowledge of what can be done by rehabilitated persons.

These proposals represent a major step forward in our effort to insure full implementation of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. In the years immediately ahead, everyone in the rehabilitation field at every level will have clear guidelines for the development of procedures to carry out the Act and provide quality rehabilitation services to handicapped people throughout the country.

In this revitalized effort, we look forward to the continuing support of consumers, professionals and interested volunteers in achieving these new objectives for vocational rehabilitation. Their experience and knowledge makes them prime candidates to provide leadership in developing a national

program for severely disabled persons, for increased involvement of consumers and for greater employment of rehabilitated persons.

We look to them for more than the provision of services of individuals who are handicapped. We expect them to fulfill their broader mission of influencing and educating people on the need for these new directions.

Persons in the field of vocational rehabilitation have long demonstrated their ability to blend Federal and State resources with local and voluntary efforts to meet important human needs. We now look forward to their pioneering of other ways to meet the new program goals.

Working together, we can make the newly constituted vocational rehabilitation program a shining example of State-Federal service. We hope you will agree with our assessment of the exciting challenges ahead and join us in supporting the present direction of the United efforts of the Social and Rehabilitation Service and the Rehabilitation Services Administration toward improved rehabilitation services for our Nation's handicapped.

ARNOLD LEVIE DAY

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, how rare to become "Alumnus of the Year," 64 years after graduation.

Arnold Levien of Cooper Union is—and I am proud to say he is also the youngest in spirit of any resident of Florida's 13th Congressional District.

Arnold Levien earned this honor, not as we do in Congress because of seniority, not just because of a lifetime of personal accomplishments and creative business developments, but primarily because he has targeted his spirit and his energy toward the service of his fellow man.

For all these reasons, it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD, the Arnold Levien Day proclamation of metropolitan Dade County.

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas: Arnold Levien has reached the young age of 84 after a full life as a philanthropist, humanitarian and benefactor, and as a good neighbor and friend to all who know him, and

Whereas: During his long span of life, to mention a few of his philanthropies, he was a founder of the Albert Einstein Medical College, is deeply involved in the success of Brandeis University, and in Dade County, is a founder of the Miami Beach Taxpayers Association, and an ardent supporter of the Bascom-Palmer Eye Clinic of Jackson Memorial Hospital, and

Whereas: Arnold Levien has had a leading career as a builder and developer and his four sons, Arthur, Henry, Edward and Robert have followed in his footsteps and have made a tremendous impact in the construction industry in both Dade County and other areas of the United States, and

Whereas: His Alma Mater, Cooper Union College of New York, in recognition of his philanthropies and technical ability, will bestow upon him the signal honor of being selected "Alumnus of the Year" on February 17, 1974.

Now, therefore: Be it resolved that I, John B. Orr, Jr., mayor of metropolitan Dade County, Florida, do hereby proclaim Sunday, February 17, 1974, as "Arnold Levien Day."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

August 1, 1974

In observance thereof: I call upon the people of Metropolitan Dade County to join with me in honoring a man who has assumed many responsibilities successfully for and with his community in mind and who has earned therefore the plaudits of his college.

AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT LIMITING CIA INTERVENTION IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am offering amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act limiting CIA covert operations which manipulate and intervene in the internal affairs of foreign countries.

I consider the Foreign Assistance Act the natural piece of legislation for attaching these amendments. For there can be no doubt that when the CIA intervenes in the internal affairs of foreign countries, the CIA is usurping Congress' role and responsibility for formulating foreign policy. Such executive abuses of power must now be ended.

In the last couple of months, particular attention has been given to unlawful CIA intervention into this country's domestic affairs. CIA intervention into the domestic affairs of foreign countries is simply the other side of the coin and deserves equal congressional attention. Such intervention is equally illegal and is a manifestation of the same drive for unchecked power on the part of the executive branch of Government.

This committee should feel a particular obligation to limit CIA activities which intervene in the internal affairs of foreign countries. As reported in the Washington Post on October 21, 1973, CIA Director Colby in hearings on the Chilean coup told me that he would not testify before this committee to specific CIA operations. Yet, it is this committee which formulates foreign policy. If the CIA will not tell us exactly how and in what respects the CIA is influencing foreign policy, this committee's only choice is to prevent the CIA to the extent possible from anyway affecting foreign policy determinations. The CIA now enjoys the best of both worlds. It tells of its intervention in foreign policy only to those Members of Congress either not interested or experienced in formulating foreign policy; on the other hand, it tells those Members interested and experienced in formulating foreign policy that CIA meddling into foreign affairs is none of their business. This clearly cannot continue.

I envision these amendments as only a first step in regaining for the Foreign Affairs Committee power over the CIA's direction of foreign policy. Certainly, full support should be given to that part of the Bolling committee reforms which give the Foreign Affairs Committee some

oversight powers in regard to the CIA. Independently, it is also necessary to work for reform which will create a CIA oversight committee which would include members of Foreign Affairs and would have the necessary powers to prevent CIA abuses of its charter.

According to President Truman, whose administration created the CIA, the agency was intended to gather, centralize and analyze intelligence and was never intended to be a "peacetime cloak-and-dagger operation." The National Security Act of 1947 authorizing the CIA gave it permission to engage only in those activities "related to intelligence." Yet, the evidence is clear that the CIA in conjunction with the National Security Council has taken upon itself the role of directing a secret foreign policy distinct from the one authorized by Congress.

Almost from its inception, the CIA has arrogated to itself the power to secretly intervene in the internal affairs of foreign countries. According to a series of articles written collectively by the New York Times correspondents Tom Wicker, Max Frankel, Bud Kenworthy, and John Finney and published in the Times from April 25-28, 1966, in the early 1950's, the CIA funded defeated Chinese Nationalists and encouraged them to raid Communist China. In Guatemala, the article noted that the CIA has admitted that it funded and engineered the revolution against the Communist-oriented President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman. As is well documented, the Bay of Pigs operation was planned by the CIA.

According to the Times, it is now documented that the CIA operated the Philippine campaign against Huk guerrillas. The CIA organized an unsuccessful coup against President Sukarno of Indonesia in 1958. According to Vincent Marchetti's book, "The CIA, the Cult of Intelligence," the CIA spent an excessive amount of energy in hunting down Che Guevara in 1966-67. All of these operations clearly affected this country's foreign policy.

In Chile, according to an April 6, 1973, Washington Post article by Laurence Stern quoting knowledgeable official sources, major intervention by the CIA helped to defeat Allende in the 1964 election for President. The CIA funded trade unions, farmer organizations, student groups, and the media in order to defeat and discredit Allende. According to testimony given before a Senate subcommittee and printed in the October 21, 1973, Washington Post, the CIA earmarked \$400,000 to support anti-Allende news media shortly before the election. In testimony before this committee and printed in the Washington Post, Director Colby refused to say that this money was not spent. The latest CIA manipulative attempt exposed by the press and admitted by the Government was the faking of a letter to Bangkok government by a CIA agent. The agent accredited the letter to a guerrilla leader in order to discredit him.

CIA interference in other countries' internal affairs through military assist-

ance has also been egregious and documented. The CIA has now admitted that it armed, trained, and operated an army of Meo tribesmen in Laos during the 1960's. The Times articles on April 25-28, 1966, documented that the CIA supplied pilots, mechanics, and aircraft to the government of Moise Tshombe in the Congo.

CIA involvement in training the military and police forces of other countries has also recently come to light. In Jack Anderson's column of October 8, 1973, he exposed the existence of papers possessed by Senator ABOUREZK which documented that the CIA was training foreign policemen under the auspices of AID in a remote desert camp in Texas. Foreign countries being trained included Chile, Brazil, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Bolivia, and Uruguay. The CIA taught these policemen the use of explosives, electric priming, electric firing devices, explosive charges, and booby traps.

That the CIA is still involved in these operations today is evident. A pattern of intervention in the internal affairs of foreign countries has been clear since the creation of the CIA. There is no reason to believe that the CIA has suddenly stopped these activities. Moreover, according to Marchetti, 1,800 CIA agents are still working in the covert activities unit of the CIA—engaged in financing youth, labor, cultural groups, operating clandestine radio propaganda outlets, and conducting large-scale efforts to influence foreign elections. Andrew Hamilton, former program analyst for the National Security Council, reported in the September 1973 edition of the Progressive that according to informed sources the 1971 CIA budget continued at about \$100 million for covert operations in 1971.

Finally, it should be briefly noted that not only is there the abundance of evidence mentioned previously tying the CIA to the formulation of foreign policy, but there is also evidence that some CIA funding comes directly from FAA money. First, there are the police training programs already mentioned. Marchetti reports in his book that AID's Public Safety Division regularly provides cover for CIA operatives all over the world. In addition, the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee revealed that the Laotian war was financed from the budgets of AID and DOD.

These amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act limiting CIA activities offer Congress an opportunity to reassert those powers, which through neglect, have been usurped by the CIA.

LINDY BOGGS COMMENDS CAP TRIO

HON. LINDY BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my heartfelt appreciation and personal commendation to three members of the

Polaris Group Civil Air Patrol in Anchorage, Alaska, who recently were honored for their efforts to locate my husband, the former House majority leader, and Congressman Nick Begich, whose plane was lost in a flight over Alaska in 1972.

Receiving the Meritorious Service Award for their part in one of the longest and most intensive searches ever conducted by the Civil Air Patrol were Maj. Dale Jepson, his wife, Capt. Diane Jepson, and 1st Lt. Ralph Thomas. These public servants were among the members of the Polaris Group that participated in 444 sorties in 310 aircraft to make a total of 1,074 flight hours in a search which lasted from October 16 to November 24, 1972.

During that period, I had the distinct pleasure of visiting Merrill Field in Anchorage and meeting with this outstanding threesome. I was keenly impressed by their competence and expertise, and am immensely grateful for the services they have performed. I would like to extend my special gratitude to Captain Jepson who so kindly escorted me throughout Merrill Field during the search period, and allowed my inspection of the equipment used in the probe. She also made available to me numerous files of many earlier, successful searches in the area.

At this time, I would also like to commend Members of Congress, especially those who have belonged or now belong to Civil Air Patrol units, for their recognition of the importance of CAP projects and training programs. Men and women throughout the Nation are involved in various CAP programs, and the services they perform for our citizenry are worthy of our support and approval. It would behoove us all to continue to conduct our legislative affairs in a manner conducive to maintaining and enhancing our commitment to Civil Air Patrol endeavors. Certainly our entire country will reap the benefits of such action.

KING CAUCUS

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

MR. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, during my tenure in this House, there has been a trend toward greater and greater openness—toward fewer executive sessions of committees, toward more clarity in telling the people what their Government is doing.

We are just now in the process of making the executive branch more open to the people's inquiry and study.

Unfortunately, at the same time, an adverse trend back to secrecy has been gaining a foothold in the House—not among all of us, but rather in some Democratic circles. My colleague from Illinois, JOHN B. ANDERSON, wrote about this threat to good government in yesterday's Chicago Tribune. I insert his statement in the RECORD:

CXX—1667—Part 20

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SPECTER OF RULE BY CAUCUS

(By John B. Anderson)

The chief deputy whip in the House of Representatives, Rep. John Brademas [D., Ind.], recently advised the nation's governors they should start thinking about the prospect of what he termed "congressional government" in the next two years—a situation in which a House controlled by 300 Democrats [there are now 247] would confront a much-weakened Presidency.

If the Democratic prescription for "congressional government" is filed at the polls this fall, this country could well be launched on a backward course to the "New Deal—Great Society" eras in terms of domestic policy—a new proliferation of inflationary federal grant programs, and a corresponding elimination of "New Federalism" programs of decentralization, including the repeal of federal revenue-sharing with state and local governments. Such legislative directions will predictably be charted by a "veto-proof," Democratic-controlled "congressional government."

But a second consideration is how the Congress itself will change the manner in which it processes legislation. I think there is cause for serious concern about the potential impact of "congressional government."

In 1885, an obscure professor at Johns Hopkins University, Woodrow Wilson, wrote "Congressional Government: A Study in American Politics." In his book Wilson advocated a Congress patterned after the British parliamentary system: Congressional committees would be composed solely of members of the majority party, subject to strict disciplinary actions if they deviated from the party line.

Perhaps not coincidentally, Wilson's prescription for congressional government came closest to fulfillment during his tenure as President of the United States. Historians record the period 1911–1915 as the era of secret "King Caucus."

Democrats took control of the House in the fall elections of 1910. The new Democratic speaker of the House was Champ Clark of Missouri, but the real power behind the throne of King Caucus was Oscar Underwood of Alabama, who was both the House majority leader and chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee and the party committee which selected members for all House committees.

Underwood exercised his considerable powers thru the Democratic Caucus in the House which passed resolutions right and left instructing committees on what bills they would and would not consider, and instructing Democratic members how to vote on floor amendments.

History has a way of repeating itself, and we are already beginning to witness the re-emergence of King Caucus in the House today, a development which is bound to be accelerated if the Democrats should control 300 seats in the next Congress.

While the Democrats have only resorted once in recent years to the caucus two-thirds vote rule to bind members' votes on the House floor, they are now employing a more subtle device to restore the iron-grip of King Caucus over the legislative process: issuing binding instructions to Democratic members on committees with respect to legislation under consideration. This procedure, which was used most effectively during the Underwood regime, requires only a majority vote of those present in a caucus.

What this means is that if only a bare quorum or half the total Democratic House membership was present in a caucus, as few as 63 Democrats could constitute a majority vote for the purpose of issuing binding instructions to Democratic members of committees.

The most recent example of King Caucus occurred on May 15 when the caucus, by a voice vote, instructed both the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and the members of the Rules Committee, to make only two Democratic amendments in order to an oil tax bill reported from the Ways and Means Committee.

Because both the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and some Democrats on the Rules Committee are not happy with these instructions and a fierce intra-party battle is now raging as to whether they are binding, the measure has not yet been cleared for floor action, and the American people are being denied the "windfall profits tax" in oil companies which they hold has been promised by April.

More of the same can be expected in the next Congress if the Democrats are given their "congressional government" of 300 Democrats in the House. The American people should consider well what this might mean to our representative democracy as we know it.

Finally, one must remember that King Caucus reigns in secrecy, behind closed doors. If the legislative business of the country is permitted to be dictated from behind closed caucus doors, I fear there will be further erosion of confidence in Congress at a time when it is already at one of its lowest points in history.

OLDER AMERICANS COMMUNITY SERVICES EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM IMPLEMENTED AS CONGRESS INTENDED

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

MR. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the rush of other business may at times cause us to overlook the small steps by which government is made truly responsive and programs executed as we in Congress intended. Just this month, the employment program for older Americans is getting underway after narrowly escaping destruction, and I rise with pleasure to mark another victory against what our distinguished colleague in the other body, the junior Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK) has called Operation Mangle of the Nixon administration.

Mr. Speaker, the older American community service employment program, of which I am speaking, was begun as a demonstration as part of Operation Mainstream under authority of the Economic Opportunity Act. Through national contractors, thousands of jobs were developed for older workers. While Operation Mainstream continued, the Select Education Subcommittee, which I have the honor to chair, helped develop separate legislation which finally became law last year to give this program its own separate identity and a permanent basis as title IX of the Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments of 1973, Public Law 93-29.

Despite the intent of both the House and the Senate that the 1974 appropriation of \$10 million for title IX go to continue the work of the successful national

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

contractors who had operated the Mainstream demonstrations, the Labor Department announced that it had, unilaterally, decided to allocate the funds to the States.

When I first heard of this intention, which gave the appearance of an effort to end the role of the national contractors without any replacements of equal competence, I wrote Assistant Secretary of Labor William Kolberg, and I shall include my letter later in these remarks.

The Labor Department persisted in its intention until almost the end of the fiscal year, ignoring explicit language in reports of both Houses of Congress directing that the national contractors be used to begin the employment program. Only after a final warning from the conference committee on the second supplemental 1974 Labor-HEW appropriation bill, did the Labor Department recant its intentions.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the Labor Department is now going ahead with contracts to the national organizations that have done such a fine job with the older worker programs so far: National Farmers' Union, National Council of Senior Citizens, National Retired Teachers Association, National Council on Aging, and the U.S. Forest Service. The final regulations reflecting this shift of views, reported in the letter from Assistant Secretary Kolberg, which I shall also insert in the RECORD, were published in the June 10, 1974, Federal Register.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all my colleagues will be gratified to know that once again the Nixon administration has been caught in the act of dismantling—consciously or otherwise—an excellent program to serve one of America's vulnerable groups. Only the most vigorous work by Members and interested citizens has averted what might have been another Operation Mangle.

I insert in the RECORD at this point the text of the two letters to which I have referred.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION,
April 25, 1974.

Mr. WILLIAM H. KOLBERG,
Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower,
Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOLBERG: As you know, the Select Education Subcommittee which I have the honor to chair, added an employment program for senior citizens as Title IX of the Older Americans Act in the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1973, Public Law 93-29. As funds for beginning this program in your Department were voted in the first 1974 supplemental appropriation bill, I am writing about the plans of your Department for carrying out the legislation.

I have noted, in particular, the comments first voiced by the Senate appropriations committee in its report on the first supplemental, and later echoed in the House report on the second supplemental appropriation bill. In both cases, these committees have suggested that national contractors which have operated successful older worker programs under Operation Mainstream be involved in the beginning of Title IX projects also. The Senate wrote that it "expects the Department to utilize the national contracts

approach in order to expedite the start-up of this program." The House recently added its voice on the subject, saying that "the Committee expects the Title IX program to be administered primarily through national contracts, as intended by the 1974 Supplemental Appropriation Act."

I am of course aware that the authorizing legislation directs the Secretary of Labor to require Title IX projects to be coordinated with other manpower and unemployment projects under this and other acts, although since the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act was not passed at that time, it is not specifically mentioned. There are several further references in Title IX to authority for coordination, joint applications, and other devices for relating manpower efforts. None of the language seems to me to preclude the use of national contractors.

I should say that while CETA has yet to be established as an operating venture with regulations and administrative mechanisms fully in place, and as such has no track record, I hesitate to require any program designed to aid a specific vulnerable population group such as the elderly, to compete with all other claimants for limited manpower dollars. The experience with general revenue sharing is illuminating: the General Accounting Office has told Representative Pepper of Florida that only a fraction of one percent of these funds was allocated to the benefit of older people. If that is evidence of the solicitude of general purpose government for vulnerable groups, then I feel constrained to work hard to maintain Title IX as a separate program, administered through other channels. Will state and local government do any better for the older worker under manpower revenue sharing than they did for the older American under general revenue sharing?

I have been most distressed, in view of the language in the two reports I quoted above, to see the third draft of regulations for Title IX with a governing memo dated April 23 which states in subpart B, section 7, that "the Secretary shall designate the State as the presumptive project sponsor under the Act. . . ." I believe there has been ample time to alter these draft rules to take account of the concerns of both House and Senate Appropriation Committees.

I will look forward to hearing from you immediately on this matter, and to hearing how you propose to alter these regulations to conform to the intent of Congress.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,
JOHN BRADEMAS, Chairman.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1974.
Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: I am taking this opportunity to personally inform you of recent Departmental policy decisions affecting the implementation of Title IX of the Older Americans Act.

On June 3, 1974, Secretary of Labor Peter J. Brennan signed regulations implementing Title IX of the Older Americans Act which will permit the immediate allocation of \$10 million appropriated by Congress to provide part-time employment for approximately 3,800 older workers.

In accordance with the intent of Congress the regulations specify that this program will be implemented in Fiscal Year 1974 primarily through the utilization of national organizations presently sponsoring similar successful older worker programs.

The Manpower Administration is now proceeding to develop the appropriate contracts

August 1, 1974

and grants which will be executed prior to the end of the fiscal year. The funds appropriated will be distributed equitably among the States and Territories in accordance with the formula contained in the Act.

The regulations also call for the close coordination of this program for older workers with other older worker programs and activities sponsored by units of State and local governments acting as prime sponsors under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) of 1973. Liaison will also be established with State and area agencies and commissions on aging which are supported under the Older Americans Act.

In the event that you wish more specific information relative to this program activity, please let me know.

Your interest in Department of Labor manpower programs is appreciated. If you have any questions or comments pertaining to these matters, please do not hesitate to bring them to my attention.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM H. KOLBERG,
Assistant Secretary for Manpower.

REAL ESTATE PROCEDURES ACT—
REFORM OR RETREAT?

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Representative STEPHENS attacked the joint supplemental views of eight Members of the Banking and Currency Committee published in the Committee report on H.R. 9989, the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974. The bill was introduced by Mr. STEPHENS, was reported out of committee July 3, and is scheduled for floor action in the House within the next few days.

The supplemental views in question were signed by me and by Chairman PATMAN, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. FAUNTRY, and Mr. STARK. Separate similar supplemental views were presented by Mr. MOAKLEY and Mr. MCKINNEY.

The main thrust of the joint statement labeled H.R. 9989 as an anticonsumer, antisettlement reform bill, the effect of which is to shield the very people responsible for abusive real estate settlement practices that have bilked homebuyers and homeowners out of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9989 would do this because it would eliminate the only Federal authority in existence to regulate maximum settlement costs—in this case maximum settlement costs applied to FHA and VA residential mortgage transactions whenever the need to do so exists. That authority was granted to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under section 701 of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970. Section 102(c) of Mr. STEPHENS' bill, H.R. 9989, would repeal section 701.

Thus, although there are a number of provisions in H.R. 9989 which would require advance disclosure of settlement

cost information and prohibit abusive settlement practices, the measure would lack any teeth whatsoever to hold settlement costs to a reasonable and fair level. In effect, the measure would largely serve to inform homebuyers and homeowners of the degree to which they are being ripped off by unscrupulous settlement attorneys, title insurance companies, real estate agents, lenders and others who provide settlement services or are involved in settlement proceedings.

The situation is made even more pathetic by the fact that HUD has failed to use the authority to regulate settlement costs for FHA and VA mortgage transactions, even though a study which HUD authorized and conclusions which the Department drew from it, clearly show the need for regulation in wide areas of the nation. HUD actually went so far as to issue proposed maximum settlement costs for six metropolitan areas but never implemented them.

Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that every spokesman for the settlement industry who testified at hearings on settlement reform legislation backed H.R. 9989 without reservation. They did so because they were willing to trade the requirements for advance disclosure of settlement cost information and the prohibition against certain abusive practices for repeal of HUD's authority to regulate maximum settlement charges for FHA and VA residential mortgage transactions. In short, they are willing to pay the small price of disclosure for eliminating the prospect of strong regulation, something that could occur by a simple administrative decision on the part of HUD either now or when a new administration takes office.

It should also be pointed out that every major consumer organization in the country opposes adoption of H.R. 9989 so long as it contains a provision to repeal HUD's authority to regulate maximum settlement charges for FHA and VA mortgages. Those organizations are:

The AFL-CIO, the Communications Workers, the International Ladies Garment Workers, the United Steelworkers, Amalgamated Meatcutters, Consumer Federation of America, National Consumers Congress, Congress Watch, Public Citizens Litigation, and the National Homebuyers and Homeowners Association.

Mr. STEPHENS contends that elimination of section 701 authority would still leave FHA and VA with the power to regulate settlement costs in particular mortgage transactions. By this he means that FHA and VA, if they ever are so inclined, can disapprove mortgage insurance or guarantees in individual cases where excessive settlement charges are found. Essentially, this means that FHA and VA can act to prohibit excessive charges only in single, isolated cases, and would have no power to establish maximum cost standards for entire communities or regions where excessive charges were being made. It is obvious that regulation confined to individual transactions of residential mortgage programs which insured or guaranteed more than

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

half a million one-to-four family unit mortgages in 1973, would for all intents and purposes be very cumbersome and utterly ineffective.

This point was brought forcefully home when the Wall Street Journal on July 5, 1972, reported that in proposing maximum settlement charges for six metropolitan areas, HUD said maximum savings could run as high as \$318 in Cleveland, Ohio; \$407 in Newark, N.J.; \$591 in San Francisco, Calif.; \$509 in Seattle, Wash.; \$276 in St. Louis, Mo.; \$451 in the Maryland-Virginia suburbs of Washington, D.C.; and \$394 in the District of Columbia itself.

Another indication of possible savings was given in a study conducted by Senator PROXMIRE, who found that the 41 largest title insurance companies in the country received a total of \$299 million in premiums in 1970, but paid out less than 3 percent of their gross income in claims.

Despite these circumstances, Mr. STEPHENS asserts that—

• It has never been found that abusive and fraudulent real estate settlement practices are widespread and are resulting in excessive costs in many areas of the country.

Why, then, did HUD propose them for the six of the largest metropolitan areas of the country as a pilot effort for regulation of FHA and VA settlement costs in all areas where it determines the need exists?

Mr. STEPHENS presents a lengthy rationale to support his claim that Congress never intended to give HUD authority to regulate maximum settlement charges for FHA and VA residential mortgage transactions when it adopted section 701 of the Emergency Home Finance Act.

The gentleman from Georgia should read the act, which directs HUD and the VA—

to prescribe standards governing the amount of settlement costs allowable in connection with the financing of such housing in any . . . geographic area. Such standards shall . . . be based on the Secretary's and the administrators' estimates of the reasonable charge for necessary services involved in settlements for particular classes of mortgages and loans.

It seems to me this clearly says that maximum rates will be established and enforced wherever existing rates are unreasonable, in other words, regulation where needed.

In its report on settlement costs, which section 701 directed the two agencies to conduct, HUD and the VA stated that pursuant to section 701, they intended to immediately "establish maximum allowable charges for all individual settlement cost items paid by both the buyer and seller, except loan discount payments and costs fixed by State and local statutes, for identifiable housing market areas. Government insurance or guarantee will not be issued in any case in which charges exceed any one of the maximums."

The above item was listed as No. 1 in a schedule of proposed actions and recommendations by HUD.

Mr. STEPHENS states there is no evidence that congressional action on set-

tlement reform serves to motivate State legislatures to move along the same lines. The following excerpts from letters received by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee should dispell that assertion:

One of our State Senators has requested us to prepare legislation designed to regulate home mortgage closing costs, particularly title insurance rates, and he has advised us that you may have prepared similar legislation on the Federal level. If a copy of your proposed draft is available, we would greatly appreciate your sending one to us.

JANE R. HARRIS,
Attorney, Legislative Service Division, Florida State Senate.

I understand that Congressman Patman has introduced, or is planning to introduce legislation in the field of home financing—specifically in the area of closing, or settlement costs. If this is so, we would appreciate having a copy of this legislation, and any relevant material, as we are presently engaged in a study of closing costs in California.

We are attempting to keep abreast of developments in this field at the Federal level, as a balancing point to whatever action we take at the state level.

STEVE POWLESLAND,
Department of Consumer Affairs,
State of California, Division of
Consumer Affairs.

I am doing research on settlement costs. It is my understanding that the House Banking and Currency Committee held hearings earlier this year on settlement costs. Could you please have the Committee send me the record of the hearings?

Any help and information you can give me is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and consideration.

CRAIG PARKER,
Staff Assistant, Department of Community Affairs and Economic Development, State of Delaware.

I have read with a great deal of approval H.R. 13337 [92nd Congress] introduced by you, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, especially that portion requiring the payment of interest to persons making periodic payments into escrow accounts to be used for the payment of taxes, amortization and interest on such mortgages. I enclose herewith a copy of a proposed bill now pending before the New York Legislature designated S. 767 and A. 844 calling for similar relief. . . .

LOUIS J. LEFKOWITZ,
Attorney General, State of New York.

Settlement reform legislation was, in fact, adopted during the last sessions of the New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland and North Carolina Legislatures. It is true that for the most part, these measures dealt with the required payment of interest on escrow accounts, a point that Mr. STEPHENS would have us believe has nothing to do with settlement reform. To this I would simply point to a provision of his own bill which prohibits excessive payments into escrow accounts and also directs the Federal Reserve Board to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of requiring that escrow accounts be interest bearing. To the contrary, measures dealing with escrow accounts are very much in the area of settlement reform and legislative action on this subject at the State level is part

August 1, 1974

of the overall effort to achieve settlement reform.

Mr. STEPHENS would have us believe that after conducting a massive study of settlement costs in selected areas across the Nation, and after proposing maximum settlement charges for six metropolitan areas, based on the findings of that study, HUD finally saw the light and backed away from implementation because it found that regulation would be "unwise and unworkable."

It is interesting to note that this position is exactly opposite that held by Secretary Romney, who launched the HUD study and publicly declared that the Department should regulate maximum charges. It is also interesting to note that officials of HUD began to say regulation wasn't possible after Romney left the Department, and after the Department was deluged with protests from those in the settlement industry who declared that they really did not think there was any reason at all to establish maximum charges.

Mr. Speaker, I will close this statement by simply saying that the Washington Post reported on June 4, 1972, that the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association, under the leadership of ABA President Leon Jaworski, 2 years ago supported adoption of settlement reform legislation which would require HUD to set maximum settlement costs for FHA and VA residential mortgages.

We should amend H.R. 9989 to retain HUD's authority to regulate these charges and thereby send the Department a message to go into action immediately.

ENDING FEDERAL CONTROL OF THE AIRWAVES

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Federal Government possesses monopoly power over the airwaves, effectively determining who shall be able to own and operate television and radio stations and the manner in which such operation is to be conducted.

Such monopoly power on the part of Government is said to be in the "public interest." After all, the advocates of such monopoly control tell us, it is "we" ourselves who have the authority to make decisions.

Prof. Murray Rothbard argues that the collective term "we" has—"enabled an ideological camouflage to be thrown over the reality of political life. If "we are the Government," then anything a government does to an individual is not only just and untyrannical it is also "voluntary" on the part of the individual concerned. If the Government has incurred a huge public debt which must be paid by taxing one group for the benefit of another, this reality of burden is obscured by saying that "we owe it to ourselves."

Dr. Rothbard concludes:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

We are not the government . . . the government does not in any accurate sense 'represent' the majority of the people, but even if it did, even if 70 per cent of the people decided to murder the remaining 30 per cent, this would still be murder and would not be voluntary suicide on the part of the slaughtered minority . . .

In 1927 the Federal Radio Commission was set up, not merely to act as policeman for property-rights violators but to establish criteria by which Government approval would be given to operators of radio frequencies. A revised form of this law, in 1934, established the Federal Communications Commission and established the Government policy that remains in operation today.

In an important article entitled "Control of the Airwaves," Chris Hocker, a senior in English at Stanford University, notes that—

Those guidelines included the definition of the airwaves as 'public' property, to be operated in the public interest, convenience or necessity. Thus, ownership of the airwaves, which had never been clearly defined up to that time, was explicitly vested in the federal government . . .

Urging that Government withdraw from the field of controlling our communications media, Mr. Hocker declares that—

In the absence of constant government pressure to conform to the State's idea of what constitutes 'good' broadcasting (which is constantly changing anyway), each broadcaster will be free to diversify or to specialize, as he sees fit and as the impartial pressures of the market indicate. Thus, there can be in one geographical area a station for blacks, for chicanos, for conservatives, for radicals—in short, a broadcast system that mirrors the rest of the communications media with their specialized forms and wide range of choice.

Mr. Hocker's thought provoking article appears in the Stanford Independent's March 1973 issue. I wish to share this article with my colleagues and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

CONTROL OF THE AIRWAVES

(By Chris Hocker)

"If censorship and the suppression of free speech ever get established in this country, they will have originated in radio and television."—Ayn Rand, "The Property Status of Airwaves" in Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal.)

Anyone sensitive to the encroachments of government on the private lives of its citizens should realize the obvious, almost simplistic truth of that statement. The government of the United States does now and has for over forty years exercised a degree of direct control over the communications airwaves. Yet, many so-called "civil libertarians" are in the forefront of those demanding an even greater and more direct control by the State, while "free market" libertarians often view the problem as minor or even nonexistent, preferring to wait until "after the revolution" to handle such questions.

But in many ways, the problem of State control over the airwaves illustrates the myriad difficulties facing libertarians in the battle to re-establish private direction in all spheres of economic and socio-political life. Those arguments that are used in favor of State control of the airwaves are similar to those used in the advocacy of other controls. And one of the most blatant forms of govern-

ment encroachment is in the communications field.

Government control over radio and television traces back to the mid-1920's, when radio was in the early stages of its development. As fledgling stations began to operate predictable conflicts came to the surface. Some operators practiced a form of "air piracy," that is, they jammed the frequencies of their competitors, disabling them, and thus violated their airspace. This problem, though real, was hardly epidemic, and understandable in light of the novelty of the radio industry at that time. Radio operators could reasonably have been expected, with maturity, to establish voluntary guidelines within the industry preventing such violation of rights. In any case, these violations were used as justification for the initial forms of government intervention—the State as policeman, ensuring that air rights would be respected.

BUSINESS INTERESTS

This reasoning, though acceptable, evidently did not comprise the sole motivation of the pro-regulation forces. Already, some businessmen who were becoming prominent in the radio field were seeking to establish their dominant positions with the help of the government. They found an ally in Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce under President Coolidge. In 1927 the Federal Radio Commission was set up, not merely to act as "policeman" for property-rights violators, but to establish criteria by which government approval would be given to operators of radio frequencies. A revised form of this law, in 1934, established the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), and laid the groundwork and guidelines for government policy that remains in operation today.

Those guidelines included the definition of the airwaves as "public" property, to be operated in "the public interest, convenience, or necessity." Thus, ownership of the airwaves, which had never been clearly defined up to that time, was explicitly vested in the federal government, to be operated in the "public interest." Licenses would be given for a period of three years to those applicants who met with the approval of the FCC, a seven-man board of authorities appointed by the President and subject to no Congressional assent.

Although there is difficulty in determining the amount of influence-peddling on the part of certain businessmen on behalf of government control in order to shore up their own interests, the effect of regulation has been the same as if that were the sole motivation. The FCC has never been a strong authority: licenses are granted upon proof of financial stability and a cursory assurance of "responsibility" and demands made upon the licensees have not been great. On the surface, in fact, it would appear that FCC power has been nominal, and that the broadcast industry has progressed just as if it had been operating on the marketplace all along.

A FREE MARKET?

A contrast made between the broadcast communication industry and those industries which have experienced little or no State control, however, reveals great differences in result. Classic market competition within a field of production unfailingly results in a wide range of choice for the consumer, if the product is adaptable to change, improvement, and diversity; or, in the case of other products, competition provides for general consumer satisfaction with one, two, or three major producers, usually due to low price and efficiency of production. Clearly, the broadcast industry under a market set-up would fall into the first cate-

gory, offering the potential for a multi-faceted variety of radio and television programs, each appealing to consumers of varying habits, lifestyles, and preferences. The broadcast industry should have developed along lines similar to the magazine-publishing industry, in which a multitude of publications, appealing both to mass and select audiences, flourish (barring government interference in the form of prohibitive postal rates, etc.).

Radio and especially television have not developed like this, however. In fact, the most frequently-heard complaints concerning the industry run along the lines of: "All programming is the same—lousy;" "There's not enough attention paid to minorities and interest groups;" "The industry is controlled by a few big corporations, and all they're out for is profit." Such complaints are certainly not reflective of a free market offering a wide range of choice.

The latter two statements, though generalizations, are demonstrably true, for the viewpoints of large portions of the population are given a best token representation both in entertainment and news programming. Certainly, three large corporations dominate the television industry, and their concern is profit, profit of the sort backed by State power and not by the free interaction of the marketplace. And, although the first complaint is admittedly a subjective judgment, the mediocre similarity among most programming is undeniable. Yet, those who complain the loudest are usually those who advocate stronger government control over the industry, not realizing that it is the action of the State, in collaboration with those corporations which derive benefit from their status of artificial oligopoly, which has brought about this sorry state of affairs.

ARGUMENTS FOR CONTROL

The general arguments advanced in favor of stronger government control are these: 1) the airwaves are limited in number; there are not enough of them to go around, so that they must be made "public" property in the interests of "fairness;" 2) the giant corporations now controlling the industry are unresponsive to the public and must be made responsive by government action.

The fallacy of 1) is obvious, for scarcity is a fact of economic life, and not a reason for government control. All physical resources are limited, some more than others. There are fewer sources of precious metals, for example, than air frequencies; should they, then, be nationalized, put under government direction, for the "public good"? The logical extension of the "limited-airwave" argument is nationalization of all resources. In addition, the notion of "public" property is a fallacy in itself, for "public" property must be the property of government officials. Otherwise, an individual would be free to sell his share of "public" property, an option which he most definitely does not have.

The problems with the second argument are more complex, for the largest broadcast corporations are not "responsive" in the sense that they do not provide opportunity for all points of view to be expressed to the satisfaction of all. While in a market system no private concern is obligated to present a point of view which it disagrees, the absence of the marketplace and the presence of State-enforced oligopoly renders the rights of these quasi-private corporations illegitimate. The present system is in effect a government sanction of the limitation of free speech.

TOTALITARIAN RESULT

It certainly does not follow from this, however, that further government control

will alleviate the ills created by that control. Every historical instance of increased government intervention demonstrates the absurdity of such a claim. Since it is in the direct interests of the regulated companies to exercise political control over the regulator, only a totalitarian commission existing within a framework of an all-powerful state could consistently resist this pressure. This would mean, of course, direct government control over the airwaves, with licensing and the lip-service paid to "responsibility" swept away.

State-run broadcasting industries do exist in other nations, of course, either as out-and-out government extensions, or as state "corporations" with nominal independence, but still retaining virtual monopoly power and a recourse to governmental coercion. To be sure, some of these State-run enterprises are "benevolent," operating with a high degree of attentiveness to public desire and presenting programming that has been labeled "higher" in quality than that available in the United States. However, the utter lack of a guarantee against State regression in the form of censorship and other abuses argues strongly against such "benevolent" control for all but the most trusting (or ambitious), and, aside from that, who is to define what "good" programming is? Is the State necessarily more knowledgeable, tasteful, or correct than the individual consumer?

The arguments in favor of increased government control have been and can be shown to promise at least the potential for a far greater evil than the already-considerable evil facing us at present. Semi-control, such as the FCC, is unworkable in terms of providing diversity and "responsiveness" to differing viewpoints, while the total control is a danger that cannot even be considered by those whose interest is freedom.

THE ALTERNATIVE

The alternative proposal is no control at all, or at most, retention of police power to prevent the unlikely occurrence of property-right violation. Assuming such a system, the airwaves, both radio and television, would be open to anyone with the resources to own them, just as in the marketing of any product or service. Take as an example the hypothetical case of a city with five radio stations, all of which operate on the free market (there would be of course, dozens more radio and television stations than five, plus cable outlets, etc.). Assume that the city maintains a wide cross-section of American society: rich, poor, minorities, interest groups, youth, and so on. Methods of financing the stations include, but are not limited to, advertising, fund-raising, promotional activities, and even exclusion devices such as de-scramblers which permit market pricing to work.

Obviously, programming will vary from station to station, unless the listening market is so homogeneous as to demand the same thing from each station. Station A will emphasize rock music, for example, while Station B will take classical music. Station C will devote itself to news, D to public affairs, and E to general programming without specialization. Given a 14-hour prime-time broadcast day (8 A.M. to 10 P.M.), there will be 70 prime time broadcast hours per day available to the city for various programming calculated to attract varying markets, as well as 50 broadcast hours which are not prime time. Certainly, this much time should be sufficient for the representation of all desires in the marketing area.

But assume that this is not the case. Assume that a minority group, Americans of Ruritanian extraction, believe that they are systematically excluded from representation on the city air channels. They never hear Ruritanian music, there are no programs

broadcast in Ruritanian, and news coverage ignores the problems of the Ruritanian-American community. What is their recourse?

The most obvious solution would be for them to take advantage of a radio frequency that was not then in use, setting up facilities that would enable them to broadcast independently of the other five stations in the city. For such minority group, a station of low wattage would probably be sufficient for the dissemination of information, cultural affairs, etc., that would be of interest only to the Ruritanian community. In fact, just such a low-wattage station existed recently in Los Angeles, which operated out of a large closet. This so-called "pirate" station was discovered and banned by communications authorities for operating without "proper" government sanction. Even in the absence of an air frequency, cable facilities, which do not require air waves for broadcasting, offer virtually unlimited opportunities.

Or, if such solutions for some reason are impossible, they could attempt to buy one of the existing radio stations. Perhaps Station B, for example, has been losing money and desires to sell its interests. The oppressed group might buy it and feature programming that will appeal to Ruritanians, although they may find that their appeal will need to be widened in order for them to stay in business. But what if no one will sell to them, or they are unable to raise enough money to buy a station? Then, the Ruritanians may take other forms of economic action permissible on the free market—boycotting the stations, urging others to boycott, exerting citizen (not political) pressure on the stations, joining with other minority groups in order to pool resources, etc. It is unlikely that all five stations will decide to ignore the mounting Ruritanian pressure, for at least one station will realize that such pressure represents a potential market and will acquiesce to the Ruritanian demands for economic reasons. Even if the highly unlikely possibility of all five stations deliberately combining against the Ruritanian community occurs, this arrangement will be less than permanent, since continued public pressure and changes in economic fortune will undoubtedly crack such a combination in a relatively short time.

CURRENT SYSTEM

Even assuming the worst possible situation—that of a short-term union formed for the express purpose of keeping Ruritanian-Americans from the airwaves with no other recourse immediately available to the group—the current system of FCC control comes off as far worse. For one thing, broadcast licensees carry a time span of three years (President Nixon has proposed extending this to five). Therefore, the Ruritanians would need to wait until the expiration of a station license in order to apply for such a license before the FCC. (It is legally possible for the FCC to revoke a license at any time; however, such an action has been a historical rarity.) Then, they would have to present their case before the FCC. That body may be under political pressure from the current licensee, and refuse to heed the plea of the minority group. Or, the members of the FCC may be prejudiced against Ruritanians themselves.

Imagine, however, that it is license renewal time for one of the city's stations, and the Ruritanians have come before the FCC to present their case, and that the FCC is sympathetic. Suppose that the FCC renews the license of the station, including the admonition that the station must devote a certain amount of broadcast time to Ruritanian-American affairs.

Perhaps, then, the Ruritanian contingent is satisfied. But what if, in providing space

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

for them, the station must cut down or eliminate programming aimed at another group? In such a case, the entire cycle would begin again, except that the newly-ignored group must wait until license-renewal time.

By demanding that a station must serve "the public interest, convenience, and necessity," the government is suggesting that each station become all things to all groups. Such a command is clearly unworkable. In practical terms, the granting of a license under such an admonition requires the value judgment of a government body as to what best serves the public interest. Even given good faith on the part of the regulatory body, some one or some group is going to be dissatisfied. But granting this good faith is dubious, since the commission is operating not only under the aegis of the government itself, but is also highly susceptible to direct political pressure from those who seek to enlist the aid of the State for their own benefit. Connected to this is the moral question of coercion: should a station be forced to program according to the wishes and whims of the State?

ABSENCE OF COERCION

A reconsideration of the free-market approach reveals a total absence of coercion, as well as a multitude of opportunities for each interest group to be represented on the air, opportunities which are not arranged or dictated at the whim of four bureaucrats (a majority of the FCC). To be sure, the lever in ensuring such representation is economic—but surely that is preferable to the myriad of conflicting political pressures which lie at the root of governmental decision-making in a democracy. The market mechanism is impartial, and is far more likely to bring about a broadcast system that "serves the people" by anyone's definition. And, clearly, the opportunities for unrestricted and diverse utilization of the market mechanism is far greater in a real situation, with dozens of different broadcast outlets, than in the hypothetical instance of a large city with only five radio stations.

In the absence of constant government pressure to conform to the State's idea of what constitutes "good" broadcasting (which is constantly changing anyway), each broadcaster will be free to diversify or to specialize, as he sees fit and as the impartial pressures of the market indicate. Thus, there can be in one geographical area a station for blacks, for chicanos, for conservatives, for radicals—in short, a broadcast system that mirrors the rest of the communications media with their specialized forms and wide range of choice.

And, most importantly, a free-enterprise broadcast industry will eliminate the always-present threat of direct government intervention in the form of censorship, or more subtle ways of abrogating freedom of speech.

Returning the airwaves to the people—that is, returning them to the producers and consumers who may freely determine the range and variety of products in a free market—would mean a major step away from the increasingly blatant violation of individual rights and the ever-growing shadow of 1984.

JOURNALISTIC INSTINCT

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the issue of the *National Observer* for the week ending August 3, 1974, includes an article excerpted from the remarks by Mr. Roscoe C. Born, vice editor of the *Observer*, at a convention of the Railroad Public Relations Association in Colorado Springs.

Although Mr. Born's message is directed to his colleagues in the newspaper fraternity, I thought it would be of interest to those Members who may have overlooked the article.

I insert the text in the RECORD:

JOURNALISTIC INSTINCTS TO "GET" PEOPLE

(By Roscoe C. Born)

I may be read out of the newspaper fraternity for this, because what I am about to say might be readily misunderstood as an attack on the press. I hope I will not be so misunderstood. I am proud to be a journalist, and I am proud of the role journalism has played, on balance, in the preservation and development of the American system of self-government. But I must say this.

I have come to the belief that there lurks in the character of nearly every journalist a fundamental flaw. I now believe that this flaw is probably there in even the most honorable and decent journalists, even though some have managed to overcome it in the same way that decent and honorable men and women have learned, over the years, to suppress or mask some of their baser instincts.

I suspect this flaw I am trying to describe is an inborn desire to "get" somebody, anybody; to publish a startling story that will result in an indictment, will get somebody fired, will get some public official ousted from office or defeated for re-election. A reporter who takes the hide off somebody in print reaps immense rewards and satisfactions. His colleagues praise him. His editors praise him. His nonjournalist friends suddenly are aware that he has done something remarkable, and they tell him about it. He may even win one of journalism's most famous awards. For it is a fact, known to journalists everywhere, that if one hopes to win a big award for reporting, one must be able to show that his stories got results; someone indicted, someone fired; someone ousted, someone sued. That is the path to journalistic glory.

When I was a kid reporter in Topeka, Kan., I was very pleased one day when no less a person than Alf Landon walked into the newsroom, came directly to where I was sitting, and said: "Well, that story of yours sure rattled the cages." It was a misunderstanding. I didn't know Alf Landon personally then, and he didn't know me; he had mistaken me for the man whose desk I was occupying at that moment. But just the same. I felt a thrill that, for a minute there, a famous person was taking note that I had "rattled the cages" with a story. God knows, I wanted to rattle cages. And I don't think that desire is peculiar to me—I think it is common to journalists everywhere.

If this is true, how does it come to be? Are we so indoctrinated in journalism schools that we enter the field brain-washed? I don't suspect that for a moment. And I think it borders on lunacy to suggest that conspiring journalists get together and plot the downfall of the personage or that. Not conspiracy is necessary. Journalists crave the thrill of the expose almost intuitively whether alone or in packs.

I believe this may be an important factor that led most of us into journalism. It's not something we acquire *after* we become reporters. Rather, it may be that the seeds of this desire, nurtured in all of us, caused us to become reporters.

I venture that if you polled all of the nations clergymen, something like 99.9 percent of them would say they devoutly believe in God. They devoutly believe in God not because they are clergymen, but they are clergymen because they devoutly believe in God. And so, I suspect, do journalists almost universally harbor the urge to "get" somebody. They became journalists because they have that urge.

Well, is this instinct—if you'll permit a

August 1, 1974

loose use of that word—is this instinct among journalists to "get" people entirely bad? I think not. If it were not for this drive, what would prompt journalists to fulfill their role in our society? Who would go about their daily lives alert to spot wrongdoing in public places and expose evil so that society might correct it? If any government were so high-handed as to conspire against the liberty of American citizens; to create a secret police unit to burgle their homes and offices and tap their telephones; to use such Government agencies as the FBI, the CIA, and the Internal Revenue Service as personal tools against their political foes—if we could possibly image such an evil government in the United States—who would be the most likely candidates to investigate and expose such a threat to our freedom? Would the Attorney General do it? Would the director of the FBI or the CIA or the IRS do it? Would the President himself do it? Not likely. Not necessarily.

Only the journalist can be relied on to do it, and for that we have to thank—in part, at least—this drive or instinct the journalist has to rattle the cages, to "get" somebody, to topple the mightiest if the journalist is convinced he should be toppled.

But there is the problem. How easily is the journalist convinced? How much of his investigation is prompted by his desire to "get" somebody, to rattle cages? Or, once triggered, does he print stories that are damaging and inflammatory only when he has sound, verifiable information? Or does his instinct push him into irresponsible, premature publication? Is his judgment crippled, so that he is no longer able to distinguish between fairness and unfairness? Are his stories loaded with prejudicial adjectives, deliberately uncomplimentary descriptions—outright distortions? How many reportorial investigations are started with the goal of simply determining the facts about a person or a situation? Or is the guilt of the target a foregone conclusion, so that only "facts" pointing to his guilt come to the reporter's clear-minded attention?

I suggest that all too often the journalist who searches his conscience cannot answer those questions without admitting the truth of what I am saying. And I suggest that all of us, reporters and editors alike, should reach our consciences—regularly.

I know of no other cure for it. This instinct cannot be banned by legislation. It will not disappear by changing the criteria by which great journalistic feats are judged and prizes awarded—although that might help. I think journalists must learn to be more self-critical; we must learn a bit of humility; we must stop telling ourselves incessantly how damned noble we are in everything we do.

The conscience of the journalist must be pricked. He must stop and think and remember that the right to gather and print information about people and institutions is an awesome power. And somehow we must come to realize that the abuse of our power can no more be tolerated than the abuse of the awesome power of the Presidency and the Government.

THE RESIGNATION OPTION—1 YEAR LATER

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD, a number of articles detailing White House pressure on the Internal Revenue Service. This pressure was designed to bring the pow-

erful administrative measures of the IRS against those the White House considered "enemies" or "uncooperative." It is my contention that this evidence substantiates the need for an independent IRS contained in my proposed legislation, H.R. 14793.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, July 31, 1974]

THE RESIGNATION OPTION—1 YEAR LATER

(By William Raspberry)

A year ago, President Nixon could have resigned "for the good of my country" and made it seem creditable.

It was clear to some of us even then that he was deeply implicated in the Watergate coverup, although a lot of people saw the evidence as ambiguous. But many of those who saw the coverup implications as crystal clear still could have been persuaded that the coverup was a tactical error that, once begun, the President simply didn't know how to stop.

In fact, it was only a little less than a year ago that certain members of the President's own party first suggested that resignation might not be a bad idea.

He didn't take the advice then. The intriguing question is: Is it too late now? And if it isn't, how well would resignation serve the country?

To take the second question first, the major objection to earlier calls for resignation was that it would thwart the public's need to know just how much their government had been undermined.

Resignation then would have left unresolved the question of the President's personal involvement in the scandals and left us instead with a handful of scapegoats to be disgraced and forgotten. Unlike the Agnew case, there would have been no criminal plea for the President to make, no bill of particulars to be made public. Resignation would have been the end of it.

Those of us who saw the scandals as a threat to the American system of government—who, in fact, saw the thing called Watergate as a very nearly successful *coup d'état*—thought it vital to get the facts out, even if it meant leaving Richard Nixon temporarily in.

In addition, it was almost inevitable that Nixon supporters would have turned his resignation into a form of martyrdom. Their man would have been driven out of office by his natural enemies even though there was no solid proof that he deserved such a fate. It would have been put forward as the liberals' way of rescinding an election they had overwhelmingly lost.

In short, resignation a year ago would have been a disservice to the country.

But now, unless there are to be major new explosions from bombshells contained in the 64 tapes whose delivery the Supreme Court has ordered, most of the Watergate facts appear to be out.

At least enough is known for Americans to get a good sense of the depth and breadth of the scandals, of the pressure put on high officials to use government agencies for political purposes—and of the ultimate source of that pressure.

Proof of presidential complicity in the scandals is lacking only in the most technical legal sense; the President's own version of the White House tapes leaves little ground for doubt. And the combination of his tax situation, his real estate dealings and the purchase with campaign funds of jewelry for his wife eliminates any possibility of his playing the martyr.

In short, resignation at this point—with the House Judiciary Committee already having voted to recommend impeachment, and with a House vote to impeach on at least one count a virtual certainty—would be in the

interest of the country saving weeks and perhaps months of televised anguish.

But would resignation be possible now, from the President's point of view?

One of the key difficulties is that Mr. Nixon has been too successful in forcing his definition of an impeachable offense. If he had been content to leave the definition loose enough to encompass malfeasance in office, or failure faithfully to execute the laws, he might have been able to escape with resignation.

But he and his lawyers insisted that only an indictable crime could be an impeachable offense. And now, if the House impeaches, and the Senate convicts him, for offenses that are also indictable crimes, his removal from office could be the first step toward jail.

Even if that removal from office results from resignation. For his insistence on making impeachment synonymous with indictability has forced the Judiciary Committee to a standard of proof and specificity that, assuming conviction in the Senate, would make his conviction in the courts all but certain.

He has persuaded the country that a sitting President cannot be indicted. But the Constitution is clear beyond even James St. Clair's ability to obfuscate that an impeached and convicted President can be tried in the criminal courts.

So perhaps Mr. Nixon can't afford to resign now, even if it would be good for the country. Unless he did so for reasons of poor health, in which case public opinion might dampen the enthusiasm of federal investigators; or unless the Congress could be persuaded to accept the deal proposed by Rep. Wilbur Mills some months ago—legislation giving the President immunity from prosecution in exchange for his resignation.

One other possibility: Somebody suggested recently that the President could escape his dilemma by the bold tactic of (a) confessing every criminal offense he has been accused of, (b) granting himself a presidential pardon, and (c) resigning from office.

Such high-handedness might constitute an impeachable offense but so what?

[From the New York Times, July 17, 1974]
NIXON ASKED DATA ON WALLACE TAX, PANEL
WAS TOLD

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON, July 16.—The House Judiciary Committee made public today the sworn testimony of a former White House staff member who said that H.R. Haldeman told him in 1970 that President Nixon personally wanted a report on an I.R.S. investigation of Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama and his brother, Gerald.

The former staff member Clark R. Mollenhoff, also testified that he had reason to believe that someone "at the highest White House level" gave derogatory information from the report by the Internal Revenue Service on the Wallaces to Jack Anderson, the columnist, three weeks before the Alabama gubernatorial primary in 1970. This was the primary in which White House agents secretly gave \$400,000 to Governor Wallace's opponent.

Asked about the allegations, Ronald L. Ziegler, the White House Press Secretary, said: "Ask Clark Mollenhoff. I haven't heard anything about it." Mr. Mollenhoff is now a reporter for The Des Moines Register and the Register is not considered a supporter of the President.

Mr. Mollenhoff's testimony is contained in the ninth volume of the Judiciary Committee's "Statement of Information" for the impeachment inquiry. The earlier volumes, dealing with the Watergate break-in and cover-up, were released last Thursday.

The Mollenhoff testimony is among many items of previously unpublished material

relating to the alleged use of the I.R.S. for political purposes by the Nixon Administration.

Other highlights include the following:

Testimony from both of Mr. Nixon's first two Commissioners of Internal Revenue confirming earlier indications that they had offered their resignations in the face of pressures from the White House to take what they considered to be improper actions.

A statement by the first of these, Randolph W. Thrower, that when he had tried to see Mr. Nixon to express his "concern about White House attitudes toward the I.R.S." he was told by Mr. Haldeman, the White House chief of staff, that "the President did not like such conferences."

Testimony repeatedly naming Vernon D. Acree, the Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who was promoted by President Nixon to be Commissioner of Customs, as the source of tax information that the White House wanted on prominent persons.

An affidavit from former Revenue Commissioner Johnnie M. Walters detailing repeated efforts by John D. Ehrlichman, the chief White House adviser on domestic matters, to force I.R.S. to find something major wrong with the tax returns of the Democratic National Chairman, Lawrence F. O'Brien, before the 1972 election.

Information that the Rev. John McLaughlin, the Jesuit priest who is on the White House staff, helped on an investigation of Lawrence Y. Goldberg, a Providence, R. I., businessman, who was apparently suspected by some in the 1972 Nixon re-election effort of being too committed to Jewish causes to be a loyal Nixon supporter. Mr. Goldberg ultimately got a staff position with the Committee for the Re-election of the President.

The Judiciary Committee's 400-page volume of evidence on the political use of the I.R.S. discloses that the committee has not made any investigations of its own in this area, but has merely used and published information gathered by others.

For example, the volume contains copies of memorandums that were made public earlier by the Senate Watergate committee, which indicate, without proving, that the White House intervened in a tax audit being conducted on the Rev. Billy Graham, the evangelist.

One such memorandum, from a subordinate of Mr. Haldeman, asks Mr. Haldeman "can we do anything to help?" Mr. Graham, who was under investigation for allegedly receiving income he never reported in the form of construction and decorator work and tuition payments for his children who were in school abroad.

Mr. Haldeman's handwritten reply was, "No—it's already covered."

The Judiciary Committee did not report any attempt to find out what Mr. Haldeman's note meant.

The volume of evidence does not contain new information on the Graham case, however, in the form of previously unpublished testimony by John J. Caulfield, the one-time White House staff member who regularly got confidential information from Internal Revenue for the White House.

Mr. Caulfield testified before a closed session of the Senate Watergate committee that he had, at the request of John W. Dean 3d, the former White House counsel obtained "back door copy" of the I.R.S. status report on the Graham investigation from Mr. Acree, the Internal Revenue Assistant Commissioner.

Mr. Dean wanted to know "whether Mr. Billy Graham was being harassed by the I.R.S.," according to Mr. Caulfield, who said that Mr. Dean "did not indicate where his assignments were coming from."

Mr. Caulfield agreed, under questioning, that "the White House making a request in

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

August 1, 1974

this fashion would probably be considered abnormal."

Another section of the Judiciary Committee's document indicates that President Nixon knew that his staff members were using circuitous channels for getting information from Internal Revenue.

On March 13, 1973, according to a Judiciary Committee transcript, the President asked Mr. Dean whether he needed "any I.R.S. stuff" in connection with an effort to show that Democrats had been engaged in political espionage and other alleged improprieties.

Mr. Dean responded:

"There is no need at this hour for anything from I.R.S., and we have a couple of sources over there that I can go to. I don't have to fool around with Johnnie Walters or anybody, we can get right in and get what we need."

Among the other pieces of information that Mr. Caulfield testified he got from Mr. Acree were reports of audits of nine "politically active" entertainers whose treatment by Internal Revenue was compared with that received by the actor John Wayne, a conservative and a Nixon supporter.

Mr. Acree selected the entertainers whose audit reports were examined, a list, according to Mr. Caulfield, that included Democrats such as Peter Lawford and such Nixon supporters as Sammy Davis Jr., the entertainer. The list also included Gov. Ronald Reagan of California, a former actor. All were picked because their incomes were similar to Mr. Wayne's, Mr. Caulfield testified.

Mr. Caulfield concluded, on the basis of information provided by Mr. Acree, that "the Wayne complaint"—who received the complaint has not been disclosed—"does not appear strong enough to pursue."

Mr. Acree was also identified by Mr. Caulfield as the man who suggested to him that the way to start an audit on Robert Greene, a Newsday reporter, who had investigated the business interests of President Nixon's friend, Charles G. Rebozo, was to have an anonymous letter written to the I.R.S. suggesting that Mr. Greene had filed inaccurate tax returns.

Mr. Caulfield said that Mr. Acree subsequently told him that "an anonymous letter did go out in a fashion where it would not be considered illegal," although investigators from another Congressional committee reported that they had not found any "informant's letter" in Mr. Greene's I.R.S. file.

Mr. Acree, who rose through the ranks at Internal Revenue, was considered an outstanding career civil servant and in 1972 won the Rockefeller Award that is given annually to about half a dozen outstanding Government careerists. It is considered the highest award available to a career employee of the Federal Government.

Mr. Acree was named Commissioner of Customs in April, 1972, after Commissioner Walters, who had repeatedly resisted White House requests, announced his resignation and after the White House picked Mr. Walters' successor, the present Commissioner, Donald C. Alexander.

Mr. Acree did not respond to a request for comment on Mr. Caulfield's allegations. The request was made by telephone to Mr. Acree's secretary early in the day.

The Internal Revenue investigation of George and Gerald O. Wallace reportedly focused mainly on Gerald and on allegations that he received kickbacks or other illegal payments from highway, liquor and other interests.

No tax case was ever publicly brought against either Wallace, and the only available information on the investigation is the

Jack Anderson syndicated column of April 13, 1970.

Mr. Anderson said that he had seen the Internal Revenue report to the White House on the Wallace investigation and that it had been shown to him by Murray Chotiner, a long-time political adviser to Mr. Nixon. Mr. Chotiner was killed in an automobile accident earlier this year.

The columnist said that Mr. Chotiner had come to him, early in the Nixon Administration and had offered to be "a pipeline" to the President by getting Mr. Anderson information that he sought.

Mr. Anderson said that he asked Mr. Chotiner in early 1969 whether the Administration would pursue the I.R.S. investigation of Gerald Wallace, which Mr. Anderson said he had learned began during the Johnson Administration.

More than a year later, three weeks before the Alabama primary in which Mr. Wallace was seeking to return to office and thus continue his career as a major national political figure, Mr. Chotiner answered Mr. Anderson's question by showing the columnist the I.R.S. report, Mr. Anderson said.

The Judiciary Committee's report also discloses for the first time that Mr. Chotiner prepared one of the lists of Administration "enemies" that was sent to Internal Revenue to stimulate tax audits and ignored by Commissioner Waters after consultation with Secretary of the Treasury George P. Shultz.

On another occasion, the Judiciary Committee's volume shows, Mr. Walters told Mr. Shultz that "he could have my job any time he wanted it." This was in August, 1972, after Mr. Ehrlichman repeatedly pressed Mr. Shultz to force Mr. Walters to re-audit the tax returns of Mr. O'Brien and denounced Mr. Walters for not doing it.

Mr. Ehrlichman's testimony on the matter, given to a closed session of the Senate Watergate committee and not previously published, was that I.R.S. staff people "down in the woodwork" had "75 selected reasons why they should not audit Mr. O'Brien and they weren't having any of the same reasons with regard to Republicans."

[From the Washington Post]
SAN CLEMENTE TAX DETAILS

(By William Claiborne)

In handwritten instructions to former presidential lawyer Herbert W. Kalmbach, former White House adviser John D. Ehrlichman urged that improvements to President Nixon's San Clemente estate be linked to the Secret Service because of the "tax implication," according to House Judiciary Committee evidence released yesterday.

Ehrlichman's June, 1969, longhand memorandum referred to the "tax implication of SS [Secret Service] use of buildings" on the southern California estate.

It urged Kalmbach to "give SS up to four of outbuildings—more write-off."

Moreover, according to a Judiciary Committee report on federal expenditures at San Clemente, Ehrlichman normally served as a conduit of Mr. Nixon's personal instructions for improvement of the presidential compound.

"The normal and more frequent procedure was for the President to discuss the details of the work and operations at San Clemente with Ehrlichman or Haldeman, who would pass along instructions," the Judiciary Committee report asserted.

H.R. (Bob) Haldeman was the President's chief of staff at the White House.

In closed-door testimony before the committee on July 17, Kalmbach testified, "I had a standard procedure to run all questions relative to matters pertaining to San

Clemente past Mr. Ehrlichman and Mr. Haldeman for their approval and direction," according to a partial transcript released yesterday.

Kalmbach testified there was "a great interest (by the President) in all things relative to that property," and he recalled to the committee one occasion when he walked through the San Clemente grounds with President and Mrs. Nixon and Mr. Nixon asked that various rose bushes be rearranged.

The Judiciary Committee reported on a total of \$9.1 million in federal funds spent at San Clemente, including \$701,000 on Mr. Nixon's ocean front property. The bulk of the remainder has been spent on an adjacent summer White House office complex, military communications and personnel permanently assigned there by the Secret Service, Coast Guard and other agencies.

Last April, the congressional Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation concluded that Mr. Nixon realized more than \$92,000 in taxable income from improvements on his property, a levy the President has agreed to pay.

Much of the Judiciary Committee's staff report is a rehash of evidence compiled by other congressional and executive branch investigating units, including the joint committee, the House Government Operations Committee, the General Accounting Office and the General Services Administration.

But the impeachment inquiry staff did question several principal figures in the San Clemente refurbishing, including Kalmbach, who served as Mr. Nixon's on-site representative when most of the work was done in July, 1969.

Kalmbach turned over to the committee the Ehrlichman memo, which, he said, was intended "to provide guidance to me in regard to the manner in which installations were to be made and financed at the President's estate."

The memo includes 10 terse commands, most of which assign the cost liability of improvements at San Clemente to either the GSA or the Secret Service.

For instance, in referring to a new \$13,500 electric heating system that ultimately was installed at government expense, Ehrlichman instructed, "At SS cost, if any."

Last December, the General Accounting Office questioned "whether the government should pay the entire cost of the new system, when the President intended to install one anyway." Later, the congressional joint committee ruled that the heating system was a taxable improvement to the property.

When referring to driveway and walkway paving—at a government cost of \$19,386—Ehrlichman said, "no change except at government expense." The GAO subsequently said the paving was a "non-protective benefit" to the President and the joint committee ruled Mr. Nixon should be taxed for it.

Referring to \$6,642 in improvements to a gazebo, or "card house," on the property, Ehrlichman wrote, "card house on north line, let SS use . . . tax implications of SS use of buildings . . . SS pay for building of property . . . give SS up to four of outbuildings—more write-off."

The Judiciary Committee noted that prior to the gazebo refurbishing, the Secret Service had decided not to use the building as a security outpost. The joint committee concluded the President owed \$5,000 in taxes as a result.

In its report, the Judiciary Committee staff made no conclusions about presidential culpability with respect to the San Clemente expenditures and government-paid improvements at Mr. Nixon's home in Key Biscayne, Fla.

However, in a four-page section entitled,

"Presidential knowledge of improvements and their financing," the staff implied through a recitation of Mr. Nixon's visits to the estates about the times the work was being done that the President was aware of how much public money was being spent on his homes.

The staff report concluded cryptically that last Dec. 8, Mr. Nixon announced he would donate the San Clemente estate to the nation after his and Mrs. Nixon's deaths.

"This announcement came approximately six months after the House Appropriations subcommittee hearings, one month after the House Government Activities Subcommittee hearings and 10 days before the GAO published its report on expenditures at the President's properties," the Judiciary Committee staff noted.

In another study, the Judiciary Committee staff backed off from saying that the Nixon administration's impoundment of funds appropriated by Congress constitutes grounds for impeachment.

"It does not follow," the staff said in a 91-page report released yesterday, "that the impoundments necessarily constitute grounds for impeachment of the President."

The staff pointed out that each of the three branches of government will push its constitutional powers to the fullest, and in doing so may temporarily step on the powers of another branch.

But the administration has obeyed all court decisions ordering it to release impounded funds, the staff said.

The Nixon administration began impounding appropriated funds early, but the practice reached its height in 1973 when it impounded about \$18 billion.

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1974]

THE IMPACT OF DEAN'S IRS TESTIMONY

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

One year after his nationally televised Senate testimony began President Nixon's greatest crisis, John W. Dean II has again proved his nemesis by building sentiment for impeachment behind the closed doors of the House Judiciary Committee.

Dean's appearance before the impeachment inquiry July 11 helped shift momentum against the President—generally by appearing as a credible witness but specifically by unveiling some new evidence. When Dean testified to a direct presidential role in attempted misuse of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), the handful of fence-sitting Republicans who may decide Mr. Nixon's fate were profoundly shocked.

So, the old White House campaign of trying to discredit Dean is being talked up among hard-core Nixon Republicans on the Judiciary Committee. Some insist a committee vote should be delayed for many weeks until Dean's damaging testimony can be checked against a segment of a White House tape recording now in litigation.

These are tactics of desperation. Dean's testimony helped undercut White House attempts to limit impeachment to whether the President authorized hush money in the Watergate cover-up. Dean's incrimination of the President in misusing the IRS led undecided Republican members toward considering gross abuse of presidential power as an impeachable offense.

Dean testified before the Senate Watergate Committee June 25, 1973, on the President's direct role in pushing the IRS to harass Nixon "enemies." According to Dean's description of the Sept. 15, 1972, Oval Office meeting, Mr. Nixon "seemed somewhat annoyed" by IRS refusal to cooperate. But Dean said nothing about direct presidential orders to pursue the matter.

The tape recording of the Sept. 15 meeting given special prosecutor Leon Jaworski did not contain the Nixon-Dean IRS dialogue.

Judge John Sirica had ruled those 17 minutes were not relevant to the Watergate investigation. When Jaworski petitioned for their release, Sirica last month reversed himself. But the White House appealed, keeping the matter before the courts.

Consequently, Dean was plowing new ground July 11 before the impeachment inquiry. Dean testified he told the President on Sept. 15, 1972, that IRS Commissioner Johnnie M. Walters was refusing to audit tax returns of Nixon enemies. Dean next added: "And he (Mr. Nixon) said something to the effect, well, if (Treasury Secretary George) Shultz thinks he's been put over there to be some sort of candy ass, he is mistaken, and if you have got any problems, you just come tell me, and I will get it straightened out."

This was a direct presidential link to Walter's sworn statement to the House committee that Dean on Sept. 25, 1972, again pressed him to audit the "enemies." After conferring with Shultz; Sept. 29, Walters continued, "We again agreed that nothing would be done with respect to the list."

Hard-core Nixon defenders shrug this off with the assertion that after all, the President's attempts failed. But uncommitted Republican committee members are deeply disturbed by the new revelation. Were it not for the stubborn integrity of George Shultz, they now believe, the Nixon administration could have assumed characteristics of a police state.

"This sounds like 'Gulag Archipelago,' like things that happen in Russia but not here," one Republican told us. Another confided that he regards Dean's revelation as the single most damning example of the misuse of governmental power.

To counter this, hard-core Republican committee members are stressing Dean's inadequate explanation to the impeachment inquiry of his one obvious credibility lapse: his failure a year ago to tell the Senate committee he had destroyed the notebooks of Watergate conspirator E. Howard Hunt. His explanation July 11 that the Hunt notebooks "were not in my conscience (sic) at the time I testified" last summer fell flat. It clouded Dean's overall credibility in the opinion of Rep. Thomas Railsback of Illinois, a key undecided Republican who otherwise viewed Dean as a highly effective witness.

Accordingly, presidential defenders argue that Dean's account of what the President said about the IRS should be checked against the Sept. 15, 1972, tape. But thanks to the President's legal fight to keep those 17 minutes private, the tape could not reach the House committee for six more weeks at the earliest—long after the scheduled House vote on impeachment.

This suggests Mr. Nixon's last line of defense. Even if the Supreme Court orders the President to give Jaworski 64 subpoenaed tapes, they could not reach the House committee for months. Consequently, fence-sitting Republican members might vote against impeachment—or abstain—in the coming showdown in protest against the committee's refusal to wait for evidence previously denied Congress by Mr. Nixon. Bizarre though that reasoning is, it may be the President's only remaining barrier against impeachment.

SERVING THE HANDICAPPED

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, to be handicapped means to have to learn to

approach life in a different way than most of us do. This is not to say that the handicapped are unable to do many of the things that physically healthy persons can. On the contrary, through sheer guts and determination many handicapped people learn to do a job as well or even better than physically healthy people do.

The life of the handicapped can be just as rewarding as any other if handicapped persons are aided in their efforts to come to grips with the world around them. This requires a person who has the proper perspective, attitude and skills needed to help a person accept his or her disability, and decide to make the most of their remainder of his or her life. Mr. Speaker, the following article speaks to the issue of the proper approach for those who serve the handicapped:

[From Interaction, July 1974]

SERVING THE HANDICAPPED: ATTITUDE, KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS ARE IMPORTANT

(By Dr. Lillian A. Pennell)

Some volunteers are better qualified than others to work with the handicapped. It is a matter of attitude, knowledge, and skill. But whatever your current qualifications, you can become more capable, more competent, and more productive.

Before getting down to techniques—the do's and don'ts for dealing with handicapped people—you should take a look at how you feel and what you know about physical disability. Maybe this is just not for you. But perhaps it is.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ATTITUDE

Do you see other people as beautiful and capable of self-direction and fulfillment? Or do you see them as blighted and needing someone else to structure their lives? Can you approach the person you work with as one who needs you, as one you need, or both?

What is your understanding of yourself as a person? Are you the type who likes to be with just a few people, or do you love huge parties? Do you do things on the spur of the moment, or do you think through all possibilities carefully before making a decision?

Your feelings toward others and your concept of yourself have much to do with your ability to work with the handicapped.

What is your belief about disability? Do you think of the physically handicapped person as belonging to some broad category of "poor crippled people?" Or is he just a person who happens to have a handicap? Are you one who believes that the problem is brought on by some wrongdoing on the part of the person, or do you see it as an unfortunate event in the normal life process?

What is your understanding of different kinds of disabilities? Do you know the effects of blindness, deafness, cerebral palsy, polio, stammering, epilepsy, amputation of limbs, spinal cord injury, heart disease, organ transplants? Would your present knowledge be sufficient for doing volunteer work with a person with any of these handicaps?

What is your knowledge of rehabilitation? Do you know that people with really severe handicaps often are rehabilitated and do successfully hold full-time jobs? Do you know which agencies offer rehabilitation to the physically disabled? Are you aware that most states have an agency working solely to assist the handicapped to become as physically fit as possible and to obtain training and jobs so as to become taxpayers instead of tax-consumers?

POSITIVE APPROACHES FOR VOLUNTEERS

Here is also what volunteers need to do in working with the handicapped.

Be accepting

As a student volunteer working with a physically disabled person, you must accept him as a person. You cannot ignore the disability, but you can de-emphasize it by focusing your attention on who this person is, what he feels, and what others feel about him. The social and emotional needs of the handicapped differ only in degree from those of the non-handicapped. He is a person just like you with the same kinds of needs and desires. You must accept this.

Be natural

Be just the person you are. If you come across as a phony, your acceptance will be suspect. The disability may raise barriers to easy communication, but these barriers can be eliminated by just being yourself. If you are comfortable with a disabled friend, you will find ways to reduce the impact of the disability and to offer him constructive help with his problems.

Be emphatic

Show empathy, not sympathy. Empathy is the exciting experience of feeling with a person, as opposed to sympathy or feeling sorry for him. An illustration of what not to do comes out of an experience in which I shared. One Saturday afternoon, a group of us who were students in a rehabilitation center were shopping in a small city. Three of us were in wheelchairs, one was on crutches and one was a "walker." We were making our way toward the end of a block when a little old lady suddenly came around the corner. As soon as she saw us, she began to shake her head slowly from side to side. Upon meeting the first wheelchair student, she exclaimed, "What a shame. What a terrible shame! And all of you are so young." Sympathy she had, but empathy there was none.

Empathy, in contrast, can be illustrated by another personal experience. Since I am a quadriplegic, paralyzed in all four limbs, I had a very difficult time learning to move from my wheelchair into bed. The first time I succeeded was a dramatic occasion. My sister and three friends were watching. When I finally inched on to the bed, there were squeals of delight, hugs, and a few tears of happiness. They were really with me, sharing joy in my progress and accomplishment and knowing how I felt inside. Empathy extends in the other direction, too. You feel the anguish of disappointments as well as the joys of success that come to the person with whom you are working.

Use your sense of humor

A genuine sense of humor is displayed by laughing with a person, not at him. Most handicapped people are able to see the amusing elements of their situation, and this insight is a tremendous plus factor in adjustment. You can help with this adjustment by not being embarrassed when an artificial limb squeaks in church or a deaf person misinterprets a statement. A group of students in one rehabilitation center even invents slogans that make light of their disabilities. And after you get to know the person with whom you work, the two of you will share many private jokes. This fosters a feeling of companionship and understanding. Naturally, your sense of humor should not concentrate solely on the disability—it is important in every aspect of life.

Learn to say, "I don't know"

This applies especially in working with the newly disabled person who feels sure he is going to be completely well again. Perhaps he may be, but in most severely disabling situa-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tions, there will be residual effects. You have no right to tell the person that you know he's going to be all right. He probably knows better than you do that he won't, and you are simply decreasing the chances of a good relationship by giving unfounded encouragement. Don't pretend and hedge—just say you don't know what the ultimate progress can be (you don't.) What he probably wants is for you to understand his uncertainty and concern and to feel this with him. On the other hand, encourage the optimism he needs for his adjustment if this optimism can be justified.

WHAT VOLUNTEERS CAN DO

Visit the person in his familiar setting

This will give you a better opportunity to get to know him, his interests and his aspirations. He, too, will feel more at ease in getting to know you in secure surroundings. If you are going to visit on a regular basis, find out the time most desirable for him. Be faithful in keeping your commitment. This is especially important for people who are confined to a bed or a building. For them a change in the routine is ever so welcome. Make your visits fun. Plan with him the activities you will do together—play cards or other handwork, discuss special topics. At the same time, allow for spontaneity. Be flexible. You might want to take friends of yours to meet him if it seems there would be mutual interests and benefits.

Take him out for appropriate activities

If you are working in a hospital or another institution, learn the rules concerning persons leaving for outings or visits. Even if there is a rule against it, inquire about exceptions if the person you are working with would like to go out. Before you take a handicapped person outside, become familiar with any special needs and be sure you can supply them. For example, it is rather difficult to fit a folded wheelchair into a small car. Remember to check out steps or other barriers that could present problems for the handicapped.

Only do for the handicapped person what he cannot do for himself

If you are not sure how he feels about you or help, ask him. Two men in wheelchairs wrote:

"I think that other people try to help you too much around town. A little help is all right but they try sometimes too hard."

"I hate it when someone tries to do something for me that I can do myself. This of course, comes from well-meaning people who just don't understand. My wife used to even salt my food. If I wanted to try to get up by myself or try something new, I had to nearly yell at the nurses not to help unless I asked for it."

Help remove barriers

Architects and planners seem to share an ecstasy about long flights of steps, an ecstasy that turns into deep frustration for the person in a wheelchair, on crutches or with a heart ailment. Many states now have regulations that require at least one level entrance into government buildings, plus elevators for access to upper floors. Those states without such laws should be encouraged to enact them. Try to influence the designers of non-government buildings (churches are among the worst offenders) to make them accessible. Get in a wheelchair yourself and go around town to see how many curbs you can manage, how many rest rooms you can get into, how many fountains you can drink from, and how many pay phones you can dial. You could organize a survey of accessible public buildings or write articles about architectural barriers.

Prejudice and ignorance also create many barriers. Some people do not realize that

August 1, 1974

blind people see through their ears and hands, that epilepsy is controlled by medication, that deaf persons can read lips better if the speaker talks naturally and does not try to exaggerate lip movement. Discrimination against the handicapped is gradually decreasing. You as a volunteer can speed this progress by helping people to understand the rehabilitation slogan, "It's not what a person has lost but what he has left that counts."

Help with the job hunt when he is ready

Ordinarily the major responsibility for employment will rest with a rehabilitation counselor or someone in a similar capacity, but you may be just the one to help by watching for employment opportunities or providing transportation for the interview.

Learn how to give of yourself

"Most people don't know how to give to another person without making him feel he needs it," wrote one handicapped man. There is no magic formula to avoid that attitude. Your philosophy of man and your understanding of disability are basic to the impression you make on a handicapped person. Such a person is probably overly sensitive to the approach and the reaction of a student volunteer, so just being yourself is very important if you are to come across as real. Remember, too, that the handicapped person has a lot to give to you, and if you don't have some needs that can be satisfied by working with the handicapped, you'll come across as condescending. This concept of giving and needing is a two-way street.

Help the disabled person to set realistic goals

Severely handicapped children set high goals. This has been interpreted as an unrealistic approach demonstrating a wish rather than an ability. You can help by gently suggesting more realistic goals—but do this on the basis of knowledge of what is realistic for him. He may underestimate his potential at times and you can help him build more confidence. It may be that you can guide him to think about where he is at that moment and what the next step should be, rather than thinking in terms of long-term goals. Whatever the direction of his goal setting, you can help him think it through.

Recognize feelings of frustration and depression

For the severely handicapped person there is often a significant amount of emotional damage, and there are always problems of adjustment. There are feelings of dependence, of lack of purpose, and of inadequacy in relating to the opposite sex.

Whenever feelings of this nature are expressed, be sure you recognize them as real. Don't argue or try to talk a person out of his feelings. Just hope that some of the things you and others are doing with him will lead him toward a more positive outlook.

Feel free to discuss religion and faith

Many disabled people feel that one of the basic helps in their adjustment is their religious faith or experiences of a mystical nature.

If the person with whom you are working wants to talk about religion and faith, you should feel free to discuss it, but be careful not to push your ideas on him.

TECHNIQUES FOR TRAINING VOLUNTEERS

Help the volunteer to understand his motives

The initial interview with a prospective student volunteer is very important, no matter what kind of service he wants to perform. If his objective is to work with the physically handicapped, his motive for this should be understood. It should be more than just to do good and make the volunteer feel warm

inside. The motive should combine benefits to the student volunteer and to the handicapped person. He should, of course, really enjoy his volunteer work with a disabled person. This enjoyment will enable him to be more helpful and meaningful to the person.

Take them where the handicapped are

Some students who want to volunteer think they want to work with the physically handicapped but have never been around anyone who has a disability. The most logical thing to do is to take them to schools, hospitals, or rehabilitation centers so that they can test their reactions. They should, of course, have the chance to talk with some of the handicapped people.

Let them try "being handicapped"

Put volunteers literally in the disabled person's situation. For example, have them put cotton in their ears to experience deafness; blindfold them and have them try moving around a room; have them get in a wheelchair and push themselves around through rooms and halls, try to get into public rest rooms, or drink from a regular water fountain. Let them try to put on clothes using just one arm.

AND FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Volunteers For People in Need. Publication Department, IARF, 5530 Wisconsin Avenue, NW, Suite 955, Washington, D.C. 20015. 1972. Price: \$2.00.

Handicaps: What Makes It Easier? What Makes It Harder? Compiled by and available from Dr. Lillian A. Pennell, Career and Personal Counseling Center, 135 North Coalter Street, Staunton, Va. 24401. 1960. Price: 50 cents.

When You Meet a Handicapped Person. National Easter Seal Society, 2023 West Ogden Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60612. Free.

Levin, Stanley. The State of the Art of Volunteering in Rehabilitation Facilities. Goodwill Industries of America, Inc., 9200 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014. 1971. Price available upon request.

McDonald, Eugent T. Understand Those Feelings: A Guide for Parents of Handicapped Children and Everyone Who Counsels Them. Stanwix House, Inc., 3020 Chartiers Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa. 14204. 1961. Price: \$5.00.

Henderson, Stephen R. One-to-One Relationships: Some Suggestions for Volunteers. Career and Personal Counseling Center, 135 North Coalter Street, Staunton, Va. 24401. 1973. Price: 50 cents.

Establishing A Volunteer Department in a Rehabilitation Center. (Rehab. Monograph XXXIII). Prepared by Ruth O'Brien. Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine, 400 E. 34th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016. 1967. Price: \$2.50.

Johnson, H. C. "Teen Agers. . . . A Real Challenge!" *Crippled Child.* XXX (6), pp. 13-15. 1953.

Meyerson, L. "Psychological Aspects of Sen-sory Disability." *Annals of the New York Academy of Science.* LXXIV, pp. 128-135, 1958. *Pennell, L. A. "The Relationship of Certain Experience to Psychological Adjustment in Persons with Spinal Cord Injury,"* Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida. 1969.

Wenar, C. "The Effects of Motor Handicap on Personality: 1. The Effects on Level of Aspiration," *Child Development.* XXIV (5), pp. 123-130. 1953.

Audio-visual resources can be found in the *Catalog of Audiovisual Materials Related to Rehabilitation*, Materials and Information Center, Alabama Rehabilitation Media Service, 216 Petrie Hall, School of Education, Auburn University, Auburn, Ala. 36830. 1971. Price available upon request.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMARKS ON H.R. 69

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the conference committee on H.R. 69 has done a commendable job. Over almost a month and a half, through 18 days of meetings, the committee has hammered out what is, on the whole, an excellent piece of legislation. It is a "compromise" in the best sense. That is, it mandates change, but provides against its being disruptive. And it provides a reasonable reconciliation of some deeply and sincerely held differences.

Overall, the bill extends, revises, and in some cases, reforms major educational programs. In most instances, the conference has provided for 4-year extensions in place of the House provision for 3-year extensions. This will give badly needed stability to these programs. The bill also provides for "forward funding", and the conference reinforces those provisions. This will give equally badly needed predictability so far as the resources that State and local agencies will have to run their programs.

While there was a good deal of debate in the House over the new title I distribution formula, I think it is a reasonable one. The problems identified in our debate had to do with our not having the technical know-how to identify the causes of educational disadvantages and enumerate the children so disadvantaged without massive testing programs. The conference's provision allowing a number of local education agencies to participate voluntarily in experimental projects of the National Institute of Education may give us the experience we need to improve the formula in future legislation. The hold-harmless provision for State education agencies' programs for handicapped, migrant, and neglected and delinquent children is one of the provisions against disruptive change that make the report a solid one.

Impact aid programs are to be gradually reformulated. This is a long-overdue move, but, according to the conference report's provisions, will be phased in so that school districts will not have to face immediate, drastic change. And I, for one, feel that the report's provision for an assessment of present bilingual education programs and future needs is essential.

The provisions providing for protection of student privacy, prohibiting the unauthorized release of student records, and permitting parents and students over 18 the right of inspection of records is of major importance. Educational research and testing are essential, but are far too imprecise for us to be careless about their dissemination and use.

I also think that the provisions added by the conference to further equal educational opportunities for women are long overdue and strengthen the House bill considerably.

I voted against the House amendments limiting the transportation of students to implement desegregation plans because of the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown* against Board of Education. I do recognize that a majority of Members of the House feel differently about these amendments and that those feelings represent the deeply held views and beliefs of large numbers of their constituents. The House Members of the conference have done a solid job of representing the basic views of the majority of the House while finding a ground for reconciliation with the amendments adopted by the Senate. The result is a reasonable one. It does not represent my own views, but it is a reasonable compromise of the views of many. Certainly, the passage of H.R. 69 cannot be further delayed. It is important legislation to the very children in whose name we are trying to provide more equal educational opportunity.

JOHN HEINZ REPORTS

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of my most recent newsletter to my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania. This is in accordance with my wish to keep the voters of Allegheny County fully informed of my activities in Congress:

AUGUST 1974.

DEAR FRIEND: Washington will be a little hotter than usual this summer even if the weather is cool. However, it'll be the work that keeps temperatures up, and there's plenty of it. I'll be right here. And if you're in Washington, I hope you'll come to see me. I recently enjoyed the visit of members of the Presidential Classroom (pictured from left to right, Samuel Lema, Marion Thompson and Mr. and Mrs. M. Cammarata) to discuss a number of current issues.

It concerns me that our country isn't making the progress we hope for. Neither is government, and what's needed is stronger leadership in Congress and the White House to undertake the tough jobs such as reforming welfare, eliminating election abuses, making taxes fairer and stabilizing the economic picture. Reform inside Congress is part of the answer, and it is time to streamline the House of Representatives into a functioning, twentieth century institution which represents people intelligently and effectively. But before we move on these matters, Congress will first have to resolve the impeachment question. As this report goes to print, no report or recommendation has yet been made by the Judiciary Committee. However, if the Committee votes for impeachment, an impeachment resolution could reach the House floor in late August. My difficult responsibility then will be to apply the right standard of judgment and to vote solely according to the facts and evidence without regard to party or bias. I think most of you want me to "call it as I see it" and agree that resolving the impeachment question and completing the full investigation of the Watergate scandal will help get government moving ahead for the people it should serve . . . you!

STOPPING INFLATION: TWO ROLES FOR GOVERNMENT

It doesn't seem right to me that the wholesale cost of meat is 15 percent lower than a year ago, while prices to you at the market are down only two percent, according to USDA figures. People aren't getting the benefit of drops in costs to middlemen but they are quick to feel the surge of production and processing cost increases. Skyrocketing prices on food, cars, gasoline, taxes and other items are wrecking family budgets and the security of those on fixed incomes.

Good solutions are hard to come by. We are learning that wage/price controls created more problems than they solved . . . and that more direct government regulation isn't the answer. There are, however, at least two steps—neither of them easy—which Washington can take that I believe will help curb inflation. First, the federal budget should be balanced. Second, responsible enforcement of antitrust laws already on the books will put downward pressure on prices and save small businesses from being squeezed out; in turn, small business provides the jobs, opportunity and competition we all need for a healthy economy.

Happily, Congress took a long overdue step in recently passing a Budget Control Act to set a federal spending ceiling. The effect will be to force us to set better priorities and save taxpayers' money. I'll fight to give health, environment, education and mass transit proper attention, while trimming foreign aid, the military, waste and unnecessary bureaucracy.

We're also moving on antitrust, whose enforcement has been weakened over the years by government letting down its guard. The result: special interest exemptions . . . and a heap of bad, discriminatory regulation. For this reason, I recently organized and now chair a 17-member Republican Task Force on Antitrust and Monopoly Problems. As a result of our work the House voted in June, 216-185, for my amendment to give the Justice Department's Antitrust Division their first manpower increase in four years. Extensive Task Force hearings on food and agriculture are already underway, and we expect to report our findings and recommendations in early September with energy industry and news media proposals to follow shortly afterwards.

Most government controls often wreck opportunity, competition and the basis for an open and dynamic U.S. economy. I believe the responsible alternative is preserving a competitive marketplace where all Americans may buy and sell freely.

POLL SHOWS 18TH DISTRICT PEOPLE WANT WASHINGTON TO ACT

In an effort to learn more about your concerns, I sent questionnaires to all 174,000 households in the 18th District. It is encouraging that more than 28,000 people answered and that many of you approved of the actions I have undertaken in your behalf. Your thoughts and opinions will be very useful to me in the months ahead. Here's the questionnaire and your responses:

[All numbers are in percent]

1. Oil profits: I don't think oil companies should get rich off an "energy crisis" that has caused hardship to so many. I've strongly advocated an excess profits tax on the oil industry and have introduced legislation to permit reasonable profits but prevent profiteering. Do you approve of this approach?

Yes, 79; No, 8; unsure, 13.

2. Environment vs. energy? I believe clean air, water and energy are vital resources we must conserve. While I support limited changes in the Clean Air Act to help attain energy self-sufficiency, I'm opposed to gutting clean air laws that protect the public's health. Do you agree?

Yes, 80; No, 5; unsure, 15.

3. Social security taxes: Someone earning

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

\$12,000 a year pays a \$702 Social Security tax (the rate is 5.85%). I think this is a tremendous burden. By cutting the rate, increasing the base, and using some funds from other tax revenues to make up the difference, we could lower this tax on working people. In principle, do you agree with this idea?

Yes, 71; No, 14; unsure, 15.

4. Attacking high prices: Wage and price controls haven't worked—except on wages. I think we should attack the real causes of inflation such as stupid wheat deals, wasteful spending, government deficits financed by printing money, and export policies that cause shortages. In addition, I am urging new tough anti-trust laws to force the kind of competition that cuts prices. Do you approve?

Yes, 83; No, 2; unsure, 15.

5. Federal spending priorities: I have voted twice to put a brake on total Federal spending. Also, I have tried to hold the line or reduce military spending, foreign aid, and farm subsidies. Besides checking to see if I'm on the right track, I'd like to know your priorities on how you want your tax dollar spent. Mark following programs: More, Less, Same:

	More	Same	Less
Education	54	30	16
Welfare	22	33	45
Social security	49	38	13
Manpower training	33	35	32
Foreign aid	2	10	88
Public works	26	37	37
Housing	34	34	32
Health	63	29	8
Mass transit	67	21	12
Military spending	11	28	61
Sewers	50	40	10
Revenue sharing	35	40	25

6. Campaign financing: We need changes to make elections fairer and more competitive. Congress will soon vote on public financing of both primary and general elections for the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives. Do you favor this kind of support from Federal tax revenues?

Strongly favor	27
Mixed feelings	35
Strongly oppose	24
Unsure	14

7. Service to you: I'm presently receiving (and trying to read!) between 500 and 600 letters and telegrams a week, plus many phone calls. Many of these concern questions or problems of individual interest. If you have been in touch with my office during the past year, how would you describe the service you received?

Excellent, 16%; Satisfactory, 18%; Unsatisfactory, 2%. No contact or not responding, 64%.

If you checked "unsatisfactory," I would appreciate your notifying me of the specifics by letter addressed to: Congressman John Heinz, Constituent Service Complaint, 324 Cannon Bldg., Wash., D.C. 20515. This will help me and the Congressional staff serve you better. Thanks!

8. National health insurance: My Public Health and Environmental Subcommittee is working on national health insurance. I feel strongly that Congressional action is overdue to protect Americans in the event of catastrophic medical problems. How do you feel?

Strongly agree	54
Somewhat agree	25
Don't agree	7
Unsure	14

9. Transportation flexibility: I can't help but feel our priorities are wrong when we've spent \$60 billion of your tax money on interstate highways since 1958 and less than $\frac{1}{4}$ th of that amount on mass transit and railroads. Do you favor my efforts to change this?

Yes, 72; No, 6; unsure, 22.

August 1, 1974

10. Food prices: The Labor Dept. has told us the average family is spending \$60.65 for the same weekly groceries \$50 bought a year ago. Those of you I talk to seem to think store prices are higher than this. How do the government's figures seem to you?

Much too low	36
Too low	39
About right	23
Unsure	2

The question of impeachment: As you know, the House Judiciary Committee is investigating impeachable offenses by the President and whether he should be tried by the Senate. Sometime this year, I expect to be called upon to vote on these questions. The House of Representatives has a strong legal, moral and political responsibility to be influenced only by the evidence and findings from this investigation. Nevertheless, many of you undoubtedly have strong feelings on these subjects and may wish to share your thoughts with me.

For impeachment	29
Against impeachment	28
Use your judgment	30
Resign	5
Not responding	8

OOPS! PARDON MY MISTAKE

I make my share of mistakes. But some good may come of one I made recently. More than a year ago I introduced H.R. 636, a bill to simplify and encourage reform of our complicated and often unfair tax code. Similar to legislation introduced by others in the last Congress, my bill would force Congress to take a fresh look at virtually all the federal tax laws by requiring their periodic review and renewal. This follows the pattern of legislation in education, defense, health, etc., where laws are enacted for several years, after which they expire and are re-examined by Congress to see what changes are needed.

Imagine my surprise when a number of church groups began to attack the bill because, contrary to my intention, it appeared to threaten charitable contributions. I strongly believe that charitable contributions are vital to strengthening the moral, educational and cultural backbone of the nation and should be kept. And because of this confusion over H.R. 636, I have withdrawn my support of it to look for superior approaches to tax reform.

In seeking better legislation to make taxes fairer, I have become convinced that our present tax laws actually discourage most people from giving to churches and other worthy charitable causes. To change this, I have written H.R. 15722, "The Religious and Charitable Donor's Tax Credit Act," which would permit each taxpayer a tax credit equal to half the value of charitable gifts up to a top credit of \$500. With this legislation people at all income levels can afford to support their church or charities. If you would like additional information on this new approach, please don't hesitate to let me know.

HOW TO SUCCEED IN WASHINGTON AT 74

Our Washington office had the decided honor and pleasure of having 74 year old, W. James Steen of Mt. Lebanon, serve as an intern during May. Mr. Steen is a former Duquesne Light employee and brought to us important insights into how Washington treats the aged. Thanks to his effort, I have prepared a new legislative way to give substantial tax relief to aged homeowners and renters. Mr. Steen's idea is to federally fund state rebates to the aged on a sliding scale based on their income. This legislation probably has a better chance for passage since it avoids the bottleneck of the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee.

FROM THE ACTION DEPARTMENT

Energy.—Remember the Arab oil embargo and lines at gas stations? Well, during last winter's "energy crunch" I pushed for legis-

lation to save our oil supplies from being exported by profiteers and to protect small manufacturers of medical and other petrochemical-based items from being squeezed out by the big corporations which control petrochemical supplies. I also pressed for across-the-board emergency price controls on oil. Unfortunately, no energy legislation ever became law. And while the crisis has receded . . . for now . . . it is shortsighted and dangerous that Congress has taken no significant action to develop a bill or energy policy worthy of the name.

College Student Loans.—Added financial relief is now available to students from middle income families. H.R. 12253, a bill identical to one I introduced earlier, recently became law. It provides guaranteed student loans of up to \$2500 to those from families with incomes as high as \$20,000, and partially eliminates the unfair "needs analysis". Under the old law, some people with the same income and circumstances as others were unfairly penalized just because they were frugal enough to save money. This troublesome and discriminatory test is no longer required for loans up to \$2000.

Mental Health.—As you read this the House should be voting on H.R. 14214, which includes H.R. 11518, the bill I wrote to develop better run community mental health centers and ensure broad support for continuing an expanded program. I especially appreciated receiving the National Association of Mental Health Award for "effective leadership" in mental health. On other health bills recently written or cosponsored by me, the Narcotic Addict Treatment Act, the Diabetes Mellitus Act and the Alcoholism Treatment and Prevention Act and the Research on Aging Act, have all been signed into law by President Nixon.

Flood Aid and Prevention.—Remember Agnes? Problems from the flooding are still being solved. Recently, I was pleased that the joint efforts of my office with local, state and federal officials resulted in \$4.5 million flood renewal funds going to the McKees Rocks area. We are also working with the Army Corps of Engineers to accelerate flood action plans for Girty's Run and other Allegheny and Ohio River tributaries.

Rape Prevention and Control.—I recently reintroduced my bill H.R. 10848, with 67 cosponsors to assure rape victims proper and dignified care by police, hospitals and courts. I expect hearings to be scheduled soon.

Social Security (Mal) Administration.—My meetings with Social Security officials to discuss occasional, but too frequent, unprofessional and inhumane handling of disability applicants have produced promises and some results. More careful attention to people's needs and questions is needed while their requests are being processed.

MY CONGRESSIONAL WORKSHOP: CAN YOU COME?

I've sent post cards to announce legislative meetings in schools, churches, libraries and town halls. Please come if you have questions, complaints or something to say. At night I am in Millvale meeting Father Pergl. I'd like to see you, too! Sessions are open, off the cuff . . . not partisan or campaign related. Frequently, I am invited to civic or neighborhood organizations in the same community, and if you would like me to come to your group, please call Barbara Buscemi at (412) 562-0533. This summer and fall, I'll almost certainly be in your community. Cards announcing my workshops usually arrive a week in advance. Hope to see you.

LET ME KNOW

This newsletter is sent to every household in the 18th District. Every once in a while "postal patron" mailings go astray or get mixed with other mail, so some people don't always see it. If you know of someone or several families in the District who do not receive my newsletters, please let me know

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

through my Pittsburgh office. Thank you, have a pleasant summer, and please contact me if I can be of service.

Sincerely,

H. JOHN HEINZ III,
Your Congressman.

MOSCOW'S "MED" MOVES

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have been especially interested in the developments inherent in Cyprus, and in the complications that this poses for the NATO alliance as it does for Greece and Turkey. The obvious interest of the Soviet Union in taking advantage of this crisis in some fashion is quite predictable.

One of the most thorough commentaries of the crisis are the opinions expressed in a column by Alex Seith who was past president of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, and incidentally, is a leader in efforts to structure reform of the Democratic National Committee and the Democratic Party. Mr. Seith has a well-deserved reputation for his interest in foreign policy developments, and he has not yet succumbed to the neo-isolationism movement that is so prominent in the Democratic congressional ranks.

Mr. Seith's article, one of the better commentaries on the Cyprus situation, was published in the Star-Tribune on July 28.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Star-Tribune, July 28, 1974]

Moscow's "Med" Moves

(By Alex R. Seith)

Has Super-K done it again? Has he produced the peace in Cyprus and averted diplomatic disaster for America?

To many "men in the street" neither the question nor the answer really matters. To them Cyprus is but another screaming headline telling of troubles in a distant place about which most Americans know little and care less.

At a time when inflation is gnawing at everyone's pocketbook and global trouble spots seem innumerable, perhaps it is little surprise if news of war on a Mediterranean island is widely ignored.

Yet, the global balance of power between Russia and America could be massively shifted by the fate of this nation of barely 650,000 Greek and Turkish inhabitants.

Because of Henry Kissinger's truce in the Mid-East, Soviet power and prestige in the region suffered enormously. Although Egypt had been the Kremlin's client state in time of war, it had become America's friend in time of peace.

America is seen as the savior of Egypt's prestige and the provider of its economic birth. In Lebanon, Jordan and Saudi-Arabia the Soviets were outmaneuvered by America's deft moves in the last four months. Despite Russia's continuing influence in Iraq and Syria, its status in the Mid-East was—before Cyprus—at its lowest ebb in more than a decade.

Suddenly the Cyprus conflagration has caused the Kremlin to conjure up new dreams of domination in the Mediterranean. For America trouble in Cyprus is a "no win"

proposition, while it is a "no lose" prospect for the Soviets.

With an 80 per cent Greek population, Cyprus has been constantly pushed toward political union with Greece. Turkey, concerned for the 20 per cent Turkish citizens of Cyprus, has warned that a joinder of Cyprus and Greece would mean war with Turkey.

Greece and Turkey are both crucial allies in the NATO alliance. With key refueling and docking stations Greece offers strategic bases for the U.S. Sixth Fleet. Turkey, having a long common border with the Soviet Union and a long history of resistance to Russian imperialism, is among America's most well-armed and most militarily anti-Soviet allies.

Together Greece and Turkey are essential to America's efforts to keep the Mediterranean from becoming a Russian lake and to keep the Mid-East from becoming a Soviet domain.

Yet, during the fighting on Cyprus the Soviets seek to reverse both recent and remote history by allying themselves with Turkey. In offering military backing for the Turkish invasion of Cyprus, the Soviet motives were both devious and clear. The Kremlin wanted to show the Turks that traditional "enemies" in Moscow had become friends. And in the bargain the Soviets wanted to weaken NATO, deprive the United States of key bases in the Mediterranean and re-establish fading Soviet power in the Mid-East.

With daily and almost hourly shifts in events, it is impossible to predict if the Soviets will succeed.

But their latest attempt to divide the west and dominate the Mid-East should be a fresh reminder for the inattentive and the unsuspecting.

For the inattentive it shows how many parts of the world, even the obscure, are part of a global power struggle. For the unsuspecting, it demonstrates that detente does not mean the Kremlin will desist in pursuing imperial power.

PRICES IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 16, 1974, Mobil Oil Co. ran an advertisement in the Washington Post entitled "Prices in Perspective." It purports to show that, in fact, gasoline prices have not risen as astronomically as everyone knows they have. The advertisement compares the prices and the increases in prices of gasoline to such human necessities as a pack of cigarettes, a washing machine, and a one-line classified ad in the New York Times. I will not comment on the folly of such a comparison; that is rather obvious. Rather, I will limit my criticism to the conclusions reached by Mobil from a study of the aforementioned statistics.

Mobil claims that "the average gasoline prices had risen less than 25 percent over the 13 1/2 years, covered by the table, from the spring of 1960 to last fall." That is true, but I do not believe it tells the whole story. I would like to put "Prices in Perspective" in its proper perspective. First, from the year 1960 until 1970, the average price of a gallon of gasoline increased by 16 percent compared to the average increase in prices of the table's

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

articles of 20 percent. So the increases were roughly the same. From the year 1970 to the present however, the price of 1 gallon of gasoline has increased by an astronomical 50 percent, compared to an average increase in the others of 20 percent. In other words, in that 4-year period gas increased at a rate 150 percent greater than that of the other necessities mentioned in Mobil's statistics. Although this increase does not seem out of line to Mobil, it appears blatantly so to me.

If Mobil is seeking to ward off criticism through advertisements such as these, I wish them the best of luck. Perhaps their money could be spent on more worthwhile undertakings, such as lowering the price of their gasoline.

[Advertisement in the Washington Post by Mobil Oil Co., June 16, 1974]

PRICES IN PERSPECTIVE

You don't need a table like this to remind you that the cost of living has gone up. Still, it's another way of looking at those high gasoline prices you hate to pay.

What the table doesn't say is that average gasoline prices had risen less than 25% over the 13½ years from the spring of 1960 to last fall.

Then came the Arab oil embargo. Crude oil prices skyrocketed. Gasoline prices shot up by 10 to 15c a gallon in a matter of months.

Even over a 14-year span, the gasoline price increase doesn't seem out of line with the price increases of the other familiar items listed above. That doesn't make gasoline prices more palatable, but perhaps it puts them in better perspective.

Average price	1960	1970	1974	Change (percent)
Bacon (1 lb.)	\$0.64	\$0.98	\$1.25	+95
Bread, white (1 lb.)	.20	.24	.34	+70
Cigarettes (1 pk.)	.27	.41	.47	+74
Classified ad (1 line) (New York Times)	2.30	3.30	4.06	+77
Dental care (1 filling)	5.08	7.33	8.99	+77
Eggs (1 doz.)	.56	.57	.78	+39
Gasoline, regular (1 gal.)	.31	.36	.54	+74
Hose, women's (1 pr.)	1.52	1.52	1.39	-9
Movie admission (adult)	.95	1.81	2.16	+127
Roast, rib (1 lb.)	.81	1.12	1.55	+91
Shoes, men's (1 pr.)	15.24	20.40	24.71	+62
Toilet tissue (650-sheet roll)	.09	.10	.13	+44
Washing machine	239.11	226.83	238.19	-1
Vitamins (100 capsules)	3.16	2.78	2.76	-13
Consumer Price Index (1967=100)	89	115	144	+62

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Platt's Gasoline Price Index, N.Y. Times, Tobacco Tax Council. (Prices are latest comparable figures available.)

BICENTENNIAL FOG CLEARING

HON. LINDY BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration Policy Board I would like to comment on James J. Kilpatrick's article in the Washington Star-News June 10, entitled "Bicentennial Fog Clearing."

Since the appointment of John Warner as Administrator of the Bicentennial Administration 4 months ago, there have been definite signs of in-

creased activity and cooperation on a national level, signs which have been long overdue.

John Warner is known to many of us personally here in the Congress as an outstanding public servant who is dedicated to the belief of putting 100 percent of himself into his work. I am pleased that he is at the helm, and I believe that we can all look forward to a constructive, well-run Bicentennial observance, under his direction.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Kilpatrick's article in the RECORD at this point:

BICENTENNIAL FOG CLEARING

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

John W. Warner, former secretary of the Navy, two months ago took over the helm of the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration. Friends of the bicentennial may wish devoutly, if vainly, that Warner had taken the helm two years ago instead. There is hope that the bicentennial effort at last is gaining momentum.

This observer expresses hope. It is something short of conviction. If Warner manages to pull this effort together, and to achieve a bicentennial observance that appropriately celebrates the past and holds meaning for the future, he will have brought off a miracle of public administration.

When Congress first authorized an official observance of the 200th anniversary of American independence, a bicentennial commission was brought into being. Lyndon Johnson window-dressed the commission with some first-class men and women, and thereafter neglected the body altogether. Richard Nixon treated the commission even more shabbily: He made it a political football and indifferently kicked it around.

By the summer of 1972, just four years before the Great Anniversary, the commission was wholly demoralized. Its chairman could provide no respected leadership. Its director resigned after a management study spoke of his "irritating and insensitive, idiosyncratic behavior." The commission was foundering in politics. The staff lacked any clear sense of direction. In December of 1972, a coldly critical report from the House Judiciary Committee left the ARBC little more than a sinking hulk.

Congress then proceeded to scrap the old commission altogether. In its place, the new American Revolution Bicentennial Administration emerged. The President announced Warner's appointment as director in March, and on April 11 Warner moved into the ARBA's office on Jackson Place. This correspondent found him there last week.

The new skipper is a pipe-smoking, 47-year-old Virginia lawyer, tall, dark-haired, ruggedly handsome. He ought to be playing one of those doctor roles on TV. His first task is to get his new 11-member board in operation. By the end of July, he expects also to have a 25-member advisory council in being. He has drafted Sydney H. Eiges, a top executive of NBC, as his new communications man. He has named James Gregory Barnes as his executive officer. Both appointees, incidentally, are Democrats.

Warner is determined to free the ARBA of its last barnacles of partisan politics. By law the advisory council can have no more than 15 members of the same party. Warner wants both his Republican and Democratic members drawn from a broad public spectrum, and he expects them to work. Their first task may involve passing judgment upon the quality, good taste, and appropriateness of products submitted for ARBA licensing.

The licensing program, not yet publicly announced, is expected to raise several million dollars a year for redistribution to state and local bicentennial committees. The general idea, subject to board approval, is for the ARBA to grant the use of its emblem

August 1, 1974

and its endorsement to manufacturers of everything from inexpensive souvenirs to costly furniture. Warner has no qualms about industrial participation in the bicentennial observance. He wants everybody to get into the act.

Except for the licensing program, the ARBA itself will operate nothing. Its task, under the new law, is to stimulate and to coordinate the efforts of others—chiefly the 1,500 to 2,000 local activities. He is not much concerned about festivals and fireworks; these, he believes, will pretty much take care of themselves. His larger concern is for a popular, nationwide re-examination of the values of 200 years ago in terms of their application to the century ahead. He wants a "do-it-yourself" bicentennial, with a minimum of governmental guidance and direction.

Not much time remains. Warner is like a destroyer captain, ordered into action before his new ship has filled its crew or secured its hatches. He inherits a scattered convoy and chests of abandoned maps, charts and canceled orders. The decks are awash, but the fog is lifting and the skipper seems to know where he is taking his ship. Those who treasure the last quarter of the 18th Century will pray he brings her into port on time.

TERMINATING MILITARY AID TO CHILE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today the Foreign Affairs Committee began its markup of the administration's foreign assistance request for fiscal year 1975, a program which includes many provisions with which I have found disfavor. As a result, I intend to offer a series of amendments, in committee, in an effort to correct what I view as some of the program's major deficiencies. Primary among the faults of the administration bill is the military assistance request for the junta in Chile, a request which stands as a nagging reminder of a foreign policy at odds with itself. The proposal for \$21.3 million worth of military assistance grants and sales credits to Chile represents to me an unfortunate continuation of an American policy to influence the internal affairs of Chile, to the detriment of both the Chilean people and the principles of freedom we claim to stand for in the world. For this reason, I intend to offer an amendment which would unconditionally terminate all forms of military assistance to the Chilean junta.

It is with great regret that I note the reports from Santiago in this morning's newspapers that military courts, which have been functioning in Chile since the coup last September, have convicted 60 persons—and handed out four death sentences—for the essentially political offense of belonging to a political party. It is even more distressing to realize that such an occurrence has not been uncommon in post-Allende Chile, as a series before the Subcommittees on Inter-American Affairs and International Organizations and Movements amply documented. However, my purpose here is not

to explore the many-faceted internal repression that the Chilean people face. It is not out of a lack of sympathy, but rather a recognition I sense that the fundamental problem in Chile runs deeper than the violations of civil rights inflicted by the current military leadership, that I focus my remarks on American foreign policy toward Chile.

While some of the basic facts about events leading up to the September 1973 coup remain in doubt, it seems evident from our policies that the United States welcomed the military overthrow of President Allende. Basic economic benefits to Chile have once again begun to flow, after a period of economic estrangement while Allende was President. For example, Public Law 480 commodity sales and grants—essentially a form of economic assistance—totaling \$37 million is planned for fiscal year 1975, compared to only \$2.5 million just 2 years ago. In addition, shortly after the coup, the first major commodity loans extended to Chile in several years, totaling \$52 million were made by several lending institutions.

Both this rapid infusion of economic assistance following the military takeover and the rather deliberate reduction in aid during the Allende period, add up to a policy designed to foster the fall of the democratically elected Allende government.

Even if nothing else were done in our name there, this policy of economic isolation forces on the United States a share of the responsibility for the situation in Chile today.

My major concern, however, is not with changing our economic assistance policy. I do not favor the use of humanitarian aid programs as a political tool against the military junta, just as I did not favor the use of these programs as political leverage against Allende. What is more alarming, it seems to me, is the dramatic increase in U.S. military aid to Chile since the advent of the junta. From a modest \$10 million worth of foreign military sales credits in fiscal year 1972, the administration is now requesting more than double that amount. Furthermore, Chile is now eligible to purchase sophisticated jet aircraft. A grant training program of Chilean military officers continues, as does the presence of an American military assistance advisory group—MAAG—in Santiago. Even to continue military aid at existing levels, in the face of the military coup, indicates a basic insensitivity to the cause-and-effect relationship of our military support in a foreign country and the direction of its government. And to seek large increases in such aid programs reveals a conscious attempt to strengthen and bolster a repressive and illegitimate government.

Some have argued that a conditional cutback of military aid, linked to an improvement in the political situation in Chile, would be the most responsible way for us to exercise a positive influence. While I wholeheartedly support the goals of furthering human rights, such a policy results at best in a wrist slap to the junta, especially when our own administration appears committed to provide military aid regardless of the internal

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

political situation. Such legislation would only aggregate the perception that Congress can only assert its feelings about critical issues but must, in the end, settle for an administration disregard of these protestations.

I prefer to see the Congress act in a more positive and forceful manner. We must demonstrate to the ruling junta in Chile not only that the United States no longer countenances their internal policies but that we no longer actively support their continued rule of force. A complete and unconditional termination of military aid to Chile would lend veracity to our assertions of freedom and democracy, with resultant positive effects elsewhere in Latin America and the world.

Our "national security" is clearly not dependent upon a continuation of our military aid to Chile. The stability of South America is likewise not kept in balance by the \$21.3 million worth of military aid proposed for Chile. The security of Chile from external attack is not guaranteed by our assistance program, as there is no identifiable external threat. The logical conclusion is that our military aid policies do nothing more than help the junta strengthen its grip on the people of Chile.

THE MILITARY AID PACKAGE

The largest single item requested for Chile for fiscal year 1975 is \$20.5 million in credits for purchases under the Foreign Military Sales Act. This is more than double the credits authorized in fiscal year 1972, and represents a significant increase over the \$15 million in credits extended in fiscal year 1974. Even more important, however, is Chile's recently acquired eligibility to purchase sophisticated jet aircraft. Last June, President Nixon waived the restriction on such sales for five Latin American countries, including Chile. Defense Department reports indicate that Chile is interested in ordering 16, and possibly as many as 36, F-5E aircraft.

Although Congress must authorize the amount of foreign military sales credits extended to Chile, as well as to other countries, it is virtually impossible to control two aspects of U.S. military assistance. The most important of these are direct government-to-government cash sales. No congressional oversight of these arms sales is provided, and reports from DOD indicate that recent sales have included jet trainer aircraft, as well as ammunition and spare parts.

The second significant and undercontrolled source of arms are commercial sales directly from U.S. manufacturers, subject to the grant of an export license by the State Department. We have no way of knowing in advance the extent or nature of these sales. An examination of previous sales, as reported by the State Department, indicates the export to Chile of such items as pistols and revolvers, cartridges and ammunition, and riot control agents.

Another "unreported" component of our military assistance to Chile consists of \$626,500 requested for fiscal year 1975 to fund a 15-man military assistance advisory group—MAAG—an item which does not appear in the foreign aid author-

ization bill now before the Congress. As a result of authority derived from a 1926 law, and years of acquiescence by Congress, the supporting funds for MAAG's in Latin America, unlike other countries, are included only in the defense budget. Nevertheless, these military missions perform the basic administrative tasks associated with the grant military assistance and foreign military sales programs currently before the Foreign Affairs Committee. According to the statement of Adm. Thomas Moorer before the Foreign Affairs Committee on May 23, 1973, the chief of each MAAG, in addition to processing military assistance requests, training quotas and sales agreements, "serves as the Secretary of Defense's representative with the Ministry of National Defense and is a high-level adviser to the Military Establishment of the host country." This function was described more succinctly in a State Department position paper submitted last year to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

... they promote the sale and use of U.S. military equipment.

The delicacy of undertaking such a relationship with the military junta in Chile has been underscored by the recent visit of Secretary of the Army Howard Calloway to Chile and other Latin American countries. As my colleague, Congressman FRASER, has pointed out, this visit with the military leaders in Chile has lent support and credibility to the military government there. I also feel that the Secretary's contacts with the U.S. MAAG personnel in Chile reassert the unfortunately close relationship among the Defense Department, American military personnel stationed in Chile, and the Chilean military junta.

Personal ties between the militaries of our two countries do not end there. As has been reported previously, six high ranking Chilean military officers are graduates of the U.S. Southern Defense Command School of the Americas, in the Canal Zone. The administration aid request for fiscal 1975 seeks \$800,000 to continue this and other training programs. Last year, 259 Chileans were trained at the Army school; courses for this year will include flying operations, communications, administration, and the studiously open-ended "military techniques and practices."

Several justifications have been offered for this wide variety of military aid, a considerable increase over expenditures before the coup. Whatever logic exists for providing more military assistance to Chile seems to be more than counterbalanced by the detrimental impact of pouring arms and munitions into the hands of a demonstrably repressive military junta.

First, the Defense Department has indicated that aid to Chile is "simply a continuation of the long standing and friendly relationship between the U.S. Armed Forces and their Chilean counterparts, and reflected our mutual security interest and a Chilean preference for continuing this relationship." It is almost unbelievable that the administration has not been fit to reevaluate that "relationship" in light of the violent

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

overthrow of the democratically elected Government of Chile that was engineered by the military. Our very recent experience in Greece during the Cyprus crisis, in which a threatened withdrawal of American military aid was seen as a significant factor in deterring all-out war and fostering reestablishment of civilian government, should have demonstrated that it is no longer consistent with our national interest to blindly pawns into the hands of military governments.

A related justification for our military assistance to Chile came from Vice Adm. Ray Peet, in hearings of the foreign aid bill before the Foreign Affairs Committee. He said that it was necessary to continue our military assistance programs at the requested level in order to secure U.S. influence with the Chilean regime. This same argument has been posed time and time again, but the payoff never seems to materialize. To gain some minimal foothold in the minds of the military men now running Chile seems a dubious small benefit compared to the moral and diplomatic cost of supplying those leaders with the tools to strengthen their repressive hold on the Chilean people.

We can send the junta a message. Only if we terminate our military aid to Chile will the junta know we mean to stand behind our calls for internal reform. It would be a more positive influence to withdraw our military aid, to show our fundamental disagreement with the course of events in Chile, than to follow the unproven logic of gaining influence through arms sales.

A third argument that was presented to the committee by Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger during the hearings on this bill holds that a termination of U.S. military assistance to Latin American countries would "simply encourage them to make their military purchases elsewhere. This is inconsistent with a foreign policy which seeks strong regional associations with the nations of the Western Hemisphere." Later he states that we ought not "leave the supply of arms largely to those outside this hemisphere." The facts surrounding possible arms sales to Chile from foreign countries clearly refute these assertions. Of the major weapons suppliers besides the United States, none appear as willing as this administration to provide arms to the Chilean junta. The British Government announced, on April 10, 1974, a termination of military aid to Chile. No new arms exports were to be licensed, and servicing for already delivered fighters has since been terminated. The new President of France has indicated that his country will seriously reconsider any weapons sales to governments such as Chile's, and the Soviet Union can hardly be expected to arm a right-wing military government. That leaves the United States in the unique position of virtually controlling the supply of available weapons to the Chilean junta. At this time, with little effect on our policy of, in Mr. Schlesinger's words, "seeking strong regional associations," we can drive home to the Chilean junta our displeasure with their policies and assert our termination of military support.

Because of the broadly based nature of the military assistance planned for Chile, it is important to enact an across-the-board termination. Otherwise, commercial sales and cash sales will continue, unregulated by the Congress and reported only after the fact. Otherwise, we will remain an active and not entirely beneficial force in Chile's internal affairs. Otherwise, responsibility for the continued repression of the Chilean people rests partly in our hands.

I include the following:

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

Page —, after line —, insert the following new section:

PROHIBITION OF ASSISTANCE TO CHILE

SEC. 305. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(x) All military assistance, all sales of defense articles and services (whether for cash or by credit, guaranty, or any other means), and all licenses with respect to the transportation of arms, ammunitions, and implements of war (including technical data relating thereto) to the Government of Chile under this or any other law shall be prohibited upon the date of enactment of this subsection."

Renumber the following sections in title III accordingly.

MONTHLY NEWSLETTER

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, last week I mailed my monthly newsletter for July 1974 to my constituents in the Fifth Congressional District of North Carolina. In that newsletter I discussed the important topic of campaign finance reform, and I want to share with my colleagues the comments I made.

The comments follow:

MONTHLY NEWSLETTER: JULY 1974
CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

For the past year, a major effort of mine has been in studying the many legislative proposals that have been made on campaign reform. On many of these proposals I have asked this basic question: "Does the proposal strengthen the vitality and preserve the integrity of the electoral process?"

Nearly three years ago, I supported the Federal Elections Campaign Act. This proposal was the first campaign reform legislation to be enacted into public law in over forty years. Since that time, events have shown that reform is still needed in this area and I would like to share with you what I consider to be the basic legislative needs, which will give emphasis to further safeguarding our great American political system.

It is my belief that legislation should be enacted which would:

Limit contributions to \$1,000 per election per candidate per individual.

Limit contributions to \$5,000 per election per candidate from a political committee that makes contributions to five or more candidates.

Prohibit secretive earmarking and laundering of funds.

August 1, 1974

Prohibit a candidate from making expenditures from their personal funds or the personal funds of their immediate family in excess of \$25,000 per election.

Limit expenditures to \$10 million for a candidate for nomination for President and \$20 million in the Presidential general election. In the Senate and the House of Representatives limit expenditures to 5c times the population of the State or \$75,000, whichever is greater.

Prohibit contributions by foreign nationals.

Prohibit contributions in the name of another person.

Prohibit cash contributions in excess of \$100.

Outlaw all "dirty tricks" and provide for stiff penalties.

Provide that each candidate designate a central campaign committee through which he must report all expenditures.

Establish an independent Federal Elections Commission, which would administer and enforce the law.

Increase the penalties for violation of the law.

One proposal that has been made and one to which I strongly object is the public financing of elections. The tax dollars from the American people should not be used to finance political campaigns. It is my belief that such a policy would only undermine our traditional political process. The American way allows for free expression of our political beliefs and I do not think the beleaguered taxpayer wants his hard earned money spent by a candidate he firmly opposes.

AWARD GIVEN TO SGT. ROBERT JAMES POTIER

HON. JOHN B. BREAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my pride in an individual from my hometown who has received the highest award given by the American National Red Cross, the Red Cross Certificate of Merit.

Sgt. Robert James Potier, of the Crowley City Police Department, was recently called to the scene of an automobile accident involving a 2-year-old boy. Sergeant Potier, who had been trained in first aid, noticed that the child was not breathing and immediately administered mouth-to-mouth artificial respiration and other life supportive measures. In the time it took the ambulance to arrive, the sergeant had been successful in restoring breathing to the child.

According to the official announcement of the award from the American National Red Cross, the attending physician stated:

His (the young boy) survival is directly related to the first aid administered at the scene of the accident.

In our fast pace of life, we sometimes forget the devotion displayed to our fellow men by those who sincerely care and are dedicated to saving and protecting the lives of others.

I join, with Sergeant Potier's family and friends, in expressing gratitude for his actions and pride in his accomplishments and high standard of work.

August 1, 1974

HEW REVEALS PSRO CONTRACTS
AWARDED AMA

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, at the recent American Medical Association convention, the AMA House of Delegates defeated a motion advocating the repeal of the PSRO provision of the Social Security Amendments of 1972. I consider this action exceedingly shortsighted, for it is the private practice of medicine that is most threatened by bureaucracies like PSRO.

It has recently come to my attention that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare awarded a large number of contracts for the development of PSRO's the week of the AMA convention. Whether this is a coincidence or not I cannot say. But I do think that this information ought to be made public so that those who are trying to understand the position of the AMA on this issue can also understand some of the usually unseen operations that a bureaucracy performs.

I include the following article:

HEW REVEALS PSRO CONTRACTS AWARDED
AMA AND ITS AFFILIATES THE WEEK OF JUNE
23, 1974

An HEW News Release dated July 19, 1974, and additional data cited in the News Release, revealed the coverage and timing of HEW-PSRO contract awards to AMA and its affiliates.

The Release revealed a \$995,635 award to AMA on June 29 for developing screening criteria for PSRO policing of medical care—and that \$1,455,299 for training of PSRO operatives was awarded an organization representing many foundations set up by components of AMA.

Contracts below are for planning PSROs, except those identified as (SSC) which are for developing "State Support Centers," or (CO) which are Conditional and Operational PSROs.

State, organization, city, and type of contract	Date	Amount
Alabama: Alabama Medical Review, Inc., Montgomery	6/28	\$65,000
Alaska: Alaska PSRO, Anchorage	6/25	72,372
Arizona: None		
Arkansas: Arkansas Foundation for Medical Care, Fort Smith	6/24	65,000
California: United Foundations for Medical Care, San Francisco (SSC)	6/27	194,335
San Joaquin Area PSRO, Stockton (CO)	6/27	662,470
East Central Los Angeles PSRO, Los Angeles	6/28	78,750
Foundation for Medical Care of Santa Clara County, San Jose	6/24	74,000
Kern County Medical Society, Bakersfield	6/24	61,800
North Bay PSRO, San Rafael	6/24	61,200
Monterey County Medical Society, Salinas	6/24	45,485
Organization for PSR of Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo Counties, Santa Barbara	6/28	44,700
Redwood Coast Region PSRO, Santa Rosa	6/24	74,500
Riverside County PSRO, Riverside	6/24	56,400
San Francisco PSRO, Inc., San Francisco	6/28	57,000
PSRO of San Mateo County, San Mateo	6/25	62,000
Stanislaus Foundation for Medical Care, Modesto	6/29	50,242
Ventura Area PSRO, Inc., Ventura	6/24	68,590
Colorado: Colorado Foundation for Medical Care, Denver (CO)	6/28	2,700,000
Connecticut: Connecticut Medical Institute, New Haven (SSC)	6/28	147,812
Connecticut Area II PSRO, Inc., New Haven	6/24	66,000

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

26449

State, organization, city, and type of contract	Date	Amount	State, organization, city, and type of contract	Date	Amount
Eastern Connecticut PSRO, Inc., Wilmantic	6/24	\$63,800	New York County Health Services Review Organization, New York City	6/24	\$86,332
Hartford County PSRO, Inc., Hartford	6/24	50,000	Richmond County Professional Standards Review, Staten Island	6/24	55,580
PSRO of Fairfield County, Inc., Bridgeport	6/25	58,654	PSRO of Central New York, Inc., Syracuse	6/25	54,400
Delaware: Delaware Foundation for Medical Care, Wilmington	6/24	45,150	PSRO of Rockland, Nanuet	6/25	62,871
Florida: Dade Monroe PSRO, Inc., Miami	6/25	73,000	Bronx Medical Services Foundation, Inc., Bronx	6/24	79,000
Georgia: None			North Carolina: North Carolina Medical Peer Review Foundation, Raleigh (SSC)	6/29	97,767
Hawaii: Pacific PSRO, Honolulu			Piedmont Medical Foundation, Winston-Salem	6/26	46,380
Idaho: Idaho Foundation for Medical Care, Boise	6/28	77,120	North Dakota: None		
Illinois: Chicago Foundation for Medical Care, Chicago	6/24	51,201	Ohio: Medical Advances Institute, Columbus (SSC)	6/26	134,325
Quad River Foundation for Medical Care, Joliet	6/24	225,760	4th Area Professional Standards Review Council, Toledo	6/25	59,000
Indiana: Indiana Physicians Support Agency, Indianapolis (SSC)	6/25	196,650	Region X Professional Review Systems, Columbus	6/25	55,300
Indiana V PSRO, Indianapolis	6/24	51,620	Medco Peer Review Inc., Cincinnati	6/24	52,000
Calumet Professional Review Organization, Highland	6/24	39,200	Physicians' Peer Review Organization, Cleveland	6/28	63,000
Iowa: Iowa Foundation for Medical Care, West Des Moines	6/24	47,500	Region Six Peer Review Corp., Akron	6/24	46,000
Kansas: Kansas Foundation for Medical Care, Topeka	6/24	47,560	Western Ohio Foundation for Medical Care, Dayton	6/28	44,330
Kentucky: Kentucky Peer Review Organization, Louisville	6/24	36,000	Oklahoma: None		
Louisiana: None			Oregon: Multnomah Foundation for Medical Care, Portland (CO)	6/27	662,848
Maine: Pine Tree Organization for PSRO, Waterville	6/24	71,000	Greater Oregon PSRO, Portland	6/24	58,500
Maryland: Maryland Foundation for Health Care, Baltimore (SSC)	6/26	97,352	Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Medical Care Foundation, Lemoyne (SSC)	3/29	243,295
Prince Georges Foundation for Medical Care, Hyattsville (CO)	6/29	212,458	Allegheny PSRO	6/27	88,217
Baltimore City Professional Review Organization, Baltimore	6/24	52,555	Central Pennsylvania Area II PSRO, Williamsport	6/28	47,175
Central Maryland PSRO, Inc., Timonium	6/24	41,000	Eastern Pennsylvania Health Care Foundation, Allentown	6/25	65,000
Delmarva Foundation for Medical Care, Salisbury	6/24	55,720	Montgomery/Bucks PSRO, Inc., Norristown	6/24	54,000
Montgomery Co. Medical Care Foundation, Silver Spring	6/24	64,800	PSRO Area XII Executive Committee, Philadelphia	6/27	100,000
Southern Maryland PSRO, Inc., Glen Burnie	6/24	36,555	Highlands PSRO Corporation, Johnstown	6/24	46,600
Massachusetts: Massachusetts Statewide Support Commonwealth Institute of Medicine, Boston (SSC)	6/29	289,412	Southcentral Pennsylvania PSRO, Lemoyne	6/25	54,000
Bay State PSRO, Inc., Boston (CO)	6/28	3,206,680	Southwestern Pennsylvania PSRO, Greensburg	6/24	62,500
Charles River Health Care Foundation, Newton Lower Falls (CO)	6/27	503,420	Rhode Island: Rhode Island PSRO, Inc., Providence	6/24	62,000
Central Massachusetts Health Care Foundation, Worcester	6/25	64,000	South Carolina Medical Care Foundation, Columbia	6/24	60,000
Western Massachusetts PSRO, Springfield	6/28	46,150	South Dakota: South Dakota Foundation for Medical Care, Sioux Falls	6/24	51,000
Southwestern Massachusetts Professional Standards Review, Middleboro	6/24	61,000	Tennessee: Tennessee Foundation for Medical Care, Inc., Nashville (CO)	6/29	1,626,305
Michigan: Michigan State Medical Society, East Lansing (SSC)	6/29	100,475	Shelby County Foundation for Medical Care, Memphis	6/24	54,000
Genesee Medical Corporation, Flint	6/24	36,000	Texas: None		
Upper Peninsula Quality Assurance Association, Escanaba	6/24	45,300	Utah: Utah PSRO, Salt Lake City (CO)	6/18	951,495
Minnesota: Foundation for Health Care Evaluation, Minneapolis (CO)	6/28	886,000	Virginia: Virginia Professional Standards Review Foundation, Charlottesville (SSC)	6/15	75,727
Professional Services Quality Council of Minnesota, Rochester	6/24	66,000	Northern Virginia Foundation for Medical Care, Alexandria	6/26	57,875
Mississippi: Mississippi Foundation for Medical Care, Inc., Jackson (CO)	6/29	1,277,954	Vermont: Vermont PSRO, Rutland	6/24	52,400
Missouri: Health Care Foundation of Missouri, Jefferson City (SSC)	6/25	106,686	Washington: Washington State Medical Association, Seattle	6/28	147,480
Central Eastern Missouri Professional Review Committee, St. Louis	6/24	61,000	West Virginia: West Virginia Medical Institute, Charleston	6/24	48,000
Mid-Missouri Foundation, Jefferson City	6/26	64,000	Wisconsin: Wisconsin Professional Review Organization, Madison	6/27	90,600
Northwest Missouri PSRO Foundation, Kansas City	6/24	49,500	Foundation for Medical Care Evaluation of Southeastern Wisconsin, Milwaukee	6/24	36,355
Southeastern Missouri Foundation for Medical Care, Cape Girardeau	6/27	54,440	Wyoming: Wyoming Health Services Co., Inc., Cheyenne (CO)	6/27	604,502
Montana: None			District of Columbia: National Capital Medical Foundation, Inc., Washington, D.C.	6/24	55,000
Nebraska: None			Puerto Rico: Foundation for Medical Care of Puerto Rico, Santurce	6/28	45,280
Nevada: Nevada PSRO, Reno					
New Hampshire: New Hampshire Foundation for Medical Care, Concord	6/29	38,200	Total type of contracts:		
New Jersey: New Jersey Foundation for Health Care Evaluation, Trenton (SSC)	6/24	56,000	Planning PSRO's	91	\$5,520,694
Area I—PSRO Region II, Morristown	6/25	193,060	(CO) Conditionally Operational PSRO's	11	13,244,132
Passaic Valley PSRO	6/24	46,150	(SSC) State Support Center Development	13	2,085,492
Essex Physicians' Review Organization, Inc.	6/24	37,000			
New Mexico: None					
New York: Medical Society of the State of New York, Lake Success (SSC)	6/25	208,596			
Adirondack PSRO, Glens Falls	6/24	52,000			
Area 9 PSRO of New York State, Purchase	6/24	57,000			
Erie Region PSRO, Inc., Buffalo	6/24	67,000			
Five-County Organization for Medical Care and PSR, New Hartford	6/24	521,000			
Genesee Region PSRO, Inc., Rochester	6/24	77,000			
Kings County Health Care Review Organization, Brooklyn	6/24	64,560			
Nassau Physicians Review Organization, Garden City	6/28	96,000			

MUST WE WAGE CHEMICAL WAR?

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

an editorial that appeared in the August 1 edition of the Washington Post entitled, "Must We Wage Chemical War?"

Not only would the proposed binary chemical weapon be an unnecessary part of our national defense system, but it would also seriously undermine our current negotiations on international chemical warfare controls. Its approval would make a mockery of the summit pledge recently made with Mr. Brezhnev at Geneva. The article follows:

MUST WE WAGE CHEMICAL WAR?

In votes today and next Tuesday, the House must decide whether to plunge ahead with a program that may keep the United States ready to wage chemical warfare for years to come, or whether to pause and study this especially dread form of warfare more thoroughly and explore new opportunities to limit or even ban it on an international basis. Specifically, the program at issue involves \$5.8 million this year (as much as \$2 billion later) to start producing a "binary" chemical weapon, a new safer-to-handle method for delivering nerve gas. Generally, the program poses to Congress perhaps its first good opportunity—and if missed, its last opportunity for a long time—to break the monopoly which special interests in the Pentagon have maintained for a full generation over the nation's policies on CW.

The key facts on binaries were brought out last spring in hearings of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The United States has huge stockpiles of deadly nerve gas so, as Rep. Donald Fraser (D-Minn.) recently put it, "we are not examining this problem from a position of weakness." The small CW lobby within the Pentagon professes to see a looming Soviet offensive CW threat. But, in fact, American military commanders apparently disagreeing with this estimate, have chosen not to prepare to defend against it. And administration officials, while asking for funds to start procuring binaries, concede that full preliminary open-air testing has not been conducted. That is, the United States has on hand enough nerve gas to kill every person in the world several times over. Its military posture reflects a judgment that the Soviet Union does not intend a CW attack. And it has not completed tests on the new binaries it wishes now to procure.

If the military reasons for delay on binaries are strong, the diplomatic reasons are more so. Discussions on controlling chemical weapons—production, stockpiling, use—have been chugging along at Geneva for years. They were given a healthy push at the Moscow summit just a month ago when Mr. Nixon and Mr. Brezhnev agreed to seek "early progress" on an agreement "dealing with the most dangerous, lethal means of chemical warfare." This means nerve gas if it means anything. The administration's arms control director Fred C. Ikle has repeatedly warned Congress that production of binaries would undermine efforts to negotiate international CW controls. Indeed, to launch a massive new CW program now is to make a mockery of Mr. Nixon's summit pledge, itself specifically reaffirmed since then by his ambassador at Geneva. That binary funds should be sought at all, after that summit pledge, is a perverse tribute to the way bureaucratic momentum can substitute for policy at the Pentagon. Careful students of arms control make the further point that binaries, being relatively inexpensive and simple to make, possess an all too scary potential for getting into the hands of terrorists or of countries looking for a hot weapon on the cheap.

The House Appropriations Committee is to vote today on the binary money. Since Rep. George H. Mahon (D-Tex.), the committee

chairman, also chairs its defense subcommittee, which has already approved the money, perhaps the best that can be hoped for in the committee is for it to add language somehow hingeing the appropriation to CW negotiations at Geneva. Certainly there is no justification for spoiling these negotiations, even before the promised Nixon-Brezhnev initiative is taken, by charging ahead on binaries. At any rate, the full House is due to address the question next Tuesday. Some 50 or more legislators have already approved a useful resolution by Rep. Wayne Owens (D-Utah) urging movement on both the biological warfare and chemical warfare fronts. So there is a better chance to gain control of binaries on the House floor. It is a fight well worth making.

THE AMERICAN LEGION MOUNTAIN CAMP

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I have recently learned of the existence of a facility in Tupper Lake, N.Y., which provides convalescent and recreation facilities for veterans. The American Legion Mountain Camp is so little known and provides such an important and unique service, I would like to share with my colleagues the following information concerning the facility.

The information follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION MOUNTAIN CAMP, INC.
TUPPER LAKE, N.Y.
IN BRIEF—THE AMERICAN LEGION MOUNTAIN CAMP

The Camp is located in the heart of the Adirondack Mountains on Big Tupper Lake—about midway between Long Lake on the south and Tupper Lake on the north, on New York State Highway #421 (off Route #30).

The Camp is a spot for Convalescence and Recreation. About 1200 acres of land, 25 residential buildings, dining rooms (3) clubhouse, Chapel and community building, garages, storerooms, workshops, etc.: outdoor recreational facilities and miles of woodland trails all bordered on beautiful Tupper Lake, and open each summer season for as long as available funds will permit.

The Camp was established as a Corporation in May, 1922, and received its first patients in the spring of 1923.

The Mountain Camp admits any honorably discharged War Veteran of The United States in need of convalescence and treats him or her without charge of any kind whatsoever. It is necessary to file an application and the case must be the type for which the Camp can properly care. Members of The American Legion Auxiliary are also eligible for admission for both convalescence and/or recreation. Members of The American Legion, and members of their families, are eligible to use the recreational facilities of the Camp. There are no facilities for the families of veterans in the Convalescent Area of the Camp. The two Camps are operated independently of each other and there is no mixing of the two. While the sick are cared for without charge, there is a fee charged for the use of the recreational facilities. Brochures are available to anyone interested, describing the Resort Area of the Camp. Mail a postcard today for up-to-date rates and information.

The two features of the Camp (Convalescent & Recreational) are not in the same area. There is a distance of one-half

to one mile between the two areas, as prescribed by regulations that there must be no mixing of the two features. Separate facilities entirely. The Convalescents have their own dining rooms and the Recreationists have theirs.

There are fifty beds available for Convalescents. Both male and female veterans and members of The American Legion Auxiliary are eligible. The Camp is aiding in the rehabilitation of the sick and disabled.

The Camp pays the cost of caring for its patients with income from the Endowment Fund; revenue from the Resort Area; donations from Legion Posts, Counties, Districts; The Mountaineers; The American Legion Auxiliary, Department of New York and the Units thereof; organized groups of the benefactors; legacies of good friends who remember us and individuals.

August 1, 1974

SENATOR TUNNEY REVIEWS RESOURCE SHORTAGES

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the subject of limits to valuable physical resources has been reviewed by many authors, usually resulting in varying conclusions. The only real conclusion that can be drawn from all of these analyses is that we do not know what the limits of each resource are. Many of the researchers in this field have neglected important side effects of increasing the use of physical resources, such as the pollution that will be generated, the declining net energy yields, or economic cost-benefit relationships.

It is for this reason that I was particularly interested in an article that appeared in the August 1 Washington Post by my friend and colleague from California, Senator JOHN TUNNEY. Senator TUNNEY is to be commended for his actions in this area, and I would highly recommend this article, which I will insert for the RECORD in a moment, to my colleagues.

The article follows:

THE RESOURCES GAP

(By Senator JOHN V. TUNNEY)

By the year 2000, twice today's population—more than 7 billion persons—may be scrambling for their daily bread on this earth, and our children may be raising theirs in a bleak world of famine, authoritarianism and war.

Thoughtfully and decisively, we must begin planning now not only to stretch and preserve remaining resources but to encourage the wonders of technology so that future multitudes can live decently and in harmony.

Otherwise, for most persons a mere two dozen years from now, diets will be meager, but their arsenals may be strong, with some of the poorest nations nuclearly equipped for Armageddon. And for wealthier nations, their survival from shortages and cataclysm may be the iron regime of totalitarianism.

In hearings I chaired for the Subcommittee on Science and Technology, expert after expert warned that present trends will confront this nation with disastrous materials crisis. The hearings also revealed that our current institutional structure for monitoring shortages is woefully inadequate to alert us to impending dangers, or to head them off. Within the foreseeable future, a series of

sudden, unexpected and economically crippling shortages could generate nearly irresistible pressures for rationing and controls to dole out what resources we have, and for military measures to withhold them from the clamoring demands of others.

If we ignore this threat, we invite its reality. So I was particularly concerned by a July 15th article in The Post, in which Bernard Nossiter sought to debunk predictions of an early exhaustion of critical minerals and material resources. Mr. Nossiter calls the purveyors of such views "ecolyptics," "eco-doomsters," or just "doomsters," and dismisses their forecasts by quoting Wilfred Beckerman, an English economist, to the effect that "resources are not really finite in any meaningful sense." In fact, Beckerman apparently believes that "used up resources are not likely to trouble anyone for 100 million years or so, if then."

But this "debunking" succeeds only by underestimating the difficulties of an exponential growth in world population. To sustain that growth, while attaining even basic levels of human existence, will require unprecedented capital outlays and countless and still uncharted, technological breakthroughs. For example, it is estimated that oil shale deposits in Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah contain 1,800 billion barrels of oil—more than four times the crude oil discovered to date in this country. However, according to a study by the National Academy of Engineering, there is serious doubt whether the huge quantities of water needed to mine the shale can ever be made available. Furthermore, the control of inevitable and widespread pollution in the wake of developing secondary and tertiary sources of energy and materials is by no means within reach, and in many cases beyond our present conceptions.

And if all of these obstacles can be overcome, the nation may still stumble into disaster. For example, the Department of Interior has predicted that by the year 2000, the United States could experience an annual \$100 billion gap between the value of primary mineral requirements and primary mineral supplies. This gap would at least strain and probably shatter our balance of trade.

Even willingness to pay a high price for foreign material resources does not assure their availability. As the Arab oil embargo amply demonstrated, in a world where vital material resources are controlled by a limited number of countries, there is no such thing as certainty of supply. Too often, the materials we need may be sold for political concessions rather than hard cash.

Presently, the United States is dependent on imports for the major part of six of the so-called 13 basic raw materials essential for a high level of industrialization—chromium, nickel, rubber, aluminum, tin and zinc. By 1985, the country will depend on imports for more than half our supply of iron, lead and tungsten. By the year 2000, imports will supply more than half of our copper, potassium and sulphur. At what point will we face a choice between the independence of our policy and the prosperity of our economy?

Some experts answer that embargo or drastic price increases through the actions of a cartel will inspire a search for alternate supplies, substitute sources or new technologies. Although this view is undoubtedly correct, it ignores the fact that the time-lag between a decision to develop and the fact of development could be long indeed. Industries cannot consume promises or prospects; during a time-lag, they would be caught short and the economy could be plunged into recession. To treat potential material shortages as merely short-term aberrations ignores the devastating effect of interim shortages on economic growth.

Along these same lines, Nossiter, in discussing the oil embargo, concludes: "The

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

crisis, of course, is one of price, not exhaustion." But for the man in the street who is hard put to buy gas, food, or other vital commodities because the price is too high, there is little comfort in knowing that the supply is high too.

We should not be "doomsters," wringing our hands over an inevitable materials crisis. But we must be realists, determined to do what can be done to prevent a catastrophe.

Billions of dollars and millions of tons of valuable materials can be saved each year without any adverse effect on the quality of life in America. We must accelerate research and development efforts to use existing materials more efficiently in products and systems, and to prepare substitute materials. In addition, the recycling of solid waste, the development of energy-efficient, non-polluting automobile engines, the mitigation of metal corrosion, and changes in energy pricing structures—all issues presently before the Congress, and all with a potential for vast mineral and material savings—can go far to meeting our needs now and in the future. It was a hopeful sign of concern and a step toward meaningful commitment when the Senate recently passed legislation mandating a system analysis of our materials posture. But we will not finish the job if we lull ourselves into a false sense of security, if we presented that half measures will solve the whole problem, if we say that inexhaustible supplies of materials lie readily at hand to resolve any crisis. If we deceive ourselves, we will deplete our society and deprive our children. If we face the facts, we can sustain our economy and fulfill our obligations to most of a world which may be worse off than we are.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it was with the deepest sadness that I learned of the untimely death of former Senator Wayne Morse.

The passing of Wayne Morse has left a void which will be difficult to fill. He was a man dedicated to the service of the people of the United States and to his beliefs.

Wayne Morse was always an independent at heart; he was never a man of partisan motives. He worked for the solutions he felt best answered the problem, sat hard regardless of the party line. His prophetic vote against the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in 1964 symbolized the determination and strength of conviction he held in every opinion he voiced during his 24 years in Congress.

Whether in the fields of labor or education, civil rights, or home rule, he was always a leading spokesman for the peoples' interests in the classic populist tradition. He was a brilliant legal scholar, a true statesman, and one of the finest individuals to serve in either House of the Congress. The tragedy of Senator Morse's untimely passing, in the midst of his vigorous campaign to regain a seat in the Senate, is heightened in this particular time when our people are seeking in their public officials the qualities of courage, honesty, and forthrightness.

To say that Wayne Morse will be missed by the Congress and by all Americans is an understatement of serious proportions. My deepest sympathy goes out to his wife and family, and to our Nation, which has lost a unique public servant, a man of unparalleled distinction.

AFSCME CALL FOR REORDERING OF PRIORITIES

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, passed a forceful resolution endorsing a reordering of America's budget priorities at its 20th international convention in June. The statement pointed out that

As the federal budget grows larger and larger, inequities which historically have been present in the allocation of funds for domestic programs as against military expenditures, grow in disproportionate ratios.

Mr. Speaker, next week the Department of Defense appropriations bill is scheduled for floor debate. At that time the House will have an opportunity to help reorder our priorities by supporting an amendment to set a ceiling on defense appropriations that will be offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO).

I am including a copy of the AFSCME resolution in the RECORD at this point: RESOLUTION 103 OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES (AFL-CIO)

As the federal budget grows larger and larger, inequities which historically have been present in the allocation of funds for domestic programs as against military expenditures, grow in disproportionate ratios.

In the current session of Congress, legislation has been enacted to reform the methods used by Congress to consider the federal budget. Approved with AFSCME support, the legislation provides an overall ceiling for federal spending, offers a process for developing budget estimates in a more open environment, and allows greater discussion and evaluation of all federal spending than ever before.

Passage of this important reform makes it all the more necessary for Congress and the nation to formulate priorities for the allocation of federal dollars to be appropriated under the new ceiling.

As this convention meets, the Nixon Administration is holding in reserve some \$11 billion in "impounded" funds—funds allocated by the Congress for domestic programs, which the Executive Branch refuses to spend.

At the same time, the White House has proposed an increase of \$13.7 billion in appropriations for the Department of Defense.

Over the years the Pentagon has become a classic case-in-point to illustrate waste and fiscal mismanagement. Unlike other agencies which must justify in tedious detail their expenditures for social programs, the Pentagon has been largely free from accountability.

Correcting the imbalance that exists between military spending and spending for human needs need not imply an opposition to a strong national defense posture. Such prestigious political science centers as the Brookings Institution and a number of cre-

dible conservative political figures have joined critics of profligate spending by the Pentagon—demanding that the military account for the money it receives.

We must ask ourselves hard questions, such as:

Should an additional \$13.7 billion go to the military budget at a time when only \$7.5 billion is available for education; \$6.4 billion for housing and community development; \$2.1 billion for energy research; only \$700 million for pollution control?

Do we really need a defense establishment that employs eight times as many civilians as the federal agency that administers all of our federal health, education and social welfare programs—HEW?

Do we need 200,000 uniformed troops in Asia, 300,000 troops in Europe, and a full Army division in Korea in a period of relative peace?

We believe that waste can be removed from the Defense Department budget, and that military spending can be substantially reduced, without compromising the strength of our nation's defense force and its ability to respond to emergencies.

Therefore be it resolved: That the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees will pursue a national policy that balances human needs with military needs.

The International Union will enter into coalitions and joint legislative efforts to persuade Congress to be more judicious in its appropriations for Defense Department requests.

We urge the councils and locals to involve their members in discourse over the need for a more open and understood appropriations process. The International Union will develop materials and information for AFSCME members which will enable them to more clearly relate the federal funding process to their jobs.

Without compromising national interests, AFSCME will urge the Congress to reduce overseas troop commitments and to reduce the standing military to a level consistent with the legitimate defense needs of the country.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

your constituency will pressure you one way or the other—but this is no political matter (or ought not to be). Here "at home" we read papers and transcripts and speculate an awful lot—but the evidence you hear and see in this matter should guide you, not the letters recommending one thing or the other. When the time comes to vote yes or no to recommend trial by the Senate, I trust you will vote your true convictions and not fear reprisals. May God guide you.

Sincerely and with best wishes,
YVONNE M. GLANZE.

THE LAUNCHING OF "THOMAS C. KINKAID"

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

MR. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a speech given by Vice Adm. Frank H. Price, Jr., at the launching of *Thomas C. Kinkaid*, DD-965, built by the Ingalls Shipbuilding Division of Litton Industries at Pascagoula, Miss. As you may remember, several years ago Admiral Price expressed a somewhat less than optimistic opinion concerning this new shipyard but the fact that the ships are being produced has apparently changed his attitude. He asserts that in addition to the new destroyers, the United States is also getting the world's most modern ship building facility. Indeed, Ingalls' efficiency is to be commended. At the midway point in the contract period, it has not only met every contract milestone to date but has completed the last one 10 weeks ahead of time.

The *Kinkaid* is the third destroyer in a planned fleet of 30 ships known as the *Spruance* class, designed primarily to detect and track enemy submarines. Admiral Price, who is a director in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, point out that the United States sorely needs the new ships in order to maintain an effective Navy that will also be functional in the future. As well as employing much advanced electronic equipment, the ships currently being produced are capable of lodging new weapons yet to be developed.

The speech follows:

A SPEECH BY VICE ADM. F. H. PRICE, JR., U.S.N., DIRECTOR, SHIP ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT

When the Secretary of the Navy asked me to represent him in the launching of the USS *Kinkaid*, it was a twofold honor. First, as the program coordinator for surface ship construction in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations I have been associated with the *Spruance* class destroyer program since its beginning and it is a pleasure to see one of these fine ships take the first important step toward joining the fleet in the service of our country. Second, in naming this ship after Admiral Thomas C. *Kinkaid*, we are honoring a distinguished naval officer whose career was characterized by aggressive leadership and determined action.

This audience is well aware that the Navy is an important element in this country's national strength. The importance of sea power to the security and economic well-being of this country is as great today as it ever has been in its history. The United

States and the free world must have unrestricted access to the oceans of the world. The Soviet Union recognized this fact and their historic deficiency at sea a number of years ago. Their position of weakness during the Cuban quarantine was all too evident to them. By virtue of their ability to bypass the democratic niceties that are a part of our heritage and to which we gladly adhere, they were able to quickly institute a vigorous program of shipbuilding which would provide a navy capable of interdicting our sea lines of communications and countering our sea power projection forces.

While our Navy has been shrinking steadily, the Navy of the Soviet Union has been expanding, both in numbers and advanced technology. Only four years ago, the U.S. Navy had just under 1,000 ships. Today, we are down in the neighborhood of 500. On the other hand, the Soviets are building nuclear submarines at three times the rate of the United States with every indication that they will pass us in numbers of nuclear powered ballistic missile submarines by the end of 1974. Also, for the first time they now have more surface combatant ships than we do. They have been remarkably successful in building up their fleet, and now have an impressive array of ships at sea, and under construction. The Soviet Navy has become a competent blue water force capable of challenging our control of the sea and we urgently need to bring our own fleet up in quality and numbers in order to retain our ability to use the seas in support of our national interests. We must have a shipbuilding program which can produce ships at a rate which keeps us abreast of the Soviet threat; ships with advanced systems that are the equal of those of any prospective opponent.

I think it is important that the American people understand that modernizing and maintaining a viable navy is not an easy undertaking. It takes time, on the order of ten years, from the first program decision until significant numbers of ships are at sea and operationally ready to deploy. It also takes budgetary resources, talent, materials and industrial capacity.

In the 1960's the block obsolescence of our World War II ships was clearly evident and the construction rate of new ships was too slow to provide a modern, effective Navy in the future. It was obvious that something had to be done and rapidly. One of the things that was done was to initiate the program for thirty new destroyers, the *Spruance* class ships which are now being built here in Pascagoula. Among the other significant steps taken was the conscious decision to reduce the numbers of ships in our active fleet—by retiring the older obsolete units—in order to obtain the funds to build the needed new ships. We also looked closely at the characteristics of our future ships, and have matched them carefully to their projected missions and tasks; trading off, where necessary, some nice to have but expensive capabilities to reduce investment costs and thus be able to construct more ships within our allowed budgets.

This concept of optimizing new classes of ships for their projected missions has come to be known as the high-low balanced force mix. Some ships, such as the 963 class destroyers and our guided missile frigates, must operate with our attack aircraft carriers in high threat areas where they will be subjected to a heavy air and submarine threat. These ships, which are highly capable and thus expensive, are part of our high mix programs. Other classes of ships are being optimized for missions in areas of lesser threat density, protecting our sea lines and the replenishment, amphibious and military cargo ships that sail on them. Examples of ships for these latter tasks are the DE 1052 destroyer escorts, the last few of which are being delivered now at Avondale, the future

A VOTE OF CONSCIENCE

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

MR. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I know that as House consideration of impeachment nears, every one of my colleagues is being inundated with constituent mail reflecting many differing views with a liberal sprinkling of suggestions, offers of advice, demands, and even threats.

Occasionally, however, one receives what can only be called a special letter; a constituent whose thoughts help make this job more than worthwhile. I received such a letter earlier this week from Yvonne Glanze of Greenwich, Conn., and I would like to share it with my colleagues for I feel it will warm their hearts as it did mine. Clearly, she understands the agony of the decision we face. The letter follows:

GREENWICH, CONN.
July 28, 1974.

DEAR MR. MCKINNEY: I just want to write to tell you that in the coming weeks when, as it appears now, the question of impeaching the President will come up before the House, you ought to follow your conscience only, because in the end that is what you'll have to live with. True, many people in

August 1, 1974

patrol frigates, and sea control ships. These low-mix ships will be effective but less expensive than our high-mix units so that we can obtain the required numbers to carry out our missions. We patently cannot afford to have all of our ships be the "battle ships" that we would like. Rather, we have had to develop a balanced mix of ship types to insure a future Navy that can support our national interests.

In launching Kinkaid we are adding to our fleet the third in a new class of urgently needed, modern surface warships. The Kinkaid is one of the most modern and capable destroyers in the world, with advanced sensors, helicopters with their sensors and weapons, a sophisticated command and control system and a variety of guns, missiles and torpedoes. This ship unlike many others, has been designed with adequate reserves for future modernization, so that it will be a viable ship into the twenty first century, capable of meeting new threats which will develop in the coming decades, by accommodating new weapons and technologies as they are developed.

A unique feature of this shipbuilding program and of the LHA, also being produced here in Pascagoula, is that the United States, in addition to getting new ships, has also gained a new, modern, shipbuilding facility. There has been some controversy generated in the press and in Congress over whether or not this new yard would reap the dividends expected of it when first proposed—a look around us provides visible proof that the United States is gaining not only these thirty modern destroyers and five versatile amphibious ships, but also the country's most modern shipyard. The ability to produce ships rapidly, economically and in quantity is vitally important to the United States, not only for naval strength, but also for our maritime self sufficiency.

I am particularly pleased at the choice of the name Kinkaid for this ship. We have traditionally named our destroyers for our naval heroes. Each destroyer bears a proud name. In some cases, names have been passed from ship to ship as in the case of some of our early heroes such as Decatur, Bainbridge, and Dewey. In other cases, such as the one today, we introduce a new name, from a more recent era.

Thomas C. Kinkaid is a name well deserving of this honor. He served his country with great distinction and devotion. The son of an admiral, Thomas Kinkaid's naval career spanned 46 years from his appointment as a midshipman by Theodore Roosevelt in 1904 to his retirement in 1950.

Admiral Kinkaid had an extraordinary rich naval career. Following graduation from the Naval Academy in 1908, he had tours in battleships, served in a gunboat operating off Vera Cruz during the Mexican Civil War, and was assigned to the British admiralty during the latter part of World War I. Following the war he was assistant chief of staff to the diplomatically important U.S. naval detachment in Turkish waters. In the early 1930's, he was Secretary to the General Board of the Navy. In that capacity and in special assignments, he participated in complex international discussions at Geneva regarding the limitations of naval armaments.

Following command of cruiser *Indianapolis* in 1937, Captain Kinkaid became naval attaché in Italy for two years including additional duty as attaché in Yugoslavia. At this time, Europe was becoming engulfed in World War II.

During 1941, prior to American participation in World War II, Kinkaid commanded a destroyer squadron engaged in short-of-war operations in the Atlantic.

With American entry into the war, Kinkaid (now a flag officer) transferred to the Pacific theatre, where he would participate in virtually every major naval engagement. He was a task group commander at the battles

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of Coral Sea and at Midway. During the Solomons campaign he commanded a force built around the famed carrier *Enterprise*. In January 1943, he became commander, North Pacific, where he coordinated the operations in the Alaska and Aleutians area of U.S. Navy, Army, and Air Force units, as well as those of the Canadian Air Force.

In the fall of 1943, Kinkaid became commander of the Seventh Fleet and of all allied naval forces operating in the Southeast Pacific theatre. As the commander of "MacArthur's Navy," the admiral oversaw the complex operations in that area and distinguished himself as a commander during the great battle of Leyte Gulf.

At the conclusion of hostilities, his Seventh Fleet accepted the surrender of Japanese naval forces in Korea and landed U.S. and Chinese Nationalist occupation forces in Korea and China. In these operations, Kinkaid became involved in delicate politico-military discussions with Chinese Communist and Soviet authorities.

Admiral Kinkaid concluded his distinguished naval career in the post-war years as commander of the Eastern Sea Frontier and of the Atlantic Reserve Fleet.

The name Thomas C. Kinkaid will provide an inspiring and enduring example for all who serve in this ship in the years to come, and I am sure that Kinkaid both ship and admiral will inspire the rest of the Navy as well toward high standards of professionalism and leadership. May she have calm seas and fair winds in all her voyages.

UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICA RELATIONS: PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN EXPOSED

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the past 12 months much has taken place in regard to United States-Latin American relations. These include two matters of strategic importance: the U.S.-owned Panama Canal and the U.S. Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba, respectively, both of which have long been under organized propaganda attack aimed at wresting them from the control of the United States.

It was, therefore, with much interest that I read in an address to the Senate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 20, 1974, by Senator LAWTON CHILES in which he quoted remarks by Hon. Sol M. Linowitz at the launching in New York at the Center for Inter-American Relations of the newly formed Commission on United States-Latin American Relations. The Chiles address includes the names of all the members of the Commission, which is heavily loaded with members of the Council on Foreign Relations, an organization devoted to the formation of world government.

Since the publication of the indicated Linowitz remarks and the names of the members of the Commission headed by him, many have wondered what its report, which is planned for completion in September, will be like. A partial answer to such questions by Harold Lord Varney, the well-informed president of the Committee on Pan American Policy of New York, was recently published.

Because the indicated article by Mr. Varney should be of wide interest to all concerned with United States-Latin American relations, I quote it as part of my remarks:

[From the Review of the News, July 24, 1974]

HEMISPHERE

(By Harold Lord Varney)

THE PANAMA FIGHT

Henry Kissinger is now running scared in his effort to give away our Panama Canal. The news that 36 Senators (23 Republicans, 12 Democrats and an Independent) are prepared to vote no on the Kissinger-Bundy treaty when it reaches the Senate was a crushing blow to the plans of the Secretary of State. Ratification of a treaty calls for a two-thirds Senate majority. Nixon and Kissinger simply haven't the votes to do the job, and Ellsworth Bunker now knows he may be grinding out a new treaty that is going to end in the Senate wastebasket.

The State Department did not expect such a roadblock. When Kissinger signed the "Principles of Agreement" with Foreign Minister Juan Tack in Panama City on February seventh it was fully expected that the new treaty, glossed with the then-current Kissinger glamour, could be whooped through the Senate with only token opposition. Now the boys at Foggy Bottom know that they have miscalculated.

Kissinger's response to this setback has been the launching of a sophisticated propaganda campaign. The effort is being fronted by an organization called the "Commission to Reexamine U.S. Relations with Latin America," which made its first public appearance on May fifteenth. Its initial bow was at the New York "Center for Inter-American Relations," headquarters in a Park Avenue mission alive with the usual Rockefeller toadies.

Front man for the undertaking is Sol M. Linowitz, one of the Xerox millionaires, an Establishment *Insider* who was so disappointing as President Johnson's Ambassador to the Organization of American States. Linowitz has assembled some impressive names behind him. Mass media support is assured by the presence, as a sponsor, of Andrew Heiskell, chairman of Time Incorporated. He will go after big money with the support of Alexander Heard of the Ford Foundation, another sponsor. Prominent Catholics will be roped in by the Reverend Theodore Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University. "Liberal" Republicans are to be won by the name of Elliot Richardson. Wall Street is represented by Peter G. Peterson, Mr. Nixon's former Secretary of Commerce and chairman of Lehman Brothers.

Opponents of the Panama surrender may now hold the high ground, but in the coming fight Kissinger and Linowitz will have the big guns on their side. The Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers' Fund, and the Clark Foundation have already pledged large grants for the "Commission." And beyond Panama, we are assured, the new organization will also make recommendations for a change in U.S. policy toward the Communist dictatorship in Cuba.

PANAMA PLOT ADMITTED

Defenders of Secretary Kissinger's policy in Panama usually fall back upon the argument that the United States is being forced into surrender of the Canal Zone because of pressure from other Latin American countries—notably Peru, Venezuela, Argentina, Costa Rica, and Mexico. Now William Jorden, a Kissinger protégé appointed as our Ambassador to Panama has blurted out that the Panama retreat was planned by the White House "a year and a half ago," long before Latin American support for the land grab by General Omar Torrijos had manifested itself.

Speaking before the American Society in Panama, Jorden said that the relationship between Panama and the United States over the Canal Zone was "singled out by the Administration" a year and a half ago as among the most urgent problems of the Hemisphere. His remarks were published in full by the *Panama City Star And Herald*.

NATIONALIZATION

American companies with large investments in Latin America see nothing but gloom on the horizon. Typical is the situation in Jamaica, where the scheme is to make things intolerable for U.S. business as a first step toward nationalization. Jamaica's principal export to the United States is bauxite, the raw material from which aluminum is made. Six U.S. companies have been buying the output. Socialist Prime Minister Michael Manley has in a single move increased by 700 percent the taxes and royalties to be paid by United States and Canadian firms operating in Jamaica.

It was over a decade ago, under the leadership of crypto-Communist Romulo Betancourt, that Venezuela set the pattern for getting rid of the Gringo by such a progressive squeeze on earnings. Today, Venezuela's petroleum royalties and taxes for foreign companies have risen to 90 percent and a complete takeover, without compensation for U.S. installations, is scheduled for 1983-1984.

We have been pushed into a con game. Our companies are encouraged to make huge investments in Latin America, they do so, and then the squeeze is applied. In the end, taxes and royalties become so high that the company is willing to sell its properties at a figure far below replacement cost.

Washington made the situation harder for the American investor by setting a precedent in Peru of consent to such robbery. There the government nationalized our International Petroleum properties at a figure far below cost, and then welshed out of paying even that amount by putting in a fraudulent claim against the company which exceeded its whole value. The Nixon Administration, advised by Henry Kissinger, refused to assert its support of the American investor and meekly consented to the theft. In doing so it ignored an Act of Congress which called for economic reprisals in any such instance, thus setting the precedent for similar grabs from Chile and Libya.

DETERRING DELINQUENCY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, juvenile delinquency is a widespread and dangerous affliction which threatens to undermine the health and energy of this Nation. Scores of young people, who should be looking forward to productive, successful lives, are turning to lives of crime. Neglect and despair compound the problem for these youths who are drawn into lawlessness by their sense of hopelessness and helplessness. At last, Congress has acted to solve this problem by focusing attention and money on preventing our young people from becoming delinquents. Congressman GUS HAWKINS deserves praise for his leadership in this field, as does CLAUDE PEPPER for the work of his Select Committee on Crime.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WE, THE YOUNG, ARE THE FUTURE

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, "the future is now" is not only the motto of a well-known football coach, but also that of a bright, articulate 13-year-old girl from Central School in San Carlos, Calif.

In a graduation speech given last month, Suzy Snowden reminds us all that the future of our Nation rests ultimately with our youth. I am confident of our future with youth who, in the words of her teacher, Ramona DeVore, "show a maturing, inquiring mind as well as a growing awareness of the world around them."

Shortly after Suzy Snowden gave that speech, it was noted and commented upon by one of the most perceptive editors in California, Mr. Dave Schutz of the Redwood City Tribune. His remarks, and Suzy's speech which follow are well worth reading. Occasionally, we all need some evidence that the next generation has the wisdom and ability to keep those ideas and ideals which we pass on to them, and at the same time to repair the damage that occurs because of poor decisions made unwittingly by those of us who now share the responsibility of governing.

YOUTH SOUNDS OFF: "WE, THE YOUNG, ARE THE FUTURE"

(By Dave Schutz)

We are indebted to Ramona DeVore, a teacher at Central School in San Carlos, who has made available to us some of the graduation speeches that were given at the school's commencement program last month.

As the teacher points out, some of these speeches "show a maturing, inquiring mind as well as a growing awareness of the world around them."

Based on the theme, "We've Only Just Begun," selected, no doubt, from a wonderful song made popular by the Carpenters, these 13-year-olds moved through a variety of topics, and because their thoughts might provide food for thought for other young people, as well as their elders, we have selected one by Suzy Snowden, as representative, and present it here.

The speech follows:

"Past, present and future are three of the most important words in the English language. Out of these three, I believe that "future" is most important. It is most important, because you cannot change the past, and you can do very little about the present, but you can change the future for the better.

"We, the young people of America, are the future. We will decide the future presidents. And it will depend on us to keep this country out of ugly wars and disputes.

"We must change the future and make it better than the past or the present. That is why we went to Central School and also why we will go on to high school and many will continue on to college so that we can be depended on to keep the country together and improve it for future generations to come.

"Now we are only just beginning to step out into the world and are starting to experiment with new ideas. We will keep experimenting until we succeed in making this a better world to live in. If we expect to succeed we must start now by enhancing our

August 1, 1974

education and improving our ability to take on responsibility.

"In the years to come we will be able to try out the things we have learned at Central and later use them to help us reach our goals. On the way to reaching our goals we will encounter many obstacles and will have to make many detours, so we must start now in making our minds, as well as our bodies, strong enough to overcome the problems we will meet along the way.

"We must, from now on, stop depending on others to take on our responsibilities for us, and we must be prepared to make important decisions concerning ourselves and later on in life, our families.

"We, the eighth graders of Central School, as well as all young people all over America, are beginning to realize that there are many problems in today's world, such as poverty, war and crime, and we are striving to eliminate them in the future.

"We cannot be completely sure that we will solve all of these problems, but by the time we are the older generation, the new generation, our children, will also be striving to better their future, and hopefully, some day we will have a perfect world.

"Until that day comes there will always be new obstacles to overcome and new problems to solve, and we must be prepared to go on, no matter how many we encounter.

"So always keep this in mind—hope is in the future, and the future is now."

And we would add only that so long as there are Suzy Snowdens, and others like her, reaching for that unreachable star our future will be in very good hands.

DR. JOHN McLAUGHLIN TALKS COMMON SENSE TO THE PRESS CLUB

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, In the deplorable atmosphere which pervades Washington at this unhappy hour, few speak common sense and just as few seem interested in hearing it. One gets the feeling that this whole horrible drama to "get the President" is being relentlessly orchestrated by those same political enemies who failed to prevail through the regular electoral processes in 1972.

It is alarming to see men of high position and media of immense influence clamoring for their pound of flesh from the political bones of the President, completely reckless as to reason, and seeking nothing so much as to gain vengeance in their longstanding vendetta with Richard Nixon.

Their sickness of purpose will not be cured by allowing them to "get the President," any more than feeding another Christian to the lions cured the lustful sickness of the Roman powerpack of another day.

A call for common sense—yea, a prayer for common sense—with respect to the impeachment debate, was raised by Dr. John McLaughlin before a National Press Club audience on the 24th of July. "Father John," as he is affectionately known, is one of the most sincere and knowledgeable persons to have addressed himself to this vital subject.

So that many of my colleagues and fellow citizens may have the benefit of his wise words and his plea for common sense, I am pleased to include Dr. McLaughlin's address for the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF DR. JOHN McLAUGHLIN, DEPUTY SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 24, 1974, "IMPEACHMENT AND COMMON SENSE"

My chosen subject today is "Impeachment and Common Sense."

Six months before the Declaration of Independence in 1776, Thomas Paine wrote a monograph called *Common Sense* in which Paine argued for the immediate independence of the United States. George Washington credited *Common Sense* with having worked a "powerful change in the minds of many men."

Common sense is what brought the Republic into existence and common sense if utilized, will preserve the Republic today.

Thomas Paine describes the nature of common sense: it is wide-angle, panoramic; "it generously enlarges man's views beyond the present day," Paine says. Common sense then, is encompassing rather than piecemeal; it views phenomena in their totality rather than by installments.

George Santayana, the philosopher, describes common sense in this way: "I think that common sense," he says, "in a rough, dogged way, is technically sounder than the special schools of philosophy [in our current context, read 'law'], each of which *squints* and overlooks half the facts, and half the difficulties, in its eagerness to find in some detail the key to the whole."

Common sense is the bedrock of the American Republic and the American experience. Americans are not a doctrinaire people, they are a common sense people—sensible, reasonable, not inclined to engorge some particular aspect of a problem into bloated disproportion. Rather they are ready, willing and able to see the problem as a whole, and then to judge with balance and perspective.

In a word, common sense is wisdom. Common sense is what we urgently need today when the present moment so tends to tyrannize and warp our judgment.

PROPOSITION

My proposition to you today is this: Common sense dictate, as well as strict legal justice, that the Judiciary Committee vote the impeachment issue both on the basis of the factual evidence, and on the basis of the probable effects of a presidential trial in the United States Senate on the Nation and the international community.

Regarding the first criterion of impeachment, the factual evidence, let us leave that matter for others to discuss, as indeed they have and will continue to do, *ad nauseam*. I would quickly append the personal view, however, that from my reading of the evidence I see not one jot or tittle of data that persuades me that the President is guilty of any criminal act whatsoever, even of a misdeemeanor.

The other index of impeachment—the probable effects on the Nation and the international community of a presidential trial in the U.S. Senate—deserves exploration here.

First, let us chronicle events in their probable course during the next year, on the hypothesis, however improbable, that the Judiciary Committee and the full House of Representatives will in fact vote the impeachment of the President. I emphasize that these are my personal ruminations and do not necessarily reflect the thinking of others in the White House community, not even of those distinguished and high-type luminaries from the White House who adorn this platform with me this afternoon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By prevailing estimate, the Judiciary Committee will vote on the 31st of July, one week from today—a day, incidentally, that is the feast of the Holy Founder of the Jesuit Order, St. Ignatius of Loyola. Pardon the plug for the home team.

If indeed the Judiciary votes to recommend impeachment, *August* will be the cruellest month this year for the House of Representatives, T.S. Elliot notwithstanding. To conjure in the imagination what the Members of Congress will be faced with during August is mindboggling. Each will have deposited on him almost literally a roomful of data, millions upon millions of words, the largest assemblage of material on any one case in the history of human jurisprudence.

The political atmosphere will become charged. Anti-Nixonites will try to ramrod the impeachment resolution through like robots, whereas Nixon supporters and middle-grounders will try to reflect and sift; try to ascertain whether Judiciary members used criminality as a standard, and whether the norm of evidentiality was "clear and convincing" or "probable cause" or "beyond reasonable doubt."

It will be an invincibly nettlesome, frustrating and, at times, terrifying experience. Members will say to themselves, "How can I in good conscience vote for impeachment when I am relatively uninformed personally on the matter, dependent almost exclusively upon Judiciary with their obvious shortcomings and on media reporting with its biases and slurs. Congressmen will recall, for example, that *Newsweek* and the *New York Times* the *Week in Review* recently featured only the front section of the President's quotation dealing with a potential White House response to the Senate Select Committee, namely, "I want you all to stonewall it, let them plead the Fifth Amendment, cover-up or anything else." *Newsweek* and the *Times* neglected to similarly stress the other section of the same quote where the President says, "On the other hand, uh, uh, I would prefer as I said to you, that you do it the other way."

The House will want to peruse the evidence and to ask questions, but the pressure will be on them to vote, and vote they will. Faced with this avalanche of documentation, the House will probably summon no witnesses, read whatever it can, and decide largely on the basis of the Judiciary Committee's recommendations. Clearly, then, the spread and partisan mix of the Committee vote will be of disturbing importance to the House verdict.

THE SENATE TRIAL

On the hypothesis—hopefully unlikely—that the House votes to impeach the President, the matter will be formally transferred to the Senate. The earliest date for this transfer would appear to be Labor Day, Monday, September 2, 1974. At this point, preparations for the Senate trial will begin. House Managers and the presidential defense counsels will call for time to develop their arguments. Depending on the number of articles of impeachment, the defense counsel will probably want to interview up to 200 witnesses for possible testimony and he will likely seek subpoena power.

This Senate trial would differ from that of Andrew Johnson in several particulars, primarily in the complexity of the transaction. President Johnson's trial was not concerned over matters of fact, but over a matter of right. The fact was not in dispute: the President did discharge his Secretary of War. What was in dispute was the President's right to discharge his Cabinet officer.

In the current case, questions of *fact* are in dispute, and capital investigations of fact usually show a full reliance on an amplitude of witnesses—secretaries, clerks, messengers and anyone who can shed light

on what happened. It is entirely possible, depending on the article of impeachment, that many personnel from the Department of Justice, the FBI, the Central Intelligence Agency, Federal Communications Commission, Environmental Protection Agency, Cost of Living Council, Government Auditing Office, Government Services Agency, Internal Revenue Service, Department of State and other agencies will have to be called.

The range of witnesses will be full. Thus if the Milk Case remains as an article of impeachment, the President's attorney might wish to subpoena members of the Congress who accepted milk monies, including the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee and other important political figures. Depositions will be taken, and interviews conducted.

This preparation would appear to require some three months, resulting in a schedule that would set a Senate trial probably for December 1. This date presumes that the problem of new Senators arriving will be resolved in favor of commencement of the trial before their seating. [One third of the Senate, you will remember, will be up for re-election this November.] Some may wish to postpone the start of the trial until the new Senators, elected in November, have been installed.

The length of the trial will depend primarily upon the number of articles in the bill of impeachment. The Johnson impeachment trial began on February 25, 1868 and ended May 26, 1868, three months almost to the day. As noted, the essential argument in that case was simple:

Did President Johnson have the right to discharge his Cabinet officer? Facts are much more intractable to deal with and once discerned they must be read and interpreted. So the current impeachment process, even if limited to one article, is as complex a legal matter as anything the Nation has ever seen.

How long will the trial last? Again this will depend on the number of impeachment articles, but surely the House Managers will wish to consume as long a period for their case as was outlaid by the Judiciary Committee in its recent presentation of one side of the evidence, namely ten weeks. For his part, the President without question will be allowed when on trial to present a volume of evidence of comparable size and in a comparable time frame. Thus, twenty weeks—ten for the managers and ten for the Defense Counsel—or five months would appear to be a baseline minimum for the trial's duration.

Certain realities suggest, however, that the trial would probably run longer than five months.

First, there is the fact that procedures and rules of presidential Senate trials are sketchy at best. They, along with the prerogatives of the court, will have to be reviewed and set. Also, everything that takes place in the trial is subject to challenge and vote. Thus, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court presides over the 100 Senators acting as jurors, and whenever a question is asked, Defense Counsel or the House Managers can object. The Chief Justice, as the presiding officer rules on whether the objection is to be sustained or not. But that is not the end of it. The Senators can then vote to accept or to reject the Chief Justice's ruling. The Senators can also debate the matter before they vote. So it could readily take a half day to determine whether a particular objection would be sustained or overruled by the Senate majority. It should be remembered, too, that literally thousands of objections will be raised during such a trial. Let me repeat everything that happens in the Senate chamber is subject to debate and vote of the majority. The judge—namely the chief justice—in this tribunal is not supreme. The majority of the Senators is.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Now the Senate, as every schoolboy knows, is a deliberative body, in fact the most deliberative body in the world. Deliberative means many things and among them is "slow."

Second, there is the matter of *verification*. John Doar spent the vast majority of his ten weeks submitting hearsay and documents. The documents were written and signed by individuals who were never called as witnesses. The President's counsel may wish to call witnesses to verify documents so that they may be put into the record. Besides straight verification the Defense Counsel may ask: "What did you mean by this document? This sentence? This phrase? This word? Did the President actually see the document? How did he interpret the document?" This is time consuming but it is elemental due process and it can be assumed that at a Senate trial nothing is going to elude the President's counsel by default. It should be remembered, too, that documentary submissions to the impeachment inquest number in the thousands.

Putting all this together, my ballpark estimate is that a Senate trial of President Nixon, if it were to materialize, would last 7 and one-half months, a period of time which would bring us to about one year from today.

SENATE TRIAL'S EFFECTS

Let us hypothesize on a Senate trial of the President of the United States, a trial of seven and one-half months duration or even a trial of considerably lesser duration, and the effects of such a trial on the nation at large in the five areas of national *morale, economy, politics, media and international relations*.

First, *morale*. The Watergate investigation has lasted for over two years and the feeling of universal surfeit, of gagging, fed-up satiety, is intensely felt.

This pervasive surfeit is accompanied by a numbness and a sense of waste, sterility and barrenness. We appear to be spinning our wheels: there is much motion but no movement.

If the President is forced to stand trial in the United States Senate, however, the morale of the nation will be depressed and outraged by a quantum leap downwards. By definition, a quantum leap means a release of energy over which cannot be predictably measured or controlled. Bitterness and rancor will appear in inestimable volume and intensity. The buttons will be off the foils, everyone will be playing for keeps, all politicians will go for broke. Fresh and anarchic energies will be unleashed into society. On all sides there will be partisan kicking and biting and scratching and rending of garments.

This is the condition that Alexander Hamilton warned would occur if the Nation moved uncircumspectly towards impeachment, as it did in the time of Andrew Johnson and as it may be doing today. In the *Federalist Papers*, Hamilton wrote:

"The prosecution [of construed impeachable offenses] will seldom fail to agitate the passions of the whole community and to divide it into parties more or less friendly or inimical to the accused. In many cases it will connect itself with the pre-existing factions and will enlist all their animosities, partialities, influence and interest on one side or on the other and in such cases there will always be the greater danger that the decision will be regulated more by the comparative strength of parties than by the real demonstrations of innocence or guilt."

The public mood during the onset of the Johnson impeachment trial in 1868 was described by Senator Edmund Ross of Kansas and echoes Hamilton's warning:

"Throughout the country, and in all walks of life . . . the condition of the public mind was not unlike that preceding a great battle.

The dominant party of the nation seemed to occupy the position of public prosecutor, and it was scarcely in the mood to brook delay for trial or to hear defense. Washington had become during the trial the central point of the politically dissatisfied and swarmed with representatives of every state of the Union, demanding in a partially united voice the deposition of the President. The footsteps of the anti-impeaching Republicans were dogged from the days' beginning to its end and far into the night with entreaties, considerations, and threats. The newspapers came daily filled with not a few threats of violence. . . ."

When one considers how both mass communication and the Presidency have expanded since Andrew Johnson's day, it is hard to believe that the American body politic would today be able to contain its outrage through December, January, February, March, April, May, June, and July while the Congress rehearsed the same tired broken records: ITT, milk subsidies, wiretapping, cover-up, subpoenas, IRS and so forth. Meanwhile besides this polarization, paralysis would be felt: legislation on energy, health, unemployment insurance, education and other social and economic programs would be seen by the electorate as remaining untouched. In this Kafka-esque environment the Nation would probably erupt.

Economic Effects. A seven month Senate trial of the President of the United States would have negative effects on the economy. I do not wish to overdraw this picture because it is very iffy. Nevertheless, it appears that the economy would sag somewhat if the impeachment goes to the Senate. The question is not whether but how much and how bad? Would a recession occur? Would inflation worsen? Would unemployment increase? Would the cost of living rise? Would housing starts plummet? Would confidence in the dollar erode? Would international trade be enfeebled? Would the market idle or drop? This much is certain: A trial of the President would produce perceived instability. The economy of the nation cannot remain indifferent to nervousness and irresolution.

Political Effects. If the impeachment goes to a Senate trial, the fact of the trial itself will wound the Office of the Presidency for an indefinite period and possibly permanently, irrespective of whether the President is convicted or acquitted. Instead of being a residual check, impeachment will become a political weapon to overturn the mandate of an election. The balance between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches will be destabilized.

As far as the bipartisan system is concerned, the prevailing political cynicism will be compounded and the effect of that incremental cynicism will be felt in drop-offs in party affiliation. The end result will be a weakening of our American political bipartisan system.

Over one third of the Nation have cemented their support of Richard Nixon. This segment of our society, do not believe that the evidence warrants a Senate trial for the President. If the impeachment goes to the Senate and the Nation is forced to endure the ordeal of the trial, this giant segment of our society, and many independents, will grow embittered and vindictive.

The President's supporters will remember the actions of certain members of the House Judiciary Committee. Peter Rodino will be recalled as the Chairman who with one hand rapped the gavel on hearings that judged the propriety of milk contributions to the President's election and with the other hand received milk contributions of his own, then refused to return the gifts—even though there are no cows in Newark, even though his fellow Committeemen returned theirs, and even though he had received over \$32,000 from the AFL-CIO—all of which raises the question of why he needed the milk

August 1, 1974

money in the first place. In fact, why did he need any big outside funding since he won the race in 1972 by over 80% of the vote?

The President's supporters will remember how Mr. Rodino first rejected TV cameras and the press, thus permitting prejudicial selective leaking against the President and other innocent persons like Dr. Henry Kissinger, the Secretary of State and Nobel Peace Prize Winner. They will remember Mr. Rodino's tampering—equivalently—with the jury by ("pursuading") two Democrat Judiciary Members into changing their conscience votes after they had opted to support the request of the President's counsel to summon witnesses.

The President's supporters will remember how Mr. Rodino ("denied") that early on he had said to three journalists: "All the Democrats on the committee will vote impeachment and if five Republicans on the Committee also vote for it, the full House will follow suit." Not only was this [words deleted] and crass judgment, the President's supporters will say, but it was public [word deleted] on a massive scale to boot.

The supporters of the President will recall that after Mr. Doar dropped the mask of impartiality and stood as the Committee's self-appointed Torquemada, Mr. Rodino said proudly, "When I hired him, I always knew he eventually would do this."

The President's supporters will remember certain Congressmen on the Committee, like Mr. Drinan and his characterizations of the President as "a goddam fink," and "the absolute hypocrite," and "corrupt," and "murderer," and his characterization of the President's Southeast Asian peacemaking efforts as Hitlerite genocide, and his saying, "We'll have him out by spring," and his wearing of an "Impeach Nixon" button on his lapel until wiser and cooler heads instructed him to remove it.

They will remember Mr. Waldie's use of his franking privilege to send out reprints of his hot rhetoric pro-impeachment address at Berkeley and blank pro-impeachment petitions to be filled out by Californians outside his District so as to maintain the impeachment momentum.

The President's supporters will remember Mr. Conyers and his statement that he was on the Judiciary Committee to keep Mr. Rodino from being "too damn fair." They will remember Mr. Rangel characterizing the President in public print as "an [a vulgar word meaning the excretory opening of the alimentary canal]." There is not a jury in the country that would tolerate any one of these individuals sitting in judgment on materials relating to the guilt or innocence of Richard Nixon, and yet these persons are doing exactly that at the most solemn and grave inquest that the Nation can undertake.

If the President goes to trial, these recollections of unfairness, and indecency on the part of these impeachment zanies will remain indelibly fixed in their memories like an epitaph in stone. This huge group of Nixon supporters will not easily swallow their searing indignation and resentment.

Media effects. An impeachment trial would bloat the power of the media. Many in the press have already claimed Richard Nixon as their trophy, and the trial would justify an I-told-you-so triumphanism.

But a backlash, harmful to the media, in my judgment, will develop. Already people have noted press excesses, as is evidenced by a majority of the populace who now say that the media are mired in Watergate. The people have noted, too, the notebook and tweezers method of executing Richard Nixon that some media have adopted like that the seaming together of fragments of the transcripts by *Time* and *Newsweek* so as to create a tortured and horrid image of the President.

The people have seen through the sophistry of the argument given wide prominence by some media, namely, that an accumulation of suspect areas regarding the President makes him guilty. People realize that twenty rowboats do not make a Queen Mary.

The people know, too, how well the media can bury items, like the "Earl Nash" story. On July 9 the Judiciary Committee released a transcript in which the President is quoted on March 22, 1973 as voicing worry about "Earl Nash." On that occasion Attorney General Mitchell had inquired of the President the general political state of affairs and the President replied, according to the Judiciary version, "Earl Nash worries the ['bejabbers'] out of us here regarding (unintelligible)." The Committee staff checked their "Earl Nash" version seven times before they released it and they boast high quality playback equipment. The "Earl Nash" reference sent newspaper research people scurrying, and the *L.A. Times* newspaper librarian pored through reference books and found, "Nash, Harold Earl" in *Who's Who in Government*, identified as an underwater sound expert working for a Navy laboratory in New London, Connecticut. Watergate reporters were then salivating with interest: an acoustical sound expert no less.

The laboratory was phoned and the reporter was told that Earl Nash was away on assignment with the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean for a month. He was then traced to his apartment in Naples. When his phone rang in Naples, there was no answer. A Military Intelligence expert kept the story alive by telling a reporter that "the name sounds familiar." But the story was finally killed when the Judiciary Committee re-listened to the tape. "Earl Nash," it turns out, was "National Security." That's what worried the President, and so his claim that Watergate disclosures were hurting national security was corroborated by the Judiciary's revision of their version of the tape.

Too bad that the story did not get wider play. Then James J. Kilpatrick might have shown somewhat more skepticism about the other sections of the Judiciary Committee transcripts which alleged points of difference with the White House versions.

Regarding media imbalance, on a more personal note, my own enriching exchange of views with my Jesuit administrator in New England is in point. When I was admonished, the story gained jumbo coverage in the *New York Times*, *Time* and *Newsweek*. But when the administrator came to an enlightened recognition of the truth and recanted on all counts, there was not so much as a line carrying that story in *Time*, *Newsweek* or the *N.Y. Times*.

The First Amendment was designed to guarantee that no power would be used to suppress the media, and also to provide that there exist a diversity of opinion. Today the First Amendment is being abused by certain powerful national media in the central political issue of our day, the President's impeachment, to argue to a uniform position, i.e., Richard Nixon must be ousted.

If the impeachment goes to trial, coverage will doubtless be slanted and sensationalized by certain powerful media, as the big media slanted and sensationalized the impeachment of Andrew Johnson.

The sensationalizing of the impeachment trial, if it occurs, will bring with it as a backlash the reinspection of the constitutional role of the media. In our whole democratic experience, the American people have not tolerated irresponsible use of power. Americans will then look to see what controls should be put on the media. They will likely say that if the media are using their power politically, then they must be subject to the same political sanctions as any one else.

Effects on International Relations. If a Senate trial is voted by the House of Representatives, it will probably be transmitted

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

in large segments via satellite to the countries of the planet. Bilaterally, our relationships certainly cannot be helped by this development. During the long period of trial, other countries would not know whether the President had the backing of the Nation, and so they would wonder whether they could depend upon us or not.

Would opponent nations, moreover, on the assumption that our leadership is disorganized, be encouraged to miscalculate? Certain countries like the Soviet Union are geared to this psychology. After Stalin's death, Russia thought very much in these terms, believing that we might try to invade them.

Most importantly, however, the image of democracy would be fouled. The democratic ideal is represented universally on the globe by the success of American democracy. The Congress will be perceived by foreign nations as overturning the democratic will through those Members of the House who disagree with the President's political mandate, not because of any alleged corruption or abuse of power.

The simple fact is, as I can personally testify to, people around the world do not regard the burglarizing of the Democrat headquarters as anything more than a bit of nonsense. They share the view of the Episcopal Bishop of South Florida, Henry I. Louttit who recently changed his registration from Democrat to Republican because of the cruel way the Democrats are exploiting this Watergate issue. "Watergate," says Bishop Louttit, "is an example of the smallest molehill being blown into the biggest mountain in the history of the world. No one charged with anything about Watergate has been accused of doing it for his own benefit. It was not a burglary for money, but for information, which politicians have been doing since time immemorial. If the Democrats had not lost the 1972 presidential election they would not have seized upon Watergate to embarrass a President they despise. Thus far there is not one shred of evidence to show that Mr. Nixon is guilty of anything, but most of the news reports are so slanted that half of the nation probably thinks he has been found guilty by a jury." This is exactly as foreign nationals commonly think.

Non-Americans will certainly not believe that the Watergate burglary—and they see all of the other charges consolidated into that one event—as something that impeachment is designed to remedy. Even sophisticated outside observers, like Alexander Solshenitsyn, points to the two-faced duplicity of those politicians in this country who fulminate over Watergate for political reasons.

Solshenitsyn says: "Deep hypocrisy is characteristic even of today's American political life, of the Senate leaders with their distorted view of the sensational Watergate affair. Without in any way defending Nixon or the Republican Party, how can one not be amazed at the hypocritical, loudmouthed wrath displayed by the Democrats?"

What will foreign nations then see? Our two previous Presidents were driven from office, and one—if he goes to trial—almost driven from office. So the danger is that internationally the people of the world will see the impeachment trial not as democracy in action—a Pollyannish expectation—but as another baffling and sad failure of the democratic experience.

THE ORDEAL AS PART OF THE IMPEACHMENT JUDGMENT

In the proposition of this address, I stated that common sense dictates that the impeachment issue be decided both on the basis of the factual evidence, and on the basis of the probable effects, immediate and remote, of a presidential trial in the United States Senate on the Nation and on the international community. Not only does common sense dictate this; good law does too.

The ordeal of the Nation consequent upon a Senate trial of the President is not extrinsic

to the political and legal judgment that the Judiciary Committee and possibly the full House must render. Indeed, the ordeal of the Nation and its effects on the international community are necessarily ingredient to that judgment.

The role closest to that of a House Member in an impeachment process is that of a prosecutor. Now a prosecutor makes a decision on whether to recommend indictment (impeachment) or not, both on the evidence itself, and on the probable harm that will be inflicted by the indictment on the person to be possibly charged.

As the Deputy Attorney General, Henry Peterson, has ably and correctly pointed out, prosecutors are required in justice to include in their judgment of whether to recommend indictment or not the potential damage of the indictment to the individual. If the damage were construed to be great, then the criterion for indictment would be correspondingly more rigorous, though always, of course, subordinate to the legal evidence.

The effect of indictments varies from individual to individual. In some cases, as for example a Congressman or Senator, an indictment is usually ruinous. Such individuals of high station who are indicted often go through life afterwards as pariahs, whether they are acquitted later or not. Other persons of lesser public station are indicted and relatively speaking, the action hardly seems to create a ripple on the even tenor of their lives. From this it can be seen that justice demands that the effect of an indictment on the individual be included in the strict legal judgment.

In the case of the President, the same principle holds true. So, just as the norm of indictment of an individual, by our canons of American jurisprudence, looks both to the evidence and to the effect on the indictment of the individual, so, too, in the instance of the President, the norm of impeachment, analogous to indictment, looks both to the evidence and to the effect of the impeachment on him and what he represents. Since the President embodies the Presidency of the United States and the leadership of the Free World, a more rigorous standard of impeachment must be applied to him than to others, as a matter of strict legal justice.

I would restress here that the evidence, in my view, will sustain no criminal case whatsoever—not even a sustainable misdemeanor charge against the President, and a Senate trial would most assuredly bear this out. It is not unlikely that this realization is part of the reason why Jimmy the Greek is currently oddsmaking the acquittal of the President in the Senate—if it comes to that—by one thousand to one, favoring the President. Our set purpose, however, should be to keep the impeachment out of the Senate, so as to spare the Nation the ordeal.

A CAVEAT AND CONCLUSION

Hearing this, some journalistic provocateurs will say that McLaughlin is launching a new White House strategy: sweep the evidence against the President under the rug because the ordeal of a Senate trial would be too great for the country to bear. Ladies and Gentlemen, with all the emphasis that I can summon, let me declare that this is not the case. The President and his Staff are not afraid of the evidence. The evidence has and will continue to clear the President, and the President is prepared to test the evidence in whatever tribunal or forum required. If that entails a trial in the United States Senate, then *Quis sera, sera*. Personally, I have absolute certitude (with Jimmy the Greek) that if the inquest goes to the Senate, the President will be acquitted by more than a majority of the members, because there exists no valid legal case against him.

My purpose in this address is to encourage the Members of the Judiciary Committee and the Congress and the American people to see

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that the ordeal of the Senate trial should be included as a principal factor in the judgment to impeach or not to impeach, and that this inclusion is altogether justified on political, purely legal and common sense grounds. My further intent is to persuade everyone that it is of absolute importance to keep this inquest out of the Senate. Otherwise negative effects of a probably serious and perhaps intolerable nature would be felt on the Nation's morale, economy, politics, media and international relations.

You will remember that the Senate Select Committee's Watergate hearings exhausted and vexed the Nation, yet there were only seven Senators conducting the proceedings, not 100; there was no examination and the area of investigation was more restricted than the current impeachment inquest.

So the Members of the Judiciary Committee have a responsibility that is colossal. The spread of their vote and its partisan mix will largely determine how the full House of Representatives will vote. House Members realizing that they have neither the time or opportunity to examine the evidence as closely as have the Judiciary Members. Equivalently, then, the Judiciary Members are now voting a Senate trial, with its ordeal, or not.

The standard of their judgment, therefore, ought to be most exacting, i.e., "beyond all doubt." In their heads and in their hearts the Members must be convinced absolutely—without any admixture of uncertainty at all—that the President is guilty of gross criminal misconduct. If this conviction does not well up from their innermost selves, then they should vote to acquit. Above all, the Members should not try to pass the buck to the House—and so ineluctably to the Senate—by invoking some hokey standard of judgment like "probable cause." Political discretion, pure legal judgment and common sense would be outraged by such an evil evasion of responsibility.

The responsibility of the Judiciary Members is not unlike that described by Edmund Ross at the Andrew Johnson impeachment when he said:

"It was tremendous responsibility, and it was not strange that he upon whom it had been imposed by a fateful combination of conditions should have sought to avoid it, to put it away from him as one shuns, or tries to fight off a nightmare. I almost literally looked down into my open grave. Friendships, position, fortune, everything that makes life desirable to an ambitious man were about to be swept away . . . perhaps forever."

Finally what the Members require—and what we all require at this grave historical juncture, above all else is *impartiality* and *common sense*.

CONCLUSION

At this grave time, the Republic requires impartiality and common sense. Thomas Paine, at the end of his essay on *Common Sense*, called for impartiality. These lines were written on the eve of America's declaring its independence and calling for that independence. Paine wrote:

"On these grounds I rest the matter. . . . Wherefore, instead of gazing at each other with suspicious or doubtful curiosity, let each of us hold out to his neighbor the hearty hand of friendship. . . . Let the names of Whig [Democrat] and Tory [Republican] be extinct and let none other be heard among us than those of a good citizen, an open and resolute friend, and a virtuous supporter of the rights of mankind and of the free and independent states of America."

Regarding common sense, I recall a few years ago a visit to India. My electric shaver broke down and I brought it to a native electrician in Delhi. He asked me for more detailed instructions, and I said to him half-irritatedly: "You know what I want. Just fix it. Use your common sense."

The Indian electrician bowed politely,

looked me in the eye, and said, "Sir, common sense is a rare gift of God. I have only a technical education."

Lord, deliver us from those who are judging the impeachment of the President of the United States as if it were simply a matter to be resolved by a technical education, though technically there is no case for impeachment.

Lord, in this solemn hour, give us common sense.

PARTIES PLAY POLITICS

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, whatever else anyone thinks of the current proceedings of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the former chief minority counsel, Mr. Jenner, of the committee has earned a place in history—an infamous place in my view—as an object lesson in how not to be loyal. He now wears the more fitting and comfortable mantle of associate general counsel. However, elementary good taste would have dictated that Mr. Jenner not accept the position in the first place if he could not perform the assignment in good faith, but assuming he accepted the job in good faith, he should have resigned the moment he felt he could no longer work loyally as chief minority counsel. Above all, he should not have made statements to the press. The politics involved have not added any luster to the current proceedings and I feel the following editorial from the Detroit News of July 23, 1974, is thoughtful in that regard:

[From the Detroit News, July 23, 1974]

PARTIES PLAY POLITICS

That partisanship should rear its ugly head in the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment deliberations is unfortunate—but was inevitable.

The demotion of Albert Jenner from his job as chief minority counsel for being "out of tune with the Republican members" recognized the political realities. Though each side may have its mavericks, the committee is generally divided along party lines.

That division may not be illustrated clearly by the final vote—since another reality, that of political survival, may prevail—but at this point the Democratic majority and the Republican minority stand at swords points.

Putting aside the partisan squabble among committee members, both Jenner and the Democratic chief counsel, John Doar, have displayed an unseemly eagerness for the kill and probably have exceeded their proper roles.

Their proper work would seem to have been to research the law, prepare the evidence and, in Doar's case, to draft a list of possible impeachment charges if the evidence suggested probable cause. These appointed advisers should otherwise have left it to the members of the committee, the elected members of Congress, to initiate any recommendation for impeachment.

As it actually happened, Doar not only urged the committee to find President Nixon guilty but later carried his crusade to the press. Jenner joined him—to the deep annoyance of certain Republican members of the committee who defend the President and feel that the minority counsel should work for the minority or at least maintain a decent neutrality.

August 1, 1974

Ideally, the committee and its staff would have approached its work in detached fashion, listened with open minds to the evidence and the witnesses, respected the rules of confidentiality, refused to leak stories to the press, eschewed pre-judgments, avoided partisanship quibbling and reached a bipartisan and just conclusion.

This ideal rests on the assumption that Congress is a haven full of angels. But, alas, we all know that it's not. In the end, we'll just have to be satisfied with a conclusion shaped in the earthly crucible of politics.

FOOD SUPPLEMENT LEGISLATION

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a heated controversy for more than a year now over soon-to-become-effective Food and Drug Administration regulations covering dietary supplements of vitamins and minerals.

A main issue in the controversy is the requirement of the regulations that high-potency vitamin and mineral products which exceed FDA-established limits be classified as either over-the-counter or prescription drugs.

I realize that these regulations are the outcome of years of consideration of the vitamin-mineral question—years of hearings, studies, proposals, filing of objections, revision, and so on. I also appreciate the FDA's concern that food supplement legislation not diminish statutory authority to protect the consumer.

Because so many important questions about the regulations and their application remain unanswered, and in hopes of finding a more promising approach than the one the FDA is taking, I introduced a bill yesterday—H.R. 16189—that would prevent the FDA from classifying certain vitamin and mineral products as drugs, but would strengthen FDA authority to regulate the labeling and advertising of such dietary supplements.

This bill, which is the House counterpart to S. 3867, introduced yesterday by Senator GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin, would amend the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act to:

First. Allow the manufacture and marketing of foods for special dietary uses, such as vitamins and minerals, that do not meet FDA standards, provided they are labeled and clearly distinguished as not conforming to these standards.

Second. Require that any therapeutic claims made for such a product be substantiated by scientific data supporting safety and efficacy, as is required by law for prescription drugs. If producers making such claims cannot substantiate them, their products will be deemed to be misbranded.

Third. Require that the labeling of such products contain no untrue nutrition, health or other statement, and that advertising for such products not be misleading or false.

The bill also requires that the labels of vitamin and mineral products state the manufacturer's name and address, list the common or usual name of each

ingredient present in the product, and show the applicable U.S. recommended daily allowance—U.S. RDA—set by the FDA.

I hope that the bill will be considered by the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee, chaired by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS), which has been meeting this week to consider drafting food supplement legislation. I would also welcome comments on the bill from my colleagues and members of the public interested in the use and availability of dietary supplements.

WHAT'S DELAYING COLORADO'S NEW WILDERNESS AREAS

HON. DONALD G. BROTMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. BROTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD this editorial of July 30, 1974, in which the Denver Post poses the question: "What's Delaying Colorado's Wilderness Areas?" I pose the same question.

The Senate easily approved wilderness status for Eagles Nest, Flat Tops, and Weminuche. In view of this, it would be most regrettable if the House failed to complete action during the current session. If that were to happen the whole process would have to begin again in the next Congress.

A compromise has been reached between the Denver Water Board and environmentalists over the character of the Eagles Nest area, because it was highly unlikely the Public Lands Subcommittee would have acted on any of the proposed Colorado wilderness areas unless such agreements were made.

My colleague, Mr. MELCHER—the chairman of the subcommittee—has reassured me that he is aware of the importance of this wilderness legislation, but to date the legislation has failed to move forward.

Part of the reason for the delay is entirely valid. Strip mining was complicated, controversial, and demanded an inordinate amount of time. But we have disposed of that, and I would urge him to end the delay which has stalled Colorado wilderness legislation.

I have been waging this "battle" for quite some time now, and would like to win the "war" before the troops go home.

[From the Denver Post, July 30, 1974]

WHAT'S DELAYING COLORADO'S NEW WILDERNESS AREAS?

Colorado's long struggle to set up three wilderness areas under the federal Wilderness Act of 1964 appears to have been hit by falling rocks.

In a maneuver that has most Coloradans—whether conservationists or economic users of national forest—a little baffled, a Montana congressman has ordered more hearings on the legislation. Directly affected by Rep. John Melcher's order (he is chairman of the House public lands subcommittee) are the proposed Eagles Nest and Flattops Wilderness Areas. But the Weminuche, Wilderness Area in southwest Colorado also will be delayed.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Melcher's reasons are straightforward enough. It's quite true that Coloradans have fought bitterly over the Eagles Nest boundaries because of the Denver Water Board's claims to water in the area (Eagles Nest lies in Denver's watershed). Water engineers want future collection areas to be free of wilderness restrictions. Quite understandably, Melcher doesn't want to get caught in the middle of a Colorado internal fight.

The Flattops similarly has been a water battleground.

Doubtless, too, Melcher has been influenced by U.S. Forest Service arguments against wilderness areas whose boundaries are larger than this federal administrative agency originally sought.

But why the fight has erupted again, and at this time, is subject of some conjecture. Legislation proposed in the U.S. Senate by U.S. Sens. Peter Dominick and Floyd Haskell passed easily last year. Haskell, who is chairman of an Interior subcommittee, was induced to support compromise wording arranged between the Denver Water Board and environmental groups. But there appeared to be some broad agreement that, pending such change, there was a consensus among Colorado House members that the three wilderness groups might be approved at this session.

Now that Melcher has made his move the whole question of wilderness is likely to be reviewed. That may not be a bad idea if it isn't destructive to the whole concept. Some wilderness supporters say if the legislation is killed this year (and the Senate bill will die along with the House bill) the matter may not come before Congress again until 1976. A good deal of damage could occur in the fringes of areas proposed for wilderness in those areas of Colorado where commercial development and reaction use are heaviest.

But there is no doubt, too, that a good many citizens are having second thoughts about wilderness. With serious shortages developing in resource areas (timber and metals, for example) those concerned with economic development have new ammunition against "locking up" resources that may be needed in the future. The argument that the President may, under the act, free such resources in time of national need is not reassuring to this viewpoint.

There is the additional argument that the creation of wilderness in other states (which are ahead of Colorado in winning designation of areas) has only served to focus public attention on them with resultant overuse. This was not the intention of the Wilderness Act of 1964.

Congressman Melcher can be forgiven at the present time if he is unresponsive to the Colorado wilderness queries. He is in the midst of a major legislative maneuver over strip mining legislation.

But he does owe Coloradans an explanation of what his plans are on wilderness. There is good evidence that the Denver water engineers and wilderness proponents were fairly close together in the Eagle Nest area. And the Colorado River Water Conservancy District has made concessions on the size of Flattops. Some Western Colorado feeling remains that Weminuche, as proposed and accepted by conservationists, is too big.

So we hope Melcher will make his intentions clear fairly soon. There is a lot of work embodied in the current wilderness areas. If that work is to be scuttled for this session of Congress—and we have not foreclosed the possibility such a delay is needed—Coloradans should at least be given some sort of timetable on what to expect. Melcher, who has supported larger—not smaller—wilderness in his own state, owes some sort of explanation.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE U.S. TAR SANDS DEPOSITS

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, tar sands deposits are located in at least 22 States, with most of this energy source concentrated in the State of Utah. The oil contained in known U.S. tar sands deposits may exceed 30 billion barrels, roughly five times the quantity of oil which is used in the United States each year. In Utah, potential oil production from tar sands ranges from 20.5 billion barrels to an optimistic 29.7 billion barrels.

Over 60 percent of the tar sands deposits in the State of Utah are publicly owned. However, this potentially valuable resource remains largely untapped due to technical problems under current leasing law. Congress must take the initiative and rewrite the present tar sands leasing guidelines so that a workable tar sands leasing policy can be instituted.

The distinguished Senator from Utah, the Honorable FRANK MOSS, has suggested proposals to establish a workable leasing policy for the tar sands. His bill, S. 3375, authorizes the Department of the Interior to issue a single hydrocarbon lease which would cover all hydrocarbons removed from beneath the surface. This proposal would remove a major stumbling block to the development of tar sands located on Federal land. The text of this bill is presented below:

S. 3375

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 437; 30 U.S.C. 181), hereinafter called the Mineral Leasing Act, is further amended by the deletion from the first sentence of the words "native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rocks or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried)" and by the addition of the following proviso: "Provided further, That as used in this Act the words 'oil and gas' shall embrace all hydrocarbons, including native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), but excluding gilsonite and those hydrocarbons which the Secretary of the Interior shall determine to lease as coal or oil shale, and the word 'gas' also includes all naturally occurring gases, combustible and noncombustible, and their constituent vapors, except helium and geothermal steam."

SEC. 2. Subsections (b) and (c) of section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act, as amended by the Mineral Leasing Act Revision of 1960 (74 Stat. 781; 30 U.S.C. 226 (b) and (c)), are amended to read as follows:

"(b) If the lands to be leased are within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field, or are known to contain native asphalt, solid or semisolid bitumen, or bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit has been mined or quarried), they shall be

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

leased to the highest responsible qualified bidder by competitive bidding under general regulations in units of not more than six hundred and forty acres, which shall be as nearly compact in form as possible, upon the payment by the lessee of such bonus as may be accepted by the Secretary and of such royalty as may be fixed in the lease, which shall be not less than 12½ per centum in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease.

"(c) (1) If any lands to be leased are not subject to leasing under subsection (b), the person first making application for the lease who is qualified to hold a lease under this Act shall be entitled to a lease without competitive bidding. Such leases shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of a royalty of 12½ per centum in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease.

"(2) Upon application to the Secretary, (A) any lessee under an oil and gas lease issued under this Act prior to the effective date of these amendments of subsections (b) and (c) of this section for lands which are not, at the time of application, also included within a lease for native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, or bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried) and (B) any lessee under a lease for native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), issued prior to the effective date of these amendments for lands which are not, at the time of application, also included within a lease for oil and gas issued prior to the effective date of these amendments, shall be entitled to exchange his lease for an oil and gas lease issued under this Act."

SEC. 3. Section 21 (30 U.S.C. 241) and section 34 (30 U.S.C. 182) of the Mineral Leasing Act, as amended, are further amended by the deletion of the words "native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried)" from the first sentence of each section. Section 21 is further amended by the revision of the last sentence of subsection (a) to read as follows: "Not more than one lease shall be granted under this section to any one person, association, or corporation." Subsection (c) of section 21 is hereby repealed in its entirety.

When tar sands are developed for their valuable oil products, we must insure that the environmental integrity of these lands are maintained. Careful environmental regulations must be issued to govern all aspects of tar sands development.

In order to provide other Members with additional information on the tar sands leasing question, I will in the near future insert into the RECORD portions of a report prepared for me by the Library of Congress on the public policy aspects of tar sands development. It will answer such questions as:

What is the resource base of the domestic tar sand resources?

What is the expected rate of development of these resources?

What problems are encountered with the current leasing policy for the federally owned tar sands?

Yesterday I introduced the bill which Senator Moss has introduced in the Senate. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee should examine the

need for a workable tar sands leasing policy. Development of Utah's tar sands deposits could play a small but vital role in satisfying our future energy requirements.

LETTER OF INTEREST

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the recently concluded hearings by the Judiciary Committee on the articles of impeachment against the President gave the Nation an unprecedented opportunity to view a fundamental democratic process in action. I think beyond question the committee performed its constitutional obligation with fairness and with great objectivity and that it merits the respect and gratitude of the House and of the Nation. My mail tells me that that feeling is shared by a great number of my constituents, but it was most eloquently expressed in a letter sent to me by Miss Ann P. Brewster of Lawrenceville, N.J. Mr. Speaker, I have received Miss Brewster's permission to share that letter with you and if there is no objection, I would like to place it in the RECORD at this time.

The letter follows:

LAWRENCEVILLE, N.J.,
July 29, 1974.

Representative FRANK THOMPSON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I know you are unusually busy and will be so for the next month or more, but I hope you have time to read this. The things I have been thinking about are important to me and have to do with the serious business which, I believe, will be before you and the other representatives shortly. I want you to know that my feelings are those of a former cynic, a former radical, and one who seldom cared about the government—and they are sincere.

I have never been a supporter of President Nixon. It is my personal belief that he has committed "impeachable offenses," and that he should indeed be accountable for his actions in all the matters concerned and subject to trial by Congress. The concerns of my letter, however, are not those personal opinions about his guilt, but some broader ideas which have become part of my thoughts and feelings.

For a number of months I have found it tedious and depressing for me to keep up on the facts and progress of the impeachment proceedings against the President. Since live television coverage of the Judiciary Committee hearings began, though, I have been absolutely absorbed by all these events. My impressions of the proceedings have surprised me. I am proud of the members of the committee—all of them—for their ability, diligence, and their concern. And I'm so proud of our democratic system! I say I was surprised by these impressions, and that's true. I have never felt close to my government (which, in the past, I referred to as "the" government) or to the issues it dealt with. I was estranged, really, from my own country. I'm happy to say that I no longer feel that way. I am happily consoled and excited. Though I do think the President is impeachable, I do not take the process lightly. I was afraid, as many were—and some still are—that this grave and unusual situation would

devastate our government and, as well, the people's trust in their elected officials. I am positively convinced now that this is not the case. If anything, the ability of Congress to accept and carry out the process is a confirmation of democracy. Never have I felt so encouraged—so proud—of this country and its government. I think it is important that every member of Congress know this. Most especially, I want you to know it.

I have faith in your capacity for understanding and interpreting the events and facts in question, and I realize that you are, because of your knowledge of the facts and your closeness to the controversy, a better judge of the case than I. You have my full support for whatever your convictions may be.

I look forward to a just fulfillment of the provisions of the Constitution. I have absolute confidence in the members of Congress that they will meet their responsibilities in this vital matter as thoughtfully as they have up to this time.

With sincerity and respect,

ANN P. BREWSTER.

SHORTAGES THREATEN FREE PRESS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the newspaper industry is facing a crisis—its ability to publish. Should the supply of newsprint grow shorter and the price continue to rise, all newspapers will be forced to reduce coverage or shut down.

These choices are unacceptable. We cannot tolerate this threat to a vibrant free press.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will read carefully the following persuasive article in the Oakland Tribune by Juan Vergara Hovey:

[From the Oakland Tribune, July 7, 1974]
NEWSPRINT COSTS SOAR, PAPERS CUT BACK
(By Juan Vergara Hovey)

Inflation—the invisible, silent enemy that consumes money faster than a hot furnace—is hitting the newspaper industry in California and elsewhere right where it hurts: in newsprint, the very stuff of which newspaper are made.

A survey by The Oakland Tribune last week revealed two things which are deeply worrying newspaper publishers:

The cost of newsprint is spiraling out of sight.

At the same time the supply is dwindling in relation to demand and is also becoming erratic.

A number of small newspapers in the East-bay skipped publication over the Fourth of July holiday to conserve their supplies of newsprint.

Prices of the soft, fibrous paper on which newspapers are printed have risen extraordinarily in the last 18 months. One major supplier of West Coast newspapers, including The Tribune, announced a new increase just last week that will balloon the cost of a ton of newsprint 40 per cent over what it was in January 1973. Other suppliers are expected to follow suit.

For a newspaper the size of The Tribune, that means that the annual cost of newsprint will be \$2 million higher than it was 18 months ago.

August 1, 1974

In some cases the price of newsprint is already rivaling the cost of labor, traditionally the highest cost of publishing a newspaper.

In January, 1973, The Oakland Tribune was spending exactly \$174 for each ton of newsprint, from which about 3,500 copies of a 50-page newspaper could be printed.

On August 1 the Crown Zellerbach Corp. of San Francisco, which supplies The Tribune and a number of other newspapers, will start charging \$245 per ton. That is an increase of 40 per cent.

Industry sources say the end is not in sight. In Europe, prices reportedly range around \$350 per ton. Prices already are about \$400 per ton in Latin America, and are said to hit \$800 per ton in less developed areas of the world, particularly Africa and parts of Asia.

Some of that paper is black market paper. One American newspaper executive, granted anonymity by The Tribune, said a black market is already operating in this country and, though erratic and shadowy, can supply publishers with 4,000 to 5,000 tons of newsprint per shipment—at a cost of about \$375 per ton.

The situation apparently had its roots during the economic controls imposed by the Nixon administration in 1971. Among the industries whose prices were strictly controlled were the nation's paper manufacturing concerns.

Traditionally a source of little profit, newsprint instantly became an unattractive product. Prevented from raising prices to meet their rising costs, pulp manufacturers put a halt to their plans for expansion and even, in some cases, reduced their production of newsprint and stepped up production of more profitable grades of paper.

The situation was complicated by a series of strikes and other labor difficulties this year in Canada, from which American newspaper publishers bought about 70 per cent of their annual consumption, which totaled 10.5 million tons last year.

In some cases shortages became so severe that newspapers stopped publishing on some days, or trimmed their circulation or their news space or their ad space.

In nearly every newspaper office in the country, steps were taken to conserve newsprint.

The shortage seemed to lift somewhat earlier this year. The strikes in Canada were resolved, and supplies, despite some intermittent labor troubles, became constant again.

But then the Nixon administration lifted its controls on the paper industry, on March 8 of this year. By March 15, one major supplier of newsprint, the Canadian International Paper Co., raised its per-ton prices from \$188 to \$213.

And no one in the industry was pretending then that costs would rise no more.

They still aren't.

And now publishers—especially those of smaller newspapers—are faced with the added problem that they can't find enough newsprint no matter what it costs.

The trouble hit home in the Bay Area for the first time this week as publishers received news of the Crown Zellerbach increase—and anticipated similar increases from other suppliers.

The Fremont Argus and Livermore Herald News, did not publish Friday morning. The Hayward Review skipped publication Thursday.

In Contra Costa County, there were no Thursday editions of the daily Antioch Ledger and Concord Transcript and the Pittsburgh Post-Dispatch. The Martinez News-Gazette also did not publish Friday morning but a company spokesman said holiday scheduling rather than the newsprint shortage was the reason.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

These, like other small Eastbay newspapers, are faced with the rising costs and dwindling, erratic supply that trouble their larger competitors.

"The spiraling cost of newsprint is one of the greatest threats to newspaper publishing we face," Dean Lesher, publisher of the Contra Costa Times and three other daily newspapers in Contra Costa County, as well as a number of weeklies and several papers in the San Joaquin Valley, told The Tribune last week.

"The Times has a five figure tonnage of newsprint (annually), and those costs are rapidly becoming the Number One costs of operating.

"Circulation doesn't pay the costs of production even before delivery," he said.

"Advertising bears the brunt of publication costs, but there's a limit how far you can raise those. We need at least a 10 to 12 per cent rate of return on our advertising—as opposed to 6 per cent—because of the rising costs.

"And it's not only the costs of newsprint. It's also the supply. Suppliers allocate (their shipments) but they don't always deliver them on schedule."

And the cost keeps rising. Lesher said industry sources had told him that the cost of a ton of newsprint could easily reach \$290 by the end of the year.

The latest increase will hike the publishing costs of Lesher's chain by about \$500,000 per year, he said.

Another area newspaper executive, Walt Dreitzler, production manager of the Vallejo Times-Herald, said the Donrey Media Group, which owns 32 newspapers including the Times-Herald, had been forced to trim its consumption of newsprint by 40 tons a month because of the shortage.

Daily editions of the papers have been cut by as many as four pages. Both advertising space and the "news hole" suffer, he said.

The Donrey Group's weekly Valejo News Chronicle this week will cut its press run in half—from 30,000 to 15,000 copies, he said.

Shipments have been unpredictable, Dreitzler said. The May shipment never did arrive. The June shipment didn't arrive until the end of the month. There's no telling when the July shipment will arrive, he added.

John Fitzwater, publisher of the Pittsburgh Post-Dispatch, a member of the Worrell Newspapers chain, has been forced to increase its subscription and advertising rates in order to meet the rising costs of newsprint and other supplies.

The newspaper has contracts for enough newsprint to supply it for the rest of the year, barring labor troubles that could interrupt shipments, he said—but there's no predicting what will happen next year.

Across the country, nearly all newspapers have been forced to increase subscription and advertising rates to meet spiraling costs in recent years. For example, on Sept. 1, 1972, the San Francisco Examiner and Chronicle increased their monthly subscription rates to \$4.75. On April 1 of this year, they increased them again to \$5.50.

Last month, The Tribune increased its monthly subscription rate to \$4.75, the first increase in more than three years.

Some California newspapers were hit with a new wrinkle on the newsprint supply situation last week.

Finland, which exported about 300,000 tons of newsprint to the United States last year, will send no more next year, according to an announcement from the Finnish trade group, Paper Producers Association.

"We shouldn't have any difficulties in selling (the halted shipments to America) in Europe, where the prices are a little bit better," a spokesman for the trade group said.

That 300,000 tons was slightly more than 2 per cent of the total U.S. consumption, but at least one California newspaper group depended heavily on it.

Hugh Hollister, assistant to the president of the Copley Press, La Jolla, which owns the Sacramento Union, the San Diego Union and Tribune, and the South Bay (Torrance) Daily Breeze, said the chain bought 25 per cent of its yearly supply of newsprint from the Finnish exporters.

Next year the Copley papers will get none at all from the Finns, Hollister told The Tribune. Already this year the Finnish exporters have cut back on their contracted-for supplies by 50 per cent, he said, and the chain is seeking other supplies.

Given the tight situation throughout the industry, the chain will have to scramble for it.

Copley's troubles come on top of others—most notably a drop in ad lineage because of the unpredictable future of the American economy, Hollister said.

Some papers in the chain have increased their subscription or street sales rates, and all have instituted strict conservation measures, he said.

"We've taken steps to eliminate waste and restrict our product to accommodate the general shortage," he said, including the elimination of a special edition delivered in parts of the Imperial Valley.

The chain has also trimmed the number of free copies available to schools, libraries, and the like, and only "spoiled" copies are available to editors and reporters in city rooms.

As yet the chain has not trimmed its news content as a result of the newspaper shortage, Hollister said.

"But we are considering it now. We are very much considering the value of some of our features," he said.

As yet the advertising space has not been trimmed either, he added.

The chain has found no supplier to make up for the 25 per cent of its consumption normally received from Finland.

Asked what he thought the general prognosis was for the industry, Hollister said:

"There will be individual cases of near disaster. A large paper can do a variety of things and still make money, but a small paper can't do as much."

The crunch will worsen, he said, until pulp prices rise far enough to make the business profitable again—and even then, because of the lead time required to bring new mills on line, it will be two years before capacity is significantly added to.

"All newspapers are going to be hard hit by the soaring costs," Charles Gould, publisher of the San Francisco Examiner, told The Tribune.

"They can only meet such costs by increasing their revenues. It's part of the inflationary pattern."

Nonetheless, he said, the latest round of price increases "is a shocker."

"I think we're faced with monumental challenges as newsprint costs go up and as labor costs go up."

"Newspapers are in danger of pricing themselves right out of the market."

THE GREAT INFLATION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during my trips home and in the letters I receive from my constituents I hear a constant and rising theme of concern about the double-digit inflation we are now enduring. I am sure my colleagues in the House

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

August 1, 1974

have the same experiences. I want to bring to their attention two excellent articles in the Saturday Review/World which shed considerable light on the exact nature of the problems confronting us.

Sidney Rolfe in "The Great Inflation" gives an outstanding analysis of our current crisis. He expertly lays out the background of the crisis, where we are now, and what we might expect in the near future. Lastly, he lays down some concrete advice as to some appropriate rules which we holding political office should henceforth consider carefully.

The second article, "Inflation Around the World" by Colin Chapman, provides a short tour of inflation highlights in the non-Communist world, underlining that other democratic governments besides our own will be facing difficult decisions in the near future.

The articles follow:

THE GREAT INFLATION

(By Sidney Rolfe)

Like a thief in the night, inflation has silently stolen wealth from all classes in society. Wage-earners and pensioners are hard hit in the supermarkets and in the shops. Since 1966, savings have lost 40 percent of their purchasing power. Stocks and bonds have lost at least this much value with rising interest rates. The flight from paper to things—real estate, art, gold—is an attempt to seek security against monetary depreciation. Loss of wealth and a pervasive feeling of insecurity have contributed to the cynicism and disillusionment that citizens feel for their governments and for the effectiveness of democracy.

Why so much inflation? The perplexed citizen is too often confused by purported explanations that mix symptoms with cause, transitory episodes with fundamental reasons.

Strangely, the best definition is still in Webster's dictionary: inflation is "an increase in the volume of money and credit relative to goods resulting in a substantial rise in the general price level." Or, in the common wisdom, "too much money chasing too few goods." Money and credit, in a more technical phrase, are the "money supply."

Where does too great a money supply come from? The answer again is stunningly simple—the oversupply results from too much deficit spending by governments. The process works this way: as Congress appropriates, and the Treasury spends, more money than it receives in taxes, the Treasury issues IOUs (treasury bills, bonds, and so forth) for the difference. In recession, when the society has idle savings (unloaned funds in the banking system or personal savings that earn zero or low-rated interest), it can lend them to the Treasury for the IOUs. But with near-full employment there are few idle savings around, so the Federal Reserve system simply creates additional money, in the form of bank credit, for banks to buy the IOUs—that is, to lend back to the government. This is a net addition to the money supply.

In times of recession, putting idle savings to work tends to stimulate the economy and create jobs. But when productive capacity and the money supply are fully employed, the result of adding new money supply cannot help being inflationary, after a time lag. This effect is particularly likely when the government buys military goods that never come back into the supply stream, as they either are destroyed or have no civilian use.

To put it differently, the money supply is tantamount to a total, aggregate demand for goods and services. But both the supply of goods and the demand for those goods (the money supply), like two blades of a scissors,

determine price. In the natural course of events, because of increasing productivity, the amount of goods available tends to increase, almost automatically, by about 3.5 to 4 percent per year in the United States (more in some countries, less in others). But the supply of money is subject to no "natural" increase rate. How much money and credit are created is arbitrary and determined by government spending decision—or lack of decision—as indicated earlier. Were the increase in money supply restricted to about the same rate as the increase of goods—that is, about 4 percent per year—then prices would remain stable. If it increased less than 4 percent, or fell as it did in the Great Depression, then prices would fall. However, in the past decade the money supply has increased by much more than the magic 4 percent, and the result—à la Webster—has been inflation.

A brief look at the figures tells the story. In the five-year Johnson era, 1964 through 1968, the money supply increased, according to one measure,¹ by no less than 47 percent, from \$259 to \$382 billion. A little arithmetic tells us that the supply of goods increased at best by about 22 percent—that is, the 4 percent productivity increase compounded over five years. The discrepancy is obvious, and the result was inflation. Nor did the Nixon administration do any better. In the five years from 1969 through 1973, the money supply increased 49 percent (\$382 to \$571 billion), over double the same 22 percent gain in output of goods. If the whole decade 1964 through 1973 is considered, the money supply increased by 120 percent. For the same decade the increase of output was of the order of 50 percent.

The genesis of the Great Inflation is thus the doubling of the money supply in the United States from 1964 on. The major single reason for the increase was the huge expenditure for Vietnam, which was not offset by increased taxes because the war was too unpopular to face a tax vote in Congress, despite the volatile protests of Johnson's economists that taxes must be raised or there would be inflation.

The signs of inflation were numerous by the late Sixties, but the most significant, for this analysis, were evident in the foreign balance of payments. For the second major step in the drama of the Great Inflation was the transmission of the American inflation to the rest of the world and particularly to industrial Europe and Japan, whence it reverberated, as a result of the international monetary system and, particularly, that system's inflexible adherence to fixed exchange rates.

How did it happen? In 1964 the United States had a favorable balance of payments on trade—that is, a surplus of exports over imports—of some \$5 billion. By 1968 this had fallen to near zero and, thereafter, to a negative for the first time in the twentieth century. The inflation in the United States had raised prices more rapidly here than in other countries, reducing American exports and inducing relatively cheap imports. As a result, a vast number of dollars were sent abroad to pay for goods.

These dollar outflows followed a path from American importer to, say, German exporter, who deposited them in a German commercial bank. The bank "sold" the dollars to its central bank for marks. The central bank thus became the residual holder of dollars. In exchange it gave to the German commercial bank from which it had collected the dollars an equivalent value of marks or of credit.

¹ M2 is used here—that is, currency plus demand deposits, plus time deposits at commercial banks. Other measures give much the same result. Based on the *Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisors*, 1973, Table C-52, p. 310.

So the money supply in the various countries also rose because of the inflow of dollars.

But the inflow of American dollars from the trade deficit was only the tip of the iceberg. For by 1969-70, when it had become apparent that the dollar was badly overvalued and could not earn its way in the world, billions of dollars were transferred from the United States—by foreigners moving their deposits to other countries, by private individuals and banks doing the same, and, least of all, by multi-national corporations. The funds were transferred to foreign banks to be converted into foreign currencies in anticipation of a devaluation of the dollar. For example, in 1971 no less than \$30 billion left the United States in this way. And all of this money, like the dollars flowing out because of the trade deficit, was translated in the countries in which it lodged, mainly in industrial Europe, into additional money supply, hence the inflationary potential there.

The "surplus" countries receiving dollars could have done something about the problem. They could have revalued their currency—that is, increased its value against the dollar. Or they could have agreed to permit the United States to devalue the dollar unilaterally, a course American officials proposed in 1970-71. Either adjustment would have permitted the United States to pay its way by making American goods cheaper on world markets so that Americans could export more and import less and move from deficit to surplus on the trade balance. But the surplus nations did not do so, because, although they feared inflation, they feared even more the loss of their own export markets and the political power of their export sectors.

In August 1971, the United States forced the devaluation of the dollar on the world by suspending gold convertibility and by imposing a 10 percent surcharge on imports, superseded in December 1971 by a general agreement on new exchange rates, which devalued the dollar and upvalued the yen, mark, and other currencies of surplus countries. But this, too, broke down, and in February 1973 the dollar was again devalued and all currencies were allowed to float—this is the current state of affairs.

The establishment of floating exchange rates in 1973 stopped the international transmission of inflation, but by then much of the irreparable damage had been done. New levels of money supply had been created throughout the world, and prices rose to meet them, distributing the supply of goods into the swollen money demand. A few figures will illustrate the extent of this world money-supply growth. In the two and a half years from June 1971 to January 1974 the most meager measure of money supply (M1, currency plus demand deposits)—but the only one available for international comparison—rose by no less than 32 percent, from \$522 to \$690 billion for the ten major industrial nations. Again, this may be compared with a 10 percent productivity growth for the period, and, of course, the process had been going on long before 1971. From 1965 on, the money supply for these nations had more than doubled, from \$332 to \$690 billion; the cost of living rose by over 50 percent.

Once established, the new money supply cannot be rolled back, as this would reduce spending and thereby employment and/or wages, and result in an unacceptable depression. Therefore prices will not decline in the near future, except for certain commodities, including grains, soybeans, and others for which rapidly rising prices in 1972-73 have called forth a significantly larger crop. On the other hand, there is evidence that the rate of increase of money-supply growth has slowed; so further price rises should be much smaller. The annual rates of change of the money supply for each six-month period of

the two-and-a-half-year span through 1973 were 10.8 percent, 16.2 percent, 13.6 percent, 10.2 percent, and only 6.8 percent in the latter half of 1973.

Parenthetically, it may be noted that some commentators blame flexible exchange rates for increased inflationary pressure in the United States. What they mean is that the devaluation of the dollar resulted in higher import prices and created a new demand for American goods abroad, resulting in a small export-led boom here. This is true as far as it goes; but a more realistically priced dollar was inevitable and should, in the long run, be welcomed. It is only unfortunate that this adjustment did not happen sooner, when a smaller dose of the medicine would have served the purpose.

This essay has blamed inflation primarily on increases in the money supply. Newspaper readers will logically ask, What about other factors in the headlines? Crop failures; Soviet wheat purchases; the anchovies that swam the wrong way; the shortages and the soaring price of grain, proteins, and commodities? What about the Arab oil-company cartel that—using the Israeli war as an excuse—quadrupled oil prices in October 1973?

These elements are important but have been, at most, marginal contributors or, in the case of oil, very late comers. Had there been no endemic inflation, the shortages might have raised prices as a whole 1 or 2 percent, although more than that for specific goods (wheat, beef, gasoline, and so forth). Putting it differently, they converted a 10 percent inflation into perhaps a 12 percent inflation. Most of these shortages would have been much less important if the rapid increase in money supply all over the world had not resulted in simultaneous booms in all industrial countries so that there was unprecedented demand pressure on supplies of almost all raw materials. Under these conditions the world was especially sensitive to any chance shortages or to cartel actions, as in the case of the oil producers.

When the agricultural shortages hit, their impact was sharp. A recent analysis² attributes 64 percent of the additional inflation, the increase in wholesale prices from late 1972 to mid-1973, to agricultural goods. If this is so, it may well qualify as the straw that broke the camel's already overloaded back. The question is not, Which straw? but, Why so much load? Now, futures prices indicate these agricultural goods will recede with this year's crop, further evidence that the worst of inflation has passed.

More sophisticated readers will recognize the money-supply thesis as what is commonly called "demand-pull" inflation. What about "cost-push"—wage-increase—inflation and others? Wage increases are usually attempts to catch up with living costs raised by monetary inflation. In the absence of monetary inflation, a cost push in one sector may score off other workers or consumers but will not of itself be inflationary overall unless the monetary authorities increase the money supply to "accommodate" the cost push. The key is still the money supply.

To be sure, other factors helped inflation. Price controls—the ill-fated phases I, II, III, and IV—certainly helped, although they were intended to do the opposite. While in force, they suppressed inflation, making it visibly worse when removed; helped reduce needed supplies of goods by making price and profit exceptions uncertain; and did nothing to cure the excess money supply. Indeed, by drawing attention from it, and by purporting to be helpful when in fact they were harmful, price controls were on the whole counter-productive.

A final factor that will only be briefly mentioned is the Eurodollar market, because

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

it is far too complex for a short article. Suffice it to say that this unregulated international banking system, which operates without reserve requirements, expanded the dollar-outflow from the United States into the formidable total estimated at \$150 billion at the end of 1973 and increased the world's already swollen money supply. But it, too, is marginal to the extent that it reflects, and thrives on, the outflow of U.S. dollars and some well-meant but counter-productive U.S. government regulations over multi-national banking and business, mercifully ended in early 1974.

Where now? For the immediate future, the worst of the inflation seems to be over. Price increases will not continue as they have in the past, because the rate of increase in the money supply has slowed and governments seem, belatedly, to be sensitive to this factor. In the case of some commodities, prices have fallen from their peaks and will fall more as inventories are dishoarded. Agricultural goods should decline, too. But a general rollback of prices to some halcyon level will not happen. It has been the hypothesis throughout that inflation—that is, price increases—is required to equilibrate the available supplies of goods with the new, higher level of money supply. Much of that equilibrating is past. Recent high interest rates reflect the reduction of money-supply growth; and penalizing though they are for the housing industry and for those businesses that rely on cheap credit, it would seem better to bear them than to increase the money supply again with future inflationary consequences. Interest rates, too, appear to have passed their peak.

Some fear that inflation will end in a crashing depression and are accordingly preparing for the worst. This, too, seems unlikely, although liquidity squeezes and more bankruptcies than usual are likely.

The real question, however, is future policy with respect to inflation. It has now had sufficient impact on enough people so that the mass fear of a repetition is deep and genuine. Can this desire be translated into political will? Any political figure must be tempted by the next election, never far off. This is particularly true in a world beset by weak governments, where a 2 to 3 percent swing of the vote will unseat any incumbent government in the West. The short-run euphoria and the hurrahs that accompany a stimulating rise in the money supply are hard to resist.

The time would seem to be at hand, therefore, for some rules about the money supply to become standard fare in all political rhetoric and action, just as "full employment" has become. The main rule would be to contain the money supply within the bounds set by the growth of output, with a view to achieving something close to price stability. The rule implies much less leeway for the Federal Reserve Board and the monetary authorities to create additional money supplies through their own secret formulas. It also implies greater public awareness, hence pressure on Congress, to resist deficit spending unless this is clearly desired for economic stimulation.

It is also necessary to take a more sophisticated view of the unemployment statistics. The rush to inflate when the overall unemployment rate rises to 5 percent or so must stop. A distinction should be made between head-of-family unemployed and school drop-outs who can swell the total number but are not employable in any event and who would be better assisted by job training or direct employment on project work than by a rush to general inflation.

Similarly, the time is at hand for international financial cooperation to coordinate movements of the money supply among the major nations, again with a view to their orderly and rational growth within the bounds of new production. Flexible exchange

rates should be re-affirmed as a means of preventing the international transmission of inflation.

Surely, all of this has been advocated before, and cynics may well wonder, Why again? The difference this time is that masses of people in every nation have been stung by inflation, as they were by unemployment during the Great Depression. And there is evidence—*vide* the slowdown in monetary growth—that politicians have been getting the message. The message needs to be sent more clearly, with more specific directions, and more forcibly. It could just work.

INFLATION AROUND THE WORLD (By Colin Chapman)

History tells us that no democracy has ever survived for long an inflation rate of more than 20 percent. Yet some of the world's great industrial nations have already passed the 20 percent mark—Japan being one notable example. Countries with 16 percent, like Britain and Denmark, are approaching the danger zone, while West Germany and the Netherlands may escape with less than 10 percent.

The fourfold rise in oil prices is the largest single cause of inflation, some countries being more seriously affected than others. Japan, which is over 70 percent dependent on imported oil, has fared particularly badly. Inflation is going to get much worse in every oil-importing country, and more governments will be facing difficult decisions. Here is what is happening in some major non-Communist nations:

AUSTRALIA

The inflation rate was 13 percent last year and is now rising to 16 percent. The country is 75 percent self-sufficient in crude oil from the Bass Strait area, and in the type of oil refined for gasoline it is totally self-sufficient. There has been considerable wage-push and demand-pull inflation. An example of the latter has been a long wait for new cars and, despite tariff cuts, an insufficient supply of imports. Referenda that would give the federal government, rather than the states, power to control wages and prices were defeated. If there had not been two upward revaluations of the Australian dollar, the position would be worse. Inflation was the issue at the May general election, but the government has produced no cure.

BRAZIL

The inflation rate is officially 14.3 percent, but bankers and economists say that 24 percent would be more accurate. However, this is a major improvement from the Sixties, when 100 percent a year was the norm. The Brazilians have a system of "monetary correction" to compensate for the falling value of money. Wages are adjusted upward to compensate for inflation, and so are interest rates. Government bonds are issued with a fixed interest rate plus monetary correction. Thus if the interest rate is 10 percent while the cost-of-living index rises 25 percent, the total interest received would be revised upward to reflect the 25 percent depreciation in currency. There is also a tax deduction for working capital affected by inflation. The system has brought great benefits to Brazil, but, of course, many personal liberties have been suppressed in the name of economic order.

BRITAIN

The rate of inflation was 13 percent last year but now is nearer to 16 percent. In February of this year Heath's Tory administration was defeated because of the unpopularity of its counter-inflationary measures. But these were mainly aimed at keeping wages down, while encouraging profligate spending because of an expanding money supply and easy credit. The Labor government has increased taxes and tightened credit, while wages rise because of new agree-

² Nordhaus and Shoven, "Inflation 1973," *Challenge*, May/June 1974.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ments tied to the cost of living. There's not much optimism in Britain these days, but the trade deficit is steadily improving, and most people cling to the hope that North Sea oil will eventually save the day.

CANADA

Inflation is threatening to accelerate from a rate of 7 percent last year to as much as 10 percent in 1974. The 1 percent jump in the consumer price index in February was the highest in 20 years. Government inability to deal with inflation explains why the Trudeau administration became the first in Canada's 107-year history to be brought down by a Parliamentary rejection of the budget; it is now in doubt whether Canada can deal with inflation any more effectively than the United States can.

FRANCE

The rate is about 16 percent. France has been Europe's success story, and there is no shortage of optimism-preaching pundits, including the American think-tank forecaster Herman Kahn. But the country depends to a great extent on imported oil and gas, and its coal resources are limited. As finance minister from 1969 onward, President Giscard d'Estaing was always ready to accept a certain degree of internal inflation as the price to be paid for uninterrupted economic growth. The French started off this year with a wild spending spree, but now money is short because of a tight credit squeeze. Efforts to hold back wage increases show few signs of succeeding; it is hard to persuade workers to accept sacrifices while wealth is unevenly distributed. Price controls have been intensified.

GREECE

The inflation rate of 33.4 percent is the highest in Europe, and it is getting worse. The colonels are trying to keep prices down by offering a number of tax incentives to encourage industrial and agricultural production. At the same time they are restricting consumer demand and liquidity by tight credit.

INDIA

The inflation rate is now 15 percent for the second year running. Hardest hit is the middle class, whose savings and hopes have been washed away. Inflation has made nonsense of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's last-election promise to abolish poverty. Food shortages and high prices pushed her into a major concession to populism—and she nationalized the wholesale wheat trade. But this action caused even more food bottlenecks, and prices soared again. So she denationalized the wheat trade and improved competition by liberalizing licenses for American and other multi-national corporations. To keep wages pegged, she broke an airline strike by locking out the strikers and ordered ruthless industrial repression to starve out railwaymen on strike. Government anti-inflationary measures include steps to check bank credit and a tightening of the money supply. There have been major cutbacks in public spending: administration and development programs are being chopped by 4 billion rupees (\$613 million). Price controls have been applied on essential commodities.

JAPAN

Inflation last year reached an unprecedented level of 24 percent in March, but it has been brought in check somewhat since then. Nevertheless, forecasts are grim. Here are three banks' predictions for the year ending March 1975: Daiwa Bank, wholesale 22.5 percent, consumer 19 percent; Mitsubishi, wholesale 21 percent, consumer 19; Fuji, wholesale 26 percent, consumer 19. Anti-inflation measures include a 9 percent discount rate and a control on the monthly volume of loans by individual banks. The government has also exercised direct proce-

dure of Japanese industry through what is known locally as "administrative guidance" in limiting price increases. Monthly wholesale prices have slowed from over 7 percent in December of last year to under 1 percent in March and April. But a faster rate is possible in late summer, owing to the inflationary effects of the recent 30 percent industrial wage increases.

SWEDEN

With inflation moderate at only 8 percent and growth predicted as high as 4.5 percent, the Swedish economy could achieve the best results in a decade. All this with no slums and no poverty. Furthermore, in an attempt to protect the small saver against inflation and to halt the decline in the savings banks' share of total savings, banks are planning to introduce index-linked deposit accounts later this year. These will give the investor not only normal interest on his money but also a further percentage to cope with inflation.

UNITED STATES

Inflation is running at 12 percent. Even so, many people are optimistic because a good harvest is expected, world commodity prices show signs of falling, and the trade unions look as if they will be moderate in wage demands. The Nixon administration hopes that by the end of 1974, prices will be rising by only 7 percent.

WEST GERMANY

In marked contrast to Weimar days, German inflation, at 7 percent, is the lowest in the industrialized world. Chancellor Helmut Schmidt is pursuing a policy of high interest rates and tight credit but will not allow wage or price controls. German institutions are also forced to deposit with the Bundesbank—at a nil rate of interest—one-fifth of whatever money they have borrowed overseas. The stability of Germany is partly due to the 20 percent appreciation of the deutsche mark since December 1971, accompanied by no loss of German exports. West Germany is one of the few oil-importing countries running trade surpluses this year: critics believe this is the wrong way of curbing inflation. But it has worked. As Chancellor Schmidt said recently: "There is no other country that has performed as well as we have, either on the price front or on employment."

SUPREME COURT RETREAT FROM HISTORIC ROLE

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's reversal of a lower Federal court's ruling that would have required exchange of students between the schools of Detroit and the city's suburbs is a severe blow to the legitimate hopes of the minority groups of America for equal educational opportunity.

In its ruling, the Court did not address itself to the exclusionary zoning practices, inequality of educational spending, and all the other strategies which preserve suburbia for the rich and the powerful while leaving the decaying inner cities to racial minorities. The justices fail to inform the country as to who can be expected to provide a decent education and equal opportunity for the children of the ghetto if the suburbs and the State are not to be responsible for

August 1, 1974

school integration or equalization of educational expenditures.

Author William Serrin paints a bleak picture of the decline of the quality of life in Detroit in an article on the op-ed page of the August 1 New York Times, and I commend it to my colleagues for its suggestion of the hopelessness left in the wake of the retreat of the Federal Government from responsibility for equal rights and protection under law for all Americans, particularly the poor and the powerless for whom the need is paramount.

The article follows:

DETROIT, WHERE LIFE IS WORTH LIVING
(By William Serrin)

DETROIT.—For months busing consumed the Detroit area. How the hatred rose, a quilt that smothered the region!

Now the United States Supreme Court has ruled. There will be no metropolitan remedy. There will be no busing to the suburbs.

The suburbs are elated. Blacks won't be coming out. Happy, too, are the politicians—Senator Phillip A. Hart seems the one exception—who scuttled like mice to the anti-busing side, among them many Democrats of long-standing liberal reputation.

The decision seems a disaster for Detroit. The Court said that Detroit's schools, 70 per cent black, 30 per cent white, must be integrated. It is likely there will be busing, probably beginning in 1975. Busing probably will end up working reasonably well. Busing is working fine in Pontiac. It has for some time.

But busing will push thousands of whites from the city—those who can leave. There will be many homes for sale on the northeastern and northwestern sides.

Integration. Yes, the Detroit case was about that. But the case was about other things as well, money and wasted lives.

For years, when this was a prosperous city (there used to be a sign, made with flowers, on the City Hall lawn: Detroit, Where Life is Worth Living), Detroit subsidized much of the state, including the suburbs. Detroit taxes provided a large part of the state budget. They built northern roads and parks. They helped build the expressways. Detroit capital financed suburban home and commercial construction.

Now the money is in the suburbs. The new homes are there. The new shops. The new factories. Once Town & Country magazine published a portrait of three dozen "Detroit leaders." Every person—I recall a utility executive who posed in his tennis whites—lived in the suburbs except one, the Mayor of Detroit, required by law to live here.

In the majority opinion, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger said integration plans that linked two districts could be justified only if discrimination in one district produced discrimination in the other. Is not that the effect of what has occurred? Area mortgage practices discriminated against blacks in Detroit. Suburban zoning and home-buying practices kept blacks penned here. State officials allowed unequal education funding.

(Not all the suburbs are prosperous. Some resemble Detroit: the white working-class suburbs of Warren, Westland, Southgate. That is an irony. Schools there face the same money problems as Detroit. But as Detroit's money problems will go unaddressed, so will those communities' money problems. Many whites who flee Detroit will end there, and find that that is the case.)

Detroit is poor, the metropolitan area's barracks, the place where the poor, black and white, and a large number of workers live. Detroit's function is to keep them out of sight although it is ill-recompensed for this service. All the city's services suffer. Parks.

Libraries. Police. The arts. Sanitation. Street cleaning. But schools are particularly hard-pressed. They are old, understaffed, ill-maintained.

What does life in Detroit do to the children? Sometimes I watch them on their way to school. Beautiful, vibrant children. Some turn out to be wonderful people. Some go into factories, marry, raise families, settle in frame houses, and lead happy lives. Some come out of, say, Martin Luther King Jr. High School or Charles F. Kettering High School and go on to Harvard University or the University of Michigan.

But so many lives are wasted. Beautiful, vibrant children become, as young men and women, bitter, ill-equipped, often vicious. Without a future, without hope, Detroit has a stupendous crime problem. Is it any wonder? It is these young people who turn to crime and dope. And end up drinking on street corners or as overdose victims. As prostitutes. They kill and rob. They end up in Jackson Prison or the Detroit House of Correction. Or dead on a hot ghetto street on violent nights.

No one was happy with the idea of busing. It would have been accompanied by great trauma. But busing would have forced suburban communities to become interested in Detroit's schools. White wealth and power could not have ignored Detroit's schools without ignoring white suburban children. Money would have been forced into Detroit. Busing was no magic cure. But it was something.

And now? During the busing controversy politicians kept saying the issue was not busing but quality of education.

Will the leaders—liberals like Democratic Representatives James G. O'Hara and John D. Dingell, who jumped on the antibusing bandwagon; the members of the Legislature; the Governor; the corporate leaders—will these men fight for more money for Detroit? No.

Will school tax revenues be apportioned on the basis of need, so that Detroit and other poor children will get the money they deserve? No. Will Detroit's housing and unemployment problems be addressed? No. Will suburban housing segregation be combated, so blacks can move to suburbs? No. Will artificial boundaries be ended? No. Will wealth assume its responsibilities? No.

Nothing will happen. Integration is now a matter for Detroit only. Thus it will be of little concern to the people of wealth and power, who live elsewhere. Interestingly, some blacks are saying that if whites flee, so what. They—blacks—will run the city, the blacks say. Racism, you see, is a two-way street.

A final point: How much during this controversy did the Detroit area resemble the South when, a decade and more ago, the South faced integration. The problem was the same. The same epithets, the same code words were used. The same cowardice was demonstrated by normally responsible people. The matter was handled in the same way by the press, from the white view.

Everywhere we are the same.

TV AND IMPEACHMENT

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times writer R. W. Apple has an interesting article today concerning the televised impeachment deliberations of the House Judiciary Committee. I insert it for the interest of my colleagues:

CXX—1669—Part 20

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TV and IMPEACHMENT: HEARINGS FOUND TO GIVE HOUSE AN IMAGE OF AN INSTITUTION WORTHY OF RESPECT

(By R. W. Apple, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, July 31.—Some months ago, Thomas P. O'Neill, the genial Bostonian who serves as the Democratic leader in the House of Representatives, was reflecting on the way his elevation to the leadership had changed people's perceptions of him. "I used to be an Irish hack," he said. "Now I have become a statesman."

Something of the same thing has happened in the last week to the House Judiciary Committee as a result of its deliberations on the impeachment of President Nixon, and by extension to the House as a whole. Suddenly, the House is seen and sees itself as an institution worthy of respect. For the moment, at least there would seem to be few takers for the derisive judgment of Representative Big Tim Sullivan of New York, who said upon his retirement in 1966. "Congressmen? In Washington they hitch horses to them."

The consensus in Washington is that the committee's six days of nationally televised meetings were marked by a dignity commensurate with the occasion. To be sure, there were some pomposity and some posturing and some pettiness (members on both sides were irked by an attack on Albert E. Jenner Jr., the associate special counsel, for his views on prostitution).

COMPETENCE AND ELOQUENCE

But for all that, what struck most of those who watched the hearings close up, including reporters accustomed to dismissing the House as 435 orators in search of an idea, was the competence of lawyers like Wiggins of California and Jordan of Texas; the eloquence of Mann of South Carolina and Sandman of New Jersey; the evident emotion felt by Railback of Illinois and Waldie of California.

The onlookers were impressed as well with the patience and evenhandedness of the committee's chairman, Peter W. Rodino Jr., Democrat of New Jersey. He proved to the satisfaction of many that the Truman tradition was not dead in America, that a relatively obscure, somewhat scorned backbencher could rise to even the most intimidating occasion.

"They didn't look like renegades," said a man with close connections to the White House, "and we'd been led to believe that they would."

Nor did the committee give the impression of ritual partisanship. Only eight Democrats voted for all five proposed articles of impeachment; only 10 Republicans voted against all five. By far the largest group, 20 members—13 Democrats and 7 Republicans—voted for some and against some.

Representative William S. Cohen of Maine, a handsome 33-year-old Republican, was commenting at a break in one of the sessions last week. The impeachment deliberations, he said, were giving the country a chance to see what he had concluded shortly after arriving here—that the House was full of talent that got lost "because of the sheer numbers."

RELEVANCE AND DECORUM

Television clearly had much to do with the tone of the debate. There were complaints about the lights, and Hungate of Missouri finally took to wearing sunglasses. There were complaints last night from the Republicans that the Democrats had deliberately delayed discussion of the tax article so it would be seen during prime time.

But the presence of the cameras held the members to a reasonable standard of relevance and decorum and guaranteed that all would be in their seats. It also gave those who feared that they were voting against the grain of their constituents a better chance to explain themselves than a whole

year of speeches, newsletters and news conferences.

If television is permitted to cover future Congressional debates on momentous questions, it could work a profound change in Congressional politics—in some ways as profound as its impact on Presidential politics since 1960. In a manner the Founding Fathers never dreamed of, the Representative could truly become the Federal office-holder closest to the people.

With the assistance of television, the committee did much to ruin the climate for the kind of counterattacks on which the White House has relied almost since the advent of the Watergate scandals more than two years ago.

It becomes more difficult, for example to describe the case as the illegitimate product of the News Media when detailed accusations are issuing from the mouths of those who have studied the case for weeks.

COMPLIMENTS RECALLED

It becomes difficult to persuade the country that a committee looks like a kangaroo court when the most impassioned defenders of the President lard their speeches with compliments for the fairness of the chairman and the procedures that he devised.

And it becomes more difficult to picture the "prosecution" as a partisan lynch mob, out of touch with middle America, when, on the first two articles of impeachment there is a coalition of Republicans and Democrats of urban, suburban and rural antecedents; of ideologies rated from zero (Mann of South Carolina) to 100 (Drinan of Massachusetts) by Americans for Democratic Action; of legislators from Tuscaloosa and Bangor, Roanoke and Akron, Moline and Flatbush and Harlem.

It is for that reason, perhaps, that White House spokesmen have abandoned their caustic critiques and began speaking of the fairness with which they hope Congress will attend to its "Constitutional responsibilities."

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARSAW UPRISING

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 30th anniversary of one of the most courageous and unselfish acts of heroism and sacrifice ever recorded by a people yearning to be free. The acts of common people and citizens, both men and women, young and old, became the standard against which all future acts of peoples trying to be free will be measured. Thirty years ago today the people of Warsaw, Poland, armed with few and primitive weapons rose up en masse against their German tormentors and oppressors and lashed out at them with a fury and frustration built up over 5 years of occupation.

On August 1, 1944, the people of Warsaw and the surrounding area rose up as one against the hated Nazi hordes and triggered a 63-day battle that was to thrill the spirit of free men everywhere. All of us in the West were overjoyed to hear of this brilliant attempt to regain the national freedom and integrity of the Polish state.

As in most great dramas of history, the heroism of the brave is often counterpoint to the cold and calculating cyni-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cism and treachery of a third party. In August and September of 1944 this third party to treachery was the atheistic Communist red army of Russia, then entrenched in the eastern suburbs of Warsaw. The untrustworthiness of the Soviet Communists was complete when, after agreeing to aid the insurrection against the Germans, they not only refused to advance from their positions and attack the Nazi emplacements but they even refused to allow allied bombers to strike German targets in Warsaw and then land behind Soviet lines to refuel and to reload.

Mr. Speaker, the treachery and treason to the cause of freedom and principle that the godless red Communists perpetrated in 1944 stands as a clear warning sign to all those who think that any Communist word then or now can be depended upon.

Even in the face of this most barbarous treachery and behavior, the brave Poles at Warsaw fought on. For the 63 days some of the most bitter fighting of the war took place between the German Army and the Polish patriots.

In the end, Mr. Speaker, over 200,000 Polish victims of the battle lay beneath the rubble that had been Warsaw. The superior firepower and the training of battle-tested troops enabled the Germans to win a victory. But in the final analysis the real victory in man's timeless struggle against tyranny and aggression belonged to the brave people of Warsaw who so gallantly and freely gave their lives in the cause of freedom and dignity.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in saluting my many friends of Polish birth and descent and the many fine Polish-American organizations that represent them on this most moving of anniversaries.

FINAL RESULTS IN LAMAR BAKER'S 1974 OPINION POLL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THIRD DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, my staff, with the help of some dedicated volunteers, has now completed tabulating the returns in my 1974 Opinion Poll Questionnaire. Residents in the Third District have always responded well in these polls and this year was no exception. We were swamped with thousands of returns which is indicative of the interest in governmental affairs. The tabulation, therefore, has taken longer than usual.

With the completion of this task, I think it is important to advise my colleagues of the views expressed by constituents of the Third District of Tennessee on questions dealing with impeachment, energy, national health insurance, wage and price controls, campaign financing and financial disclosure, stripmining and food stamps for strikers.

These responses serve as a guide to me in my deliberation on these issues and I

feel that they will be of interest to other Members as well. In presenting the questions and the percentage breakdown of the replies, I want to point out that on the multiple choice questions the percentages exceed 100 percent because some respondents felt they should vote "yes" or "no" on more than one of the choices. In some instances, respondents would vote for all three of the choices.

The questions and final tallies in this year's questionnaire follow:

1974 OPINION POLL QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS
RECEIVED FEBRUARY-MAY 1974

1. Considering the President of the United States, do you favor

- a. Impeachment? 11 percent.
- b. Resignation? 11 percent.
- c. Filling out his term? 78 percent.

2. In making consumer decisions, do you rely mostly on

- a. Ralph Nader? 24 percent.
- b. Consumer Reports? 67 percent.
- c. Other? 86 percent.

3. To conserve energy, do you favor

- a. Year-round daylight savings time? 58 percent.
- b. Federal gas rationing? 18 percent.
- c. A 55 mph speed limit? 86 percent.

4. Do you favor the TVA arrangement with organized labor that Union members should receive preference over non-union members employment?

- Yes, 17 percent.
- No, 83 percent.

5. Whom do you consider responsible for the petroleum shortage

- a. Government? 75 percent.
- b. Major oil companies? 85 percent.
- c. Wasteful practices of society in general? 82 percent.

6. Do you favor a national health insurance program for everyone financed by tax revenues?

- Yes, 32 percent.
- No, 68 percent.

7. Do you favor the continuation of wage and price controls after the April 30 expiration of the present law?

- Yes, 35 percent.
- No, 65 percent.

8. Do you favor financing federal political campaigns out of tax revenue?

- Yes, 27 percent.
- No, 73 percent.

9. Do you think all candidates for public office should make full disclosure of their personal finances?

- Yes, 64 percent.
- No, 36 percent.

10. Would you favor the complete abolition of stripmining?

- Yes, 25 percent.
- No, 75 percent.

11. Should Congress reconsider and vote to ban foodstamps for strikers?

- Yes, 77 percent.
- No, 23 percent.

It is appropriate, I feel to emphasize some of the results of this opinion survey. My colleagues should note that 78 percent of those responding are in favor of President Nixon filling out his term while only 11 percent favor impeachment and another 11 percent favor resignation.

There is strong endorsement for retaining the 55 mile per hour speed limit as a means of conserving energy. On the matter of placing responsibility for the petroleum shortage, my poll shows the people feel that the Government, the major oil companies and the wasteful practices of society in general come in for a full share of the blame.

On other issues, my poll shows that there is not much support for a program of national health insurance to be financed out of tax revenues. They also voted against the continuation of wage

and price controls by 65 percent to 35 percent. Likewise, my constituents are overwhelmingly against financing Federal political campaigns out of tax revenue by 73 percent to 27 percent.

My constituents feel that all candidates for public office should make full disclosure of their personal finances. They are not in favor of the complete abolition of strip mining, but they do feel that Congress should reconsider its vote of last year and vote to ban food stamps for strikers.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the fine response I received to this year's questionnaire. I want to thank all of those who have participated to give me their views on these issues. I am pleased to share the opinions with my colleagues. I hope these views will be helpful to Members of this body as we give further deliberation to the issues in our legislative process.

YOUNG WEST VIRGINIA LEADER SPEARHEADS FIGHT TO SAVE NEW RIVER

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, in my effort to save the New River from destruction by a proposed power project that is dubious, at least, in any value, I have become acquainted with many outstanding people who are dedicated in their efforts to save one of the last free-flowing rivers in the United States. Mr. Jerry "Proc" Kirk, the president of the Three Rivers Chapter of the Izaak Walton League in Hinton, W. Va., is one such person.

This concerned young man has devoted much of his time in this effort. Proc has lived most of his life in the area of the New River, and from his comments to me, I know of his firsthand knowledge of what the destruction of the New River would mean.

No one can find a better example of a young person who cares and who is working within the system.

At this time I would like to submit to my colleagues the text of his remarks at the hearings which was held to provide that a section of the New River in Virginia and North Carolina be studied for possible inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems:

TESTIMONY OF JERRY P. KIRK

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Congressmen, I am Jerry P. Kirk, P.O. Box 901, Hinton, W. Va. I am proud to have this opportunity to appear before you.

For your reference, I should note here that my home town of Hinton is located on New River about 250 miles downstream from the headwaters in North Carolina and about 60 miles upstream from where New River empties into the Kanawha near Charleston, West Virginia.

I appear on behalf of and as president of the Three Rivers Chapter, Izaak Walton League of America, Hinton, W. Va., and on behalf of and as second vice president of the W. Va. State Division, Izaak Walton League of America. I wish to give you testimony as to the official posture of these

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

organizations in support of House bills 12836 and 11120. I also wish to express our opposition to the proposed Blue Ridge power project which is, of course, at issue here. To deny that Blue Ridge is the real "Bone of Contention" would be deceiving and untruthful.

I would also like to inject here that having spent my entire life up and down this river valley, I feel justified in suggesting that I represent the grass roots feelings and opinions of those who live by, work by, and play in New River.

To state our official position briefly and bluntly, we want New River left alone, just like it is now. We want no part of the Blue Ridge project of Appalachian Power Company. We feel the portions of New River designated in the legislation in question will meet the criteria set forth in the Wild and Scenic River System and we want it included within that system.

These are not bland or purely emotional positions precipitated by a "do-gooder" approach. Our position is based on education, having followed and studied the Blue Ridge controversy and in having an intimate familiarity with the river, its characteristics, and in having a firsthand knowledge of what it means economically, socially and culturally.

We know, from studying the testimony and evidence presented in the Blue Ridge, Federal Power Commission hearings, that the proposed modified Blue Ridge dams hold the potential for total destruction of the present natural characteristics of this most unique river which gives so abundantly of water oriented recreation.

We are acutely aware of the current E.P.A. ruling that storage of water for pollution dilution will not be permitted in this project, but we also know that this was an administrative decision which is subject to review and reversal after the big dams are built. When Appalachian made no move to revert to their originally planned project after the E.P.A. ruling, we mean to smell a rat. We know that the pollution abatement goals of the 1972 Water Pollution Control Act are far behind schedule. It is, therefore, definitely possible that after the big dams are built, E.P.A. might well be persuaded that low flow augmentation is, after all, needed to meet the water quality control needs along the heavily industrialized Kanawha river. We want no part of this and we stand firm on this proposition.

When we look at New River we feel a great sense of pride that in spite of all the pollution and degradation around us, it remains a high quality stream. It adds a quality to our lifestyle that cannot be replaced, substituted for or measured. New River is free, a gift of God, and it supports itself. It requires no stocking with the fish or the recreation it dishes out day after day, year after year.

It is well known to those of us familiar with New River, and it is also the consensus of knowledge within the W. Va. Department of Natural Resources that New River is by far the most valuable fishery in the State. Indeed, it has been expressed to me by high officials within the Department of Natural Resources that it may well be one of the best sport fishery rivers in the world. In 1969 a cooperative study between the Corps of Engineers at the Bluestone Dam at Hinton and the W. Va. Department of Natural Resources, on the half mile stretch of river immediately below Bluestone Dam, revealed that during a five month summer season 45,000 anglers used that portion of river. A creel census revealed that over 50% of the fish caught, by weight, were game fish and over 20% were smallmouth bass. To those familiar with fishery systems, these figures are outstanding and are representative of the entire river system. Keep in mind that the fishery of this river is wholly natural with no stocking

except for musky which was simply to introduce the species to the river.

A fantastic natural biological structure must be present in this river to support such thriving fish populations, and is testimony to the high quality of the stream. Indeed, any layman can wade out into this river, lift a rock or other sample of bottom material, hold it in his hands and watch it move alive with natural biota.

Because of the fishery and quality of this river it is without doubt the water oriented playground of the entire southwest coalfields of W. Va. It's all they've got. The other few rivers in that entire area have been ruined by industrialization, primarily strip and deep mining. This is another reason New River must be preserved.

We think it appropriate to add here that from the figure of 45,000 anglers using this half mile stretch of water it is easy to recognize what New River means economically to our area. It is undoubtedly the second leading industry in my home town of Hinton, ranking only behind the C&O Railway.

If the electricity to be generated from Blue Ridge were truly critically needed then perhaps we would need to take a closer look at our posture. What we see, however, is simply an efficiency operation for Appalachian Power Company, rather than a truly necessary commodity. On the evening of March 28, 1974, Mr. Donald C. Cook, chairman of the board of the American Electric Power Company, of which Appalachian is a subsidiary, appeared on a nationally televised NBC-TV energy crisis documentary.

He told the American public that there is no shortage of electricity within the American Electric Power Company system and none is expected in the foreseeable future. In fact, I believe he was interviewed because his system is the only major electricity supplier without a power crunch. As recent as May 8, 1974, at a Hinton, W. Va. Chamber of Commerce dinner meeting, Mr. Paul J. Johnson, superintendent of hydro-generation for Appalachian Power Company, in response to a question directed by me, stated, "We have never said we had to have the electricity from Blue Ridge to meet our customer needs".

Why then are they so persistent to build these giant dams? We have reason to believe it is because they may have other ulterior motives in store that haven't surfaced yet. For instance, we know that in Appalachian's original application to develop Blue Ridge they also asked for authority to develop the power potential of Bluestone Dam at my home town of Hinton, about 180 miles downstream from Blue Ridge. Facilities for six penstocks were designed into the Bluestone Dam structure when it was built in 1948. These penstocks have never been used because Bluestone is a flood control reservoir and cannot be used for power generation until the upper reaches of the river are brought under control for flood protection purposes.

That permit to develop power at Bluestone was then subsequently denied. But, if the modified Blue Ridge dams go in, then the upper portion of the river will be under control and Appalachian could again apply for a permit at Bluestone. Now, what would that mean? Quite simply it means that if power is to be generated at Bluestone, the releases of water during peaking periods would be in excess of 10,000 CF's which would annihilate any public use of the river and upset its ecological balance. Studies have proven that river flows in excess of 4,000 CF's below Bluestone are too much for public use. Now, in order for Bluestone to generate power efficiently, more water would be needed flowing into its reservoir than is now available during normal summer flows. In order to get this extra water it would have to be released from Blue Ridge where it would indeed be available. What we wind up with then is pollution dilution for the Kanawha

River through a back door approach. Appalachian could then say "We're not releasing water for pollution dilution, we're releasing it to operate Bluestone". They would then have their whole ball of wax, power in Blue Ridge, power in Bluestone, and pollution dilution for the industry in the Kanawha Valley. We would then have only what might be left over.

If all this sounds like we don't trust the power companies and the industrial complex in the Kanawha Valley, then, for the record, that's exactly what it means.

In closing let me say just one more thing.

The stretches of New River proposed for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic River System by Mr. HECHLER's bill are truly wild and scenic. No one familiar with that stretch of New River could deny that once they have been there to see it first hand. The river here, with the exception of one or two places, is inaccessible to the public except by float trips or back packing. The majesty of the whitewater and intermittent quiet pools at the bottom of that canyon is something to behold and experience. It is a pristine treasure only a fool could deny. It must be preserved.

As we see it, we have two choices. We can let it be exploited and ruined by the fickle hand of the innate greed of man or we can preserve and cherish it for ours and future generations. Whichever we choose will tell just what kind of a people and society we really are.

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this opportunity to advise my colleagues of the fact that at the appropriate time, I shall offer an amendment to H.R. 15264, the Export Administration Act Amendments of 1974, when it is considered next week.

The text of my amendment follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SARASIN to H.R. 15264.

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

Sec. (a) The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a continuous review of the effectiveness of procedures implemented by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the Export Administration Act of 1969. In carrying out such review the Comptroller General shall consider, among other relevant factors—

(1) current and projected domestic shortages of key commodities, export levels of these commodities, the impact on domestic prices and employment of such shortages and anticipated domestic and foreign demand for such commodities; and

(2) the need for additional export controls of commodities in short supply, the time and manner in which such controls should be implemented, and the recommended duration of any such controls.

(b)(1) The Comptroller General shall transmit to the Congress regular reports setting forth the results of the review required by subsection (a).

(2) In addition, the Comptroller General shall transmit without delay to the Congress a special report whenever he determines that there is a domestic shortage of any commodity which, together with exports of stability of that commodity and/or employment related to that commodity. Such

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

report shall contain the Comptroller General's estimate of the extent of the domestic shortage of that commodity, the current and projected export levels, and the projected domestic price and employment impact at projected export levels. The Comptroller General shall include such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as he deems appropriate.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, in carrying out such functions, the Comptroller General is authorized to request, and any department, agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government is directed to furnish, such information as is necessary to carry out the functions provided for under this section, including estimates of the quantity of any commodity necessary for (1) domestic consumption, (2) exports, and (3) reasonable carryover, including disaster relief assistance or other emergency situations.

OUR FOOTDRAGGING ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues, a fine editorial written in the Weston Town Crier, an outstanding newspaper, published in my congressional district.

This editorial calls for meaningful campaign reforms in the legislation which the House will be considering on the floor in the near future.

The title of the editorial is "Our Footdragging on Campaign Finance Reform." It is from the Weston Town Crier of July 11, 1974.

The editorial follows:

EDITORIAL

OUR FOOTDRAGGING ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

After 18 months of allowing corrective legislation to languish, the US House has at last come out with a bill to reform campaign finance—and it isn't nearly good enough. The House bill is so riddled with loopholes and questionable ideas as to make one wonder whether post-Watergate morals were just a dream.

As delineated by Common Cause, the new bill has at least seven major flaws. It would: put enforcement largely in the hands of Congressmen themselves; not provide for any public funding of congressional races (it would for presidential contests); write fresh loopholes into existing legislation; allow congressional election-law committees to veto rules and regulations proposed by election-law officials; have a Congressionally-controlled election board advise candidates on the legality of financing actions, thus relieving candidates of responsibility; allow candidates under investigation to keep the inquiry secret; still permit special interest groups to contribute up to \$10,000 to a congressional candidate's campaign.

The bill does have certain strengths, chiefly in limiting individual contributions, limiting cash contributions, and retaining public funding for presidential elections through the income tax writeoff.

The Senate has three times passed reform legislation but the House has continued to balk at meaningful changes. This bill, which has at last emerged from the House Administration Committee, gives only the illusion, not the substance, of reform.

When the bill comes up before the full House some Congressmen will introduce

amendments designed to make the bill more effective. We suggest you use whatever influence you have at your disposal from personal contact to a simple wire, to help get this law passed—in a good form. The alternative will be more Watergate-type scandals.

MR. COHEN REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE OF MAINE

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the day after his historic vote Saturday evening, July 27 in the House Judiciary Committee to recommend an article of impeachment to the House of Representatives, our colleague WILLIAM S. COHEN, returned to his State of Maine to report to his constituents in a televised broadcast.

I am placing this address in the RECORD because simply and clearly the gentleman from Maine has stated the law, the evidence and the standard of proof upon which his decision was reached.

Mr. Speaker, I think that all who read my colleague's statement, whatever their disposition toward the question of impeachment, will acknowledge that the decision of the gentleman from Maine was arrived at with a deep understanding of his constitutional responsibility, our political process and from a sincere conviction that the evidence was clear and convincing.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM S. COHEN

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

During the past six months I have been engaged in a process of great contemporary and historical importance. In my very first term in Congress I have been thrown into one of the most critical situations of this century. When you elected me to serve as your representative two years ago, I had no idea that I would be called upon to pass judgment upon the President of the United States. It is an assignment that I did not anticipate or request. But it is a responsibility from which I cannot retreat, whatever the ultimate impact will be upon my own life.

The question I have been compelled to decide is whether President Nixon has engaged in conduct that would warrant his removal from office upon a conviction by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate.

After having wrestled with this question for six months, after having spent hundreds of hours reviewing evidence in the House Judiciary Committee and after having studied thousands of pages of material—I have concluded that the answer must be "yes": the President must stand trial in the Senate.

Because I am speaking as your Representative and because I am accountable to you for my actions and decisions, I want to take this opportunity to explain to you fully the decisions I have made and the reasons why I have made them.

The selection of a President occupies a unique position within our political system. It is the one act in which the entire country participates, and its result is binding upon the 50 States for at least four years. The outcome is accepted and the occupant of that office stands as the symbol of our national unity and commitment. If

August 1, 1974

the judgment of the people is to be reversed, if the majority will is to be undone, if that symbol is to be replaced through the action of the elected representatives of the people, it must be for substantial and not trivial offenses, supported by facts and not surmise.

A great deal of debate has been devoted to the meaning of the constitutional phrase "high crimes and misdemeanors." Some have suggested that phrase must be restricted to ordinary statutory crimes. I do not accept that narrow interpretation. The purpose of that constitutional provision was to prevent the Chief Executive from engaging in the gross abuse of the tremendous powers vested in that office, to protect the people against the subversion of the rule of law, of their fundamental liberties—no matter how silent or subtle that subversion may be.

One constitutional scholar recently pointed out that if the President of the U.S. were to refuse to appoint members of the Catholic faith to any position within the Government, there would be no violation of our criminal laws, but there surely would be a violation of the Constitution, which provides that there shall be no religious test for office. While this is an exaggerated example, it makes clear that the impeachment process involves a determination as to whether acts that strike at the core of our constitutional system have been committed. It is within this framework that I have attempted to conduct a dispassionate, objective and non-partisan search for the truth.

There have been many people who have written to me calling for the immediate impeachment of the President in order to place him on trial in the Senate, based upon what they had read in the papers or watched on television. But, ladies and gentlemen, the American system of justice demands much more than that. And basic fairness to the President demands much more than that. The scrupulous search for the truth has been a long, painful process. But I have not been prepared to put the President or the country through the ordeal of a trial unless the allegations against him were supported to my satisfaction by clear and convincing evidence.

More than 50 allegations of wrongdoing have been leveled against the President. Upon investigation and examination, many of them were simply without factual support. Some were serious, such as the secret bombing of Cambodia, the impoundment of funds appropriated by Congress, and the expenditures of tax dollars for improvement of the President's residence in California. But in each of these areas, after giving full consideration to all of the factors involved, I concluded they would not support the President's removal from office.

The President's use of tax funds to improve his private residences, as well as some questionable deductions he took on his own tax returns, certainly can be construed as shabby and morally wrong. But, in my opinion, these actions are not sufficient grounds for me to vote for impeachment.

The bombing of Cambodia was carried out in violation of the law because it was secret and it was done without congressional consent. But the lives of our young men in southeast Asia were at stake at the time, and, moreover, Congress failed to take action and acquiesced in the decision even after it was disclosed. It would be an act of hypocrisy for Congress to condemn the President for an act which it had the ability to curtail once it was discovered.

Similarly, in the area of impoundments, I think the President abused the power of the executive to withhold the spending of funds. But Congress, because of its own excesses and its failure to create a meaningful system of controlling its spending policies, contributed to the problem. The recent action of the Congress in creating new legislative

machinery to deal with the budget is tacit acknowledgment of its own culpability—at least, in part—in this area.

There are, however, two major allegations which I cannot reconcile with the President's constitutional duties and which I cannot condone:

First, a failure to faithfully execute the laws of this country by engaging in a course of conduct that obstructed justice, and, second, the use and abuse of government agencies for political advantage and to harass and intimidate private citizens for expressing their political views and preferences.

The facts are clear and overwhelming:

That shortly after the break-in at the offices of the Democratic national committee, the President became aware that employees of the committee to re-elect the president, who were previously employed by the White House on other covert and illegal activities, were involved in the planning of that operation as well.

That he allowed his former Attorney General, John Mitchell, to make false and misleading statements to the public concerning those responsible for the break-in.

That he attempted to use the CIA to curb the FBI's investigation of the burglary on the false premise that CIA operations in Mexico might be disclosed and thereby jeopardized.

That his top advisors, H. R. Haldeman, John Ehrlichman, John Mitchell and John Dean were using campaign contributions to pay to those arrested, and in particular to procure the silence of Howard Hunt.

That the President became aware of these payments at least as early as March 21, 1973, and there is evidence that it may have been sooner.

That he approved or acquiesced in the payment of hush money to Howard Hunt for the purpose of purchasing enough time to develop a strategy to combat the investigations underway by the Senate and Justice Department.

That the President encouraged his subordinates to testify falsely before committees of Congress and the Grand Jury.

That he revealed information given him by Assistant Attorney General Henry Peterson for the purpose of helping Mr. Haldeman and Mr. Ehrlichman formulate a defense strategy.

That he has engaged in conduct designed to frustrate the Administration of Justice.

Equally clear and substantial is the evidence that Top White House aides began keeping a list of political enemies as early as 1971 for the purpose of using the Internal Revenue Service and other agencies to harass and intimidate them. The President not only was aware of these activities, but urged that they be implemented.

The American people are unquestionably the most generous in the world in sharing the fruits of their labor. We work hard, and we pay taxes, perhaps not always enthusiastically, but certainly with the hope and belief that our tax dollars will be used for legitimate purposes and programs. The most serious and dangerous threat to our very society and liberties occurs when those in positions of power undertake to turn neutral instruments of government into agents of vengeance and retribution against private citizens who engage in the exercise of their constitutionally protected freedoms. If we are to have confidence in the concept of even-handed treatment under the law, then we simply cannot condone such intolerable conduct.

As I attempted to reach my judgment on whether a vote to impeach the President was warranted on the basis of the evidence, a great many thoughts passed through my mind. What is at stake is the very soul of America. We are a people committed to liberty, to equality, to justice, to the sanctity of the right of privacy and to the dignity of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the individual. It is because of our commitment to these principles that the people of this country over the years have dropped their jobs and left their families to pick up arms to fight for the freedom of people in foreign lands. Americans were prepared to let their blood flow so that others would know the flow of freedom in their lands as well.

I think of all of our veterans, or their parents or widows or survivors, and I ask, as they must ask, is this what we fought for, were wounded for, died for—a country, a system of government which attempted to turn our agencies into instruments of abuse out of personal vindictiveness? Is this the product of liberty for which so many were willing to pay so high a price?

I have tried to put all of these events into the context of a political system that I know well, that of the state of Maine. I have asked myself some questions.

What if the governor of Maine ordered his aides to keep a list of those people who supported his opponent?

What if he tried to have the state treasurer's department conduct audits of those who voiced dissent?

What if he ordered the state police to investigate those who were critical of his policies or speeches?

What if he asked aides to lie before legislative committees and judicial bodies?

What if he approved of burglaries in order to smear and destroy a man's credibility?

What if he obtained information that was to be presented to a grand jury for the purpose of helping his advisors design a strategy for defense?

What would the people of Maine say?

You and I both know that the people of Maine would not stand for such a situation, for it is inconsistent with our principles and our constitutional system of government. As Edmund Burke observed, "Law and arbitrary power are in eternal enmity," and our allegiance must always be to the law.

This is not a happy occasion for me. Few, if any, of us are without failings and weaknesses, so that we are free to cast stones at others. Consequently, I pass no personal judgment upon the President. But even though we are not without blemishes in our character, that must not prevent us from meeting our responsibilities to pass judgment upon the conduct of our elected leaders.

I have been faced with the terrible responsibility of assessing the conduct of a President for whom I voted and believed to be the best person to lead this country, a President who has made significant and lasting contributions toward securing peace for our country and throughout the world—but, a President who, in the process, by act or acquiescence, has allowed the rule of law, the very cement of our civilization, to slip under the boots of arrogance, oppression and abuse.

It has been said in recent days that any Republican who votes for articles of impeachment is not a Republican. This suggests that any Democrat who does not vote for impeachment is not a Democrat. This is sheer nonsense. I am a Republican and proud of the traditions of my party. I know the Republican party does not stand for burglary or bugging, the buying of silence, or perjury or the obstruction of justice. The Republican party, just as the Democratic party, believes in the rule of law. No man can stand above it.

How many men have fallen victim to the false plea of loyalty to the President? Kleindienst, Kalmbach, Magruder, Chapin, Porter, Krogh, Ehrlichman, Colson—all indicted and adjudged guilty of crimes.

Ladies and gentlemen, our loyalty must be to the Constitution, not to the President. The future of America is not dependent upon the success or survival of Richard Nixon until January 20, 1977. If we believe that this President and the Office of the President are

one, then the President's failings become our undoing. No one man should be able to bind up our destiny, our perpetuation, our success, with the chains of his personal destiny.

It also has been said that even if Mr. Nixon has committed some of the offenses ascribed to him, every other President has engaged in some of the same conduct, at least to some degree. The answer is that democracy is a matter of degree, and that it can be eroded by degree. Its survival will be determined by the extent to which we will tolerate the silent and subtle subversions that absorb it slowly into the rule of a few, in the name of what they perceive to be right.

Our laws and our Constitution are—and must be—more than a pious wish, more than a sanctimonious recital of what we should prefer, but will not insist upon.

We who hold public office are more than simply craftsmen who hammer out legislation for the benefit of the people of this country. We are the keepers of the flame, the symbol of this Nation's ideals, and we do the greatest disservice when we allow that flame to be snuffed out. Justice Brandeis once said: "If the government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for the law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy."

It has been said that an impeachment proceeding would tear the country apart. But to say that it would tear the country apart to abide by the Constitution is a conclusion I cannot accept.

However distasteful our committee's responsibility may have been, however unpleasant our findings, whatever the short-term dislocations, I am absolutely convinced that our slow, steady, and fair pursuit of justice in this matter will be looked back upon as one of the finest hours in the history of America. We will have demonstrated that in our system of justice, no man, not even the President of the United States, the most powerful man in the world, is above the law.

What would tear the country apart would be to turn our backs on the unavoidable facts and to condone his conduct. That, in my opinion, would do more to start the unravelling of the fabric of this country and the Constitution than would a strong reaffirmation of that great document.

I am confident of the ability of this republic to withstand the outcome of the impeachment debate that will follow on the House floor, as well as a possible subsequent trial in the Senate. We have withstood equally serious crises in the past, and emerged from them stronger and more confident of our own destiny.

Ladies and gentlemen, some of you will undoubtedly disagree with my decision. I want you to know that it has come from sincere conviction. It is a decision that I will be able to live with for the rest of my life, for it does not violate my conscience nor the sacred trust I hold as your Representative.

Thank you—and good night.

AN ESSAY ON GOVERNMENT

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker I include an essay prepared by Mr. Arthur Frankel, of Chesterton, Ind., in the RECORD at this point. During one of my recent trips back to Indiana, I spoke briefly with Mr. Frankel, and he mentioned an article he had written a number of years ago on "The First Duty of Govern-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

August 1, 1974

ment." He has since been kind enough to send me a copy of the article, which I would like to place in the RECORD at this time:

THE FIRST DUTY OF GOVERNMENT IS TO
MAINTAIN ITSELF
(By Arthur Frankel)

On reflection it should be immediately apparent that the first duty of government is to maintain itself. For unless it does that it cannot govern. And if it cannot govern it denies itself; it is not what it appears to be and it fails. Countless examples from history demonstrate the truth of that simple fundamental principle: the first duty of government is to maintain itself.

In the United States that principle is bottomed upon a fundamental inherent in our government "of the people, by the people and for the people". So the United States must exist only in accordance with both of these principles simultaneously and at all times. And must so conduct itself.

This being not only true, but acceptable can be violated only at peril. For if one government does not do so, it will be replaced by another. This fact of history cannot be ignored. Such brought the United States into being: first the Revolutionary War, the Articles of the Confederation, then the Constitution.

As any government, the United States has had to apply that principle—the first duty of government is to maintain itself—determining on each occasion the elements, weighing them, evaluating them and then coming to a conclusion, in both its internal and external affairs without exception. Certainly its foreign affairs have had to be determined in the light of that principle, for on what other basis can one explain the Monroe Doctrine, territorial waters, the Panama Canal, treaties, tariffs and all matters dealing with other nations?

The thoroughness of the application of that principle to each situation as it arose, to which subsequent events have furnished the answer, have shown how well that principle has been applied in each situation. A brief reference to American history will point out the correctness of that fundamental principle.

As to internal affairs—they divide into two kinds: first, the relationships of the government to the citizens and second, the relationships of the citizens to the government.

Here a balance must be struck in applying that principle—the first duty of government is to maintain itself—for the full rights, obligations and duties of each must be accorded to each, both government and citizenry, else there is potential and then actual trouble. For inherent in the misapplication of this fundamental criterion is revolution. Woe betide any government that unremittingly fails properly and promptly to apply the first duty of government.

Again the relationships of government to the citizens envisions the myriad of relationships that exist: individuals, groups, taxpayers, associations, unions, employed and unemployed, employers and employees, farmers and manufacturers, those on relief and so forth. Government has a particular relationship with each and all, besides which, frequently overlapping interests between them exist. For none exists independently of another, since all have much in common, besides being the people of the United States. To each and all must the government be fair, consistent with its first duty which is to maintain itself.

With regard to the relationship of the citizens to the government that principle still holds good, for the government can maintain itself only through the people; if they do not assist in maintaining it, then that government will cease to exist in its accepted form, for the people are the ultimate source from which our government derives. This

being so, all services, both civilian and military in all capacities, and all revenue come from the people, who by their attitude and acts maintain the United States and make it what it will be.

Today there is a tumult in the minds of many, as well as in the nation, as a consequence of different connotations of "law and order." Partisan views are taken regarding it and what it means. Yet none of the partisan viewpoints can take exception to that paramount principle: the first duty of government is to maintain itself. And if that principle be adhered to what becomes of "law and order"? Of a certainty it is subordinated to its proper place, and in a just perspective of the nation and the conducting of its internal affairs, having due regard to the interests, rights, duties and obligations of all citizens to one another and to their government, as well as its relationship to them.

Then assuredly the application of that principle, the first duty of government is to maintain itself, with due selection, evaluation and determination of the elements present in each situation is limitless and should be unvarying. Assiduously, carefully applied along with care and concern, it should yield the correct answer, without exception, to all questions or problems confronting the United States of America.

IN MEMORY OF RABBI NUSSBAUM

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I learned of the death of Rabbi Max Nussbaum. Rabbi Nussbaum, spiritual leader of Temple Israel in Hollywood, was not only a respected leader in the Jewish community but was recognized both nationally and internationally for his efforts to achieve better understanding among all people.

I was privileged to have known and worked with Rabbi Nussbaum for nearly 20 years. Those of us whose lives he touched have been enriched and this world is surely a better place because of his efforts.

I would like to include for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from the eulogy for Dr. Nussbaum delivered by Rabbi Edwin L. Herman; as well as an article which appeared in the B'nai B'rith Messenger.

ALL ZION MOURNS RABBI MAX NUSSBAUM: A STUNNED COMMUNITY PAYS TRIBUTE—WORLD LEADER PASSES AWAY AT AGE 66

Rabbi Max Nussbaum, world Jewish leader and spiritual leader of Temple Israel of Hollywood, was laid to rest in Hillsides Memorial Park this week after a stunned and saddened community said its "shalom" Sunday afternoon at the Synagogue. He was 66.

Mourners, filling the house of worship at 7300 Hollywood Blvd., to capacity, stretching to the uppermost reaches of the balcony, heard Rabbi Edwin L. Herman, Pacific Southwest Council director of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, eulogize his colleague. "We had come to depend on Max for so much," he said of the fallen past national president of the Zionist Organization of America.

MAX LASHED US WITH LOGIC, LIFTED SPIRITS

What a terrible loss Ruth and the children have suffered!

What a terrible loss our community has sustained!

What a terrible loss world Jewry must now measure!

Our beloved Max Nussbaum—so concerned in life, with his family, his community, his people—leaves us suddenly; bereft, heartsick, unfinished.

We had come to depend upon Max for so much. Wherever a Jew cried out in pain, Max was the first to offer healing—and gratefully we learned there his example whenever Israel—*God, how he loved Israel!*—was subjected to criticism or attack, it was Max's voice that provided our direction.

Whatever were the moments that we yielded to apathy or ground under the burden of responsibility for our fellow Jews, it was Max who lashed us with logic, renewed our vigor, pricked our conscience, lifted our sagging spirits.

Rabbi—Teacher—Max's congregation was Temple Israel of Hollywood and the world's Jewish community. He was at home in one as in the other. He was beloved in one as in the other. He will be missed in one as in the other.

Sterling orator, God gifted with an incisive and penetrating mind—devoted, devout Jew—Zionist extraordinaire—our beloved Max made his mark in this world—a modern Jewish hero—whom history will aggrandize—and whose memory we will treasure with love.

Yet, there was one role in life vouchsafed to Max more important than all others: Family Man... head of two households, the one which he shared with his darling Ruth, with his children Hannah, and Jerry, Ronnie and his precious grandchildren.

The other which Ruth and he together shared, their Temple family.

For those of us who were privileged to become part of Max's life, it was difficult to tell where one family began and the other ended. Max could love with passion, and he loved them both passionately... although I must admit, when he spoke privately of his Ruth and his children, a special glow seemed to illumine his face... surpassed only by a bursting radiance when he was with his grandchildren.

Max, who loved to laugh and who loved to tease, was rewarded by society with heaping honors... yet his greatest reward was the love that he shared with his family.

The temple family, this congregation, was as precious to him as life itself. He saw Temple Israel as an extension of his own life's purpose and goal—indeed, it is just that.

Max touched the lives of thousands upon thousands in his ministry of more than three decades at our congregation. He taught us that God lives, that the children of Israel live, that the State of Israel lives—that Judaism must be alive.

And he taught us more intimate things, too—that we must never lose our dignity nor sacrifice our integrity, that we are responsible for one another, that when we are called to serve, no matter how modest the honor or inconvenient the moment, we must answer "Yes." By precept and by example he taught us those things. And he helped us see his visions—and dream his dreams.

Would that I were a poet—that with perfect phrase and balanced line. I might aptly express what is my heart and yours this day. But I am not a poet.

I am—as each of us—a mourner, torn within by the profundity of my loss of a precious friend, a magnificent colleague, a dear and beautiful human being.

I feel—as each of us feels—that a star has fallen from God's glorious galaxy.

I hurt until I cry—and then I realize how doubly deep is this heat of pain that scorches these hours for Ruth and his children.

To them we extend our hand in comfort—our hearts in consolation.

Our tears join theirs in a flood of sorrow—what little strength we possess, we offer to them and we offer them our pledge that Max's

dreams and aspirations—his work yet unfinished—become our responsibility. His life had purpose and he gave it plan. We shall try very hard to fulfill it.

JEWRY MOURNS NUSSBAUM, STRICKEN ON SABBATH EVE

Despite Dr. Nussbaum's preeminence in the world and national scenes, the service at Temple Israel stressed his role as a family man and as a community man. It was truly Los Angeles Jewry's own farewell to the man who for 32 years had been inspiration and guide.

Rabbi Nussbaum had just returned from Europe and Israel, where he had taken part in highest level discussions that would affect the history of the Jewish people in the agonizing post Yom Kippur War period.

He had attended the deliberations of the Governing Council of the World Jewish Congress in Lausanne, Switzerland.

He had taken part in the debates at the Actions Committee of the World Zionist Organization and of the Assembly of the Jewish Agency, both in Jerusalem.

And before returning to Los Angeles, he addressed and played a key role in the 77th annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America in New York.

Many of his friends said that the seemingly tireless rabbi did look "strained" on his return from the four major assemblies.

He was due to report on the impact of the international meetings Friday evening. Shabbat Mattoth-Massi, from the pulpit of Temple Israel. His topic was to have been "Israel and the Jewish people—Dawn of a New Era." But Rabbi Nussbaum never appeared.

His congregants were told that he had been stricken and taken to the hospital.

Dr. Nussbaum had suffered a heart attack while at his Sabbath meal. His wife, Ruth, called the Los Angeles Fire Department emergency squad. They restored his pulse and his breathing.

At 4 a.m., however, the great Zionist leader passed away at the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center.

It was his second heart attack in two years. "What one learns from an experience like this," he told friends after his first seizure, "is how to pace one's self."

In the tradition of his people, Max Nussbaum was interred the day following his death, almost before a weekend community could grasp the full impact of what had happened.

Joining Rabbi Herman in the memorial services at the synagogue—services which drew a cross-section of admirers and co-workers from every segment of the Southland Jewish community—were Rabbi Benjamin Leinow of Temple Israel, Cantor emeritus Saul Silverman of Temple Israel, Cantor David Ben Veniste of Temple Israel, Rabbi Lewis J. Barth, dean of the California School of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, and Bruce Corwin, the temple's young president in whom the Rabbi took particular pride.

Corwin had become a Bar Mitzvah at Temple Israel and was blessed by Dr. Nussbaum. "How many Rabbis," he once asked, "are privileged to have such an experience?"

Pall bearers were George Hecker, Paul Sonderling, Ruben Marsh, Larry Leiman, Danny Marsh, Gary Marsh, Bernard Lepoff and Don Marx.

All the presidents of the temple were honorary pall bearers. They included Bruce C. Corwin, Samuel Bischoff, Irving Briskin, Steve Broidy, Irwin R. Buchalter, Herman Burke, Judge David Coleman, Sherrill C. Corwin, Harold L. Fleischer, Julius Fligelman, Joe Herman, Walter Maier, Charles J. Mund, Philip Wain, Jack Winer and Lister Ziffren.

Rabbis Herman, Barth and Leinow and Cantor Silverman officiated at interment rites at Hillside under the direction of Grozman Mortuary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Rabbi Nussbaum is survived by his wife, Ruth, a son Jeremy, a daughter, Hannah, the wife of Ronald Marsh; and three grandchildren.

GREAT LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH LABORATORY ESTABLISHED

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor to announce to constituents of the Second Congressional District that the Department of Commerce has formally established the Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory in Ann Arbor, Mich. This facility will be of tremendous benefit in studying the ecology and future of the Great Lakes. The projects range from basic research to such problem-oriented programs as improving navigation, preventing erosion or pollution, or predicting changes in lake water levels.

Changing water levels in Lake Erie have been a major concern to many lake shore residents who have been plagued by floods despite our efforts to provide a system of protective dikes. The NOAA scientists hope to improve prediction of changes in lake levels and river flows through studies of water levels and how water is added or subtracted by the network of rivers surrounding the lakes.

All of these efforts are described in considerable detail in an article in the July edition of NOAA which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

NOAA'S NEW LIMNO LINK

(By Louise A. Purrett)

This summer, NOAA puts all its Great Lakes researchers into one laboratory. Scientists from the Lake Survey Center in Detroit are joining researchers working on the International Field Year for the Great Lakes (IFYGL) in a new NOAA laboratory at Ann Arbor, Michigan. The Great Lakes laboratory, established April 28, is the newest partner in NOAA's Environmental Research Laboratories.

At the Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory, some 30 scientists will investigate the total lake ecology, from the sediments below the water to the air above. Dr. Eugene J. Aubert, IFYGL Project Office Director, heads the new laboratory.

IFYGL will be the main item on the GLERL agenda for the first few years, and, says Dr. Aubert, "will help tie the whole thing together." The project is an ambitious joint effort between the United States and Canada to collect, analyze, and manage massive amounts of data on one of the lakes the two nations share—Lake Ontario. NOAA is the lead United States agency for the project. Beginning in April 1972, some 600 United States and Canadian scientists and technicians spent a year collecting reams of data about Lake Ontario. But that was just the beginning of the six-phase project. The job of analyzing the data will occupy the scientists until 1977. In addition to the scientists from the IFYGL Project Office in Rockville, about a third of the scientists from the Lake Survey Center are engaged in IFYGL work. Dr. Aubert estimates that for the next couple of years, two-thirds to three-fourths of the GLERL efforts will be occupied with IFYGL.

In the longer view, NOAA has mapped out some of the projects and goals of the Great Lakes Lab. The research will have two emphases. Basic research will contribute to the background of general knowledge about the lakes. Other projects are problem-oriented, aimed at solving specific problems or meeting specific needs, such as improving navigation, preventing erosion or pollution or predicting changes in lake water levels.

One of the main goals of the lake lab will be a comprehensive model of lake circulation—how the water circulates in response to the natural forces upon it. Existing models are in early stages of development, dealing with the effects of surface wind stress and surface heat flux. The GLERL scientists are developing a hierarchy of models that includes every conceivable facet and factor, such as wind stress, differential heating and cooling, inflow of water from tributaries, seasons, and the shape of the lake.

Some of the Great Lakes harbors are plagued with unpredictable currents that call for tricky navigation. Toledo Harbor which has particularly troublesome currents in its entrance channel, is already under study. The researchers hope to produce a device that will show the direction and speed of these currents at any given time.

The group will also study the most familiar type of water motion—waves. Wave action may erode the shoreline in one place and build it up somewhere else. Data on waves can be used to predict wave-induced changes in the shoreline. Surface waves are a hazard to navigation—especially for recreational boating. Wave data must also be considered in designing ships and shoreline structures. Present wave theories are based largely on observations from the oceans, where waves may travel great distances without obstruction. The situation on the lakes is quite different: the total distance from end to end is much more limited and a variety of obstacles may impinge on a wave's path, all making wave predictions much more difficult. The researchers are developing models to predict wave conditions from the meteorological conditions and lake geometry.

The lakes are also subject to seiches—fluctuations in water level that result when water at one end of the lake rises as the other drops, like liquid sloshing back and forth in a bowl. Seiches may cause considerable flood damage to shoreline property. When more is known about water motion in the lakes, perhaps potentially destructive seiches could be better predicted.

Another major project will be to develop comprehensive models of lake ecology. These models would consider the dynamics of such components as phosphorus, phytoplankton, zooplankton, nitrogen, and oxygen, and describe the variations in time and space of physical, chemical, and biological properties—the primary colors in the lake ecology picture—and how these properties contrast and mingle. Information on the characteristics of the water, the nutrients, sediments, and life forms and how these all interact will be combined with data on lake diffusion to assess the natural processes and the effects of contaminants.

Lake levels may change drastically over short periods of time, rising or falling several feet in a few hours, due to wind setup. Long period lake level variations also occur over seasons and over periods of years. Studies of lake levels, lake hydrology and how water is added or subtracted by the network of rivers enmeshing the lakes will aid efforts at water quality control, power generation, flood control, navigation. The NOAA scientists hope ultimately to improve prediction of changes in lake levels and river flows. Winter ice impinges on navigation and shore facilities, and determines the length of the shipping season. With an eye to eventual improved prediction of ice conditions, GLERL scientists will look at

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

how ice forms, its thickness and extent, where it moves, and when it melts.

Complex interactions between lake, atmosphere and land produce a variety of phenomena—localized heavy snowfalls, seiches, dense fogs—all greatly affecting human activity. The GLERL scientists will attempt to develop improved techniques that the weather Service can use to forecast potential hazards.

The rapidly growing population surrounding the Great Lakes will need new sources of power. Power plants should be built at minimum environmental cost. NOAA scientists will develop tools to examine environmental effects associated with the entire problem of planning future power plants; selecting sites, cooling methods, and fuels.

In recent years, pollution of public beaches has been a serious problem. Many beaches are forced to close during the summer because high bacterial levels make the water unhealthy for swimmers. One GLERL project will develop environmental science tools to predict the extent and concentration of this pollution, trace it to its source and suggest ways to control the sources so beaches will suffer less.

Other studies will focus on lake climatology, the population dynamics of key organisms, and water quality in the various bays, rivers, and harbors.

To accomplish these goals, the scientists will work in lab and lake. The facilities at Ann Arbor include laboratories for water chemistry and sediment studies, an ice laboratory with a storage room kept at -30 degrees Celsius for close-up looks at ice, and a biology laboratory for analysis of samples collected in the field and for observing the effects of environmental changes on selected species. A lakeside facility will provide a starting point for field research. For research on the waters of the lakes, the limnologists will use NOAA's 65-foot research vessel, *Shenon*, operated by the National Ocean Survey's Lake Survey Center.

The laboratory site at Ann Arbor was selected for its central location and for its proximity to the University of Michigan, explains Dr. Aubert. The University of Michigan is a Sea Grant institution, with an ambitious program of lake research and marine applications. The NOAA lake researchers hope to work in conjunction with their colleagues at the university.

In the more distant future, the GLERL may become part of a NOAA Great Lakes Center, which would include regional offices of the National Ocean Survey, the National Weather Service, the Environmental Data Service, and other agencies—all with a Great Lakes focus.

More than 35 million people in the United States and Canada live within the field of influence of the Great Lakes. Major industrial centers line their shores. The lakes serve as playgrounds, water sources, coolant or motive force for power plants, and major routes for trade and transportation. But the many uses of the lakes are also creating some of their problems. If the lakes as to be both exploited and preserved, they must be skillfully managed, and the necessary skill can come only from a more complete understanding of the lakes. The NOAA Great Lakes scientists, from their new laboratory in Ann Arbor, hope to provide that knowledge.

THE TURKISH OPIUM POPPY BAN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues recent editorials broadcast by

New York City radio stations WCBS and WWRL which urge that Congress consider cutting off all aid to Turkey, until Turkey reinstates its ban prohibiting opium poppy cultivation.

In my home community in New York City, junkies line the streets, occupy abandoned buildings, lurk in doorways and literally hold the community in fear. Consequently I know first hand the destructive impact of heroin on a community, and the detrimental effects it has on the quality of life for our citizens. I have devoted a significant portion of my energies as a legislator toward the elimination of this cancerous sore from my community, as well as from the other infected communities throughout the country, urging the establishment and implementation of more effective law enforcement measures.

No law enforcement measure has proven as successful as the agreement reached between the U.S. and Turkish Governments to eradicate the source by placing a ban on the cultivation of the opium poppy in Turkey.

JUDICIAL SETBACK FOR MINORITY STOCKHOLDERS

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, a brief article, which appeared in Bank Stock Quarterly in May of 1974, raises interesting questions which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues regarding the rights of certain minority stockholders under the Bank Holding Company Act of 1970.

The article follows:

JUDICIAL SETBACK FOR MINORITY STOCKHOLDERS

Will the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System ask Congress for the authority to assure equal treatment for all shareholders?

When control of a bank or a bank holding company changes hands, should there be two prices for its stock—a big price for the big stockholder, and a little price for the little one? A premium for some, a discount for others?

Why these questions? Because the Federal Reserve's administrative policy of protecting minority stockholders against unequal treatment was struck down on June 21st of last year by the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, Denver. The three-judge panel ruled unanimously that Congress, in enacting the Federal Bank Holding Company Act Amendments on December 31, 1970, had not empowered the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System with authority to reject applications on the basis of unequal treatment of stockholders.

The case involved the application of Western Bancshares, Inc. in January 1971 to become a bank holding company following the acquisition by its organizers in late December 1970 of the Rooks County State Bank, Woodston, Kansas. On August 31, 1972, the Federal Reserve rejected the application and ordered divestiture of the acquired bank. The Board held that the substantial disparity in prices paid for the bank stock was not justified and that "the failure to make an equivalent offer to all shareholders of Bank is an adverse circumstance weighing against approval of the application." Shares of the

August 1, 1974

bank's minority stockholders were bought at a price approximately two-thirds less than was paid for the majority interest, without disclosure of the disparity.

Federal Reserve Board protection of minority stockholders has received a judicial setback. As reported in the December 1972 issue of Bank Stock Quarterly, the Board by letter of August 20, 1971 directed the twelve regional Federal Reserve Banks to "use their influence in exercising their authority to approve the formation of one-bank holding companies to assure that: (1) if any offer to acquire shares is extended to shareholders of the bank, the offer is extended to all shareholders of the same class on an equal basis."

This requirement went beyond any standard the courts had established. In a consistent line of cases, the courts had refused to forbid any disparity in the terms of sale of majority and minority stockholdings unless there was some other wrongdoing present. Mere unequal treatment of majority and minority stock interests has not been enough. The Board, however, went beyond court decisions. The Board even required that a fair and equivalent offer be made to all shareholders where an applicant successfully responds to a request for bids by the estate of a majority shareholder. *Connecticut Bancshares Corporation* (1972 Fed. Res. Bull. 66).

FED DEFENDS POLICY IN COURT

The Board had gone not only beyond court decisions, it had also exceeded its statutory authority under the Federal Bank Holding Company Act, as amended, in requiring that substantially equivalent offers be made to all shareholders. In *Western Bancshares, Inc. v. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System*, the Fed defended its policy before the Circuit Court as sound public policy on three grounds:

1. Inherent fairness justifies requiring that all stockholders be treated on an equivalent basis;

2. Capital financing of bank stock would be hindered to the extent minority stockholders are treated less equitably than majority holders; and

3. The minority interest in a bank would have a precarious existence if there were not an opportunity to sell out on a basis substantially equal to majority holders.

The court, however, found that: "the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System lacked statutory authority to deny the application of the petitioner [Western Bancshares] because substantially equivalent purchase price offers to all of the Rooks County State Bank stockholders had not been made."

PREMIUM FOR SOME, DISCOUNT FOR OTHERS

In *Western Bancshares*, the nominee for the bank holding company, Jack B. Berkley (then serving as President of Stockton National Bank located about nine miles from Woodston), purchased 383 1/2 shares or 76.7 per cent of the 500 outstanding shares of the Rooks County State Bank from the McCormick family for \$200,000.00, representing a price of \$521.51 per share. On the same day, December 23, 1970, Mr. Berkley purchased an additional 6 per cent of the stock from other officers of the Bank for \$400 per share. Again on the same day, the nominee offered to purchase each of the remaining shares at \$160 per share. In communicating his offer to purchase the remaining shares, the nominee told the shareholders he had already purchased 83 per cent of the shares although there was no disclosure that he had purchased one block at \$521.51 and another at \$400 per share. Subsequently the nominee purchased some of the remaining shares at \$160 each and some at \$164 each.

For their holdings the McCormicks realized a premium of 30.4 per cent over book value. Bank officials were paid the \$400 book value. The remaining stockholders were offered \$160 per share, or \$240 less than the equity, a discount of 60 per cent.

The Rooks County State Bank, founded in

1909, is the only bank in Woodston, Kansas, a town with a population of 332. State-chartered, FDIC-insured and a non-member of the Federal Reserve System, the Bank reported deposits of \$1,176,000, loans of \$45,000 and equity capital of \$200,000 as of December 31, 1970. There were 500 shares outstanding, with an indicated book value of \$400 per share.

With Chairman Arthur F. Burns absent and not voting, the Fed's Board of Governors voted four to two to require divestiture of the shares purchased for Western Bancshares. The Board concluded that "approval of the proposal would have no effect upon existing or potential competition." The sole factor leading to disapproval of the application was the Board's consideration of the "public interest" aspect of the disparity in the purchase prices for acquisition and the inequitable treatment accorded minority shareholders.

The Court of Appeals reviewed the legislative history relating to the Bank Holding Company Act Amendments of 1970 and found that it did not "disclose that Congress intended to regulate the price of acquisition stock by bank holding companies." The court thus found that "the Board's divestiture order is based entirely upon its administrative policy requiring equal treatment to shareholders in bank acquisitions." The court, however, could find neither legislative nor statutory authority for the Board's administrative policy.

Thus the court concluded "we have no argument with the Board's policy determination; however, neither the Board nor this court may usurp a function vested exclusively in the legislative branch. . . . Neither administrative agencies nor courts may legislate."

The *Western Bancshares* case was not appealed to the Supreme Court although it is understood that the Federal Reserve Board would have preferred Supreme Court review and that its request for review was denied by the then Solicitor General Robert H. Bork. The Board has therefore eliminated the requirement that the Reserve Banks consider whether an equal offer has been made to all shareholders in passing on bank holding company applications.

ASK CONGRESS FOR AUTHORITY, SAYS COURT

The court in *Western Bancshares* clearly held that only Congress had the power to grant the authority the Board had sought to exercise and that Congress had not done so. If Congress had wanted to empower the Board to regulate or "to order that equity be done if inequity were found to exist in stock acquisitions," Congress was fully capable of doing so.

Undoubtedly Congress was not aware of the need to protect the small stockholder when it enacted the Bank Holding Company Act Amendments of 1970. It is now clear that only Congress can assure that all shareholders receive equal treatment. The concern of the Federal Reserve Board for the small stockholder, while admirable, remains academic until it informs Congress of the abuses in acquisition offers now possible under the Act.

In its argument before the Court of Appeals, the Federal Reserve said that unequal treatment creates "a precarious existence" for minority stockholders, and that "capital financing of bank stock would be hindered" by such unfairness. The argument carries even greater weight today when the Fed is prodding banks and bank holding companies for additional capital.

Ours is a private capital banking system. Its more than 13,000 banks rest on \$53 billion of equity capital belonging to individual and fiduciary investors. Because bank credit is a national resource for the benefit of the whole country's economy, Congress and the bank regulatory agencies must encourage the continuing growth of bank capital.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SURVEY RESULTS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I received the results of a poll taken from a representative sample of the people of Nassau and Suffolk Counties. The survey was concerned with their feelings about the Judiciary Committee's behavior and the impeachment of the President. There are several statistics which are very significant. When asked the question, "Do you think the President should be impeached?" Fifty-four percent said yes and 37 percent said no. What is so significant is that 1 month before that the response had been 39 percent yes and 52 percent no. Another fact which is important is that 11 percent said that they had changed their minds as a consequence of watching the televised impeachment proceedings. I would like to include the entire survey result sheet in the RECORD because of its findings. I am sure that my colleagues will find the results interesting and noteworthy:

DON: Most significant basic information to emerge from latest Newsday Poll (July 30) of 390 Long Islanders generally representing the overall Nassau-Suffolk population:

1. Nixon is in very serious trouble. People not only think he should be impeached, they think he will be impeached and, what's more, that he will be found guilty by the Senate.

A. Do you think Nixon should resign? Yes 47%; No 46%; Don't know 7%; Refuse 1%.

Last month's responses to same question: Yes 40%; No 50%; Don't know 9%; Refuse 1%.

B. Do you think Nixon should be impeached? Yes 54%; No 37%; Don't know 8%; Refuse 1%.

Last month's responses to same question: Yes 39%; No 52%; Don't know, 8%; Refuse 1%.

C. Do you think House will vote to impeach? (asked after Judiciary Committee had passed 2 impeachment articles). Yes 69%; No 16%; Don't know 14%.

D. If the House votes to impeach, will the Senate find Nixon guilty and vote to remove him from office? Yes 42%; No 33%; Don't know 24%; Refuse 1%.

E. If your congressman or senators failed to support your position on impeachment, would you vote for them when they run for reelection? Yes 33%; No 43%; Don't know 24%; Refuse 1%.

Other findings:

About two-thirds of the respondents (65%) said they had watched the televised impeachment proceedings. 11% said that they had changed their minds as a consequence. (Won't know until tomorrow the makeup of the 11%).

75% agreed with a statement that Nixon took part in the coverup.

58% agreed with a statement that Nixon continually lied to the American people.

66% agreed with a statement that Nixon has abused the power of the presidency for personal and political gain.

43% agreed that "impeachment will do more harm than good even if the President is guilty" (46% disagreed).

Note: The sample of 390 was representative. 64% said they voted for Nixon in 1972 (compared with 66% who actually did), 41% are enrolled GOP, 30% Dems, 22% Independent.

THE FACTS ABOUT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal lately about persons withholding evidence on certain issues, but the recent prohibition of the presentation of evidence before the Senate Subcommittee on Health, as revealed by a letter in the June 26 issue of the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, is an example of the hypocrisy of some of the liberals. I include this letter in the RECORD at this point:

[From the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, June 26, 1974]

KENNEDY WITHHOLDS FACTS ON HEALTH

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

To the Editor:

On July 22, 1973, in an address to the American Pharmaceutical Association, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy derided not only the pharmaceutical industry but also the American physician in his role of using and prescribing drugs.

The speech was to serve as the program for the hearings on drugs and drug-prescribing before Sen. Kennedy's Subcommittee on Health between December, 1973, and June, 1974. The hearings were a stage play for the benefit of the press.

A cast of actors was carefully selected and anyone with conflicting testimony was carefully kept out.

Participants included William S. Apple PhD, a co-member with Kennedy on the Committee for National Health Insurance and executive director of the same American Pharmaceutical Association. Several witnesses appeared more than once.

Physicians who have spent a professional lifetime in government service or in administrative work told of their vicarious experience in the use and prescribing of drugs. Faulty data was presented, phony extrapolations of savings were announced and at least one lethal procedure was in a package that was advocated.

Excluded from the hearings were those of us who have spent a professional lifetime attending the sick and who, therefore, have the bulk of the experience in the use of drugs in humans.

For example, the American Council of Medical Staffs (ACMS), a national organization of 34,000 privately practicing physicians, asked to be heard last December and was assured by Mr. Kennedy in January that we would be heard.

Recently, Kennedy's staff notified ACMS that we would not be heard in this matter.

Others who are not members of the appointed chorus have been similarly excluded from the platform, e.g. the Congress of County Medical Societies. One non-collaborator was actually locked up to keep him from testifying in a related hearing.

This Goebbels-like manipulation of testimony is reminiscent of Sen. Kennedy's "roadshow on health" about two years ago, in which he similarly excluded all opposing opinion.

It takes Kennedy's full charisma to accuse President Nixon of withholding information in the Presidential tapes while he himself is withholding information on a subject far more important to the country, the nation's health.

The subject of the hearing on drugs and drug-prescribing bears directly upon us, the practicing physicians who prescribe drugs for the sick, and upon our patients, the American public.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Although Mr. Kennedy may disapprove of what we have to say, we should be afforded the right to say it. The American public will suffer the consequences of any legislation based on the faulty information of a stacked tribunal.

EDWARD S. HYMAN, M.D.,
Secretary, American Council of Medical Staffs.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY—
GOOD OR BAD

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the legislation creating the Consumer Protection Agency is the worst bill that the House has passed during the 93d Congress, but it is certainly a top contender for that honor. The CPA will have authority so broad that the EPA and OSHA will look mild by comparison. It will add a multimillion-dollar bureaucracy to duplicate the responsibilities of existing public and private institutions. I fervently hope that the Senate will take a good look at what is contained in this legislation and resoundingly defeat it.

Last evening an excellent article appeared in the Washington Star News by Mr. Smith Hempstone on the Consumer Protection Agency. I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and urge all my colleagues to give it their close attention.

WATCHING WATCHDOGS
(By Smith Hempstone)

The White House can hardly make a move these days without getting "impeachment politics" thrown at it. So it is not unusual that some backers of legislation to create a consumer protection agency would be running around town claiming that President Nixon's threat to veto this new superagency is impeachment politics—that he is bowing to conservatives who oppose the bill in order to win their support in his fight against impeachment.

But that is just a smokescreen to hide the real arguments against what could turn into a giant boondoggle in the name of consumerism.

Opponents of the bill are hard at work in the Senate trying to head off creation of CPA. They contend, and with considerable justification, that it would be just another expensive government agency, staffed by dozens or perhaps hundreds of high-paid lawyers and countless other researchers, typists and paper-shufflers, whose principal function would be to harass other government agencies and private businesses—all with dubious benefit to consumers.

It is a strange concept that holds that government agencies created to look after the public interest must in turn be watched over by still more government agencies. But that's the way it is in Washington: Bureaucracy feeds on bureaucracy; that's how the town got so full of overlapping operations. What the Congress ought to be doing is eliminating a few agencies instead of creating more.

CPA would be able to stick its finger into just about every other governmental operation around—any that "may substantially affect the interest of consumers." Since almost everything is related in some way to consumers, that is a pretty broad mandate.

There are a couple of interesting exceptions, however. One would prohibit CPA

from horning in on most labor negotiations; the other would prohibit it from interfering in broadcasting license applications before the Federal Communications Commission. A suspicious person might easily get the idea that backers of the legislation might have been playing a little politics of their own by writing in those exemptions—like cozying up to big labor and the media to get support for the bill.

The legislative director of the AFL-CIO, Andrew Biemiller, made it plain that his organization, which favors creation of the agency, would oppose it without exemptions for labor. "We don't regard labor relations as having a consumer interest. We don't want another government agency intervening in labor-management relations, sticking their nose in our affairs," he said. He's got to be joking. Since when have consumer interests been unaffected by wage negotiations?

With few exceptions, CPA would be able to swing high, wide and handsome. It would have the right to sit in on decision-making and then appeal agency decisions it didn't like to the courts. It would have authority to investigate consumer fraud and other conduct it felt detrimental to consumers. It could require private businesses to furnish information about their operations.

The way one supporter described its relationship with other agencies: "With an independent CPA looking over his shoulder, the product-safety agency won't be so quick to tell a manufacturer his lead-based Christmas tinsel won't be banned until after he has unloaded this year's supply on the market. The transportation-safety people will think twice before taking an auto maker's word that a defect in his vehicles isn't anything to be concerned with."

That sounds like putting the watchdog out to guard the watchdog. The product-safety and transportation-safety agencies presumably were established to look after consumer interests. Before long, no doubt, there would have to be a third watchdog to guard the second watchdog that is guarding the first watchdog.

The President is threatening to veto the legislation unless some changes are made to tie a few strings on the proposed agency. Rather than tinkering with it, Congress probably would be better off just to forget about it entirely.

What the consumers need more than anything are congressmen and administration officials who will do the job they're supposed to do, which is to watch after the public's (the consumers') interests. If congressmen aren't up to the job, maybe what the consumers ought to do is vote in some new watchdogs.

SALUTE TO JIM HARTZ

HON. JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, all Oklahomans share in the pride of Jim Hartz' selection as coanchorman of the National Broadcasting Co.'s "Today" show.

Jim Hartz was born and reared in Oklahoma where he grew into a competent, balanced, and fair broadcast journalist. It was no surprise to Oklahomans that the network recognized his talent and that he moved to New York.

Following the death of Frank McGee, another great Oklahoman who was co-host of the "Today" show, the search for a replacement quite naturally ended with Jim Hartz' selection.

August 1, 1974

This week, the Nation started sharing the warmth and candor of Jim Hartz in the new role shared with the talented Barbara Walters. It is a responsible position which all Oklahomans know that Jim Hartz will shoulder well because he was nurtured in the balanced atmosphere of a great State and with the love of a wonderful family.

With pride and gratitude, I salute Jim Hartz with best wishes for greater success.

THE FAILURE OF SOCIALIZED MEDICINE IN NEW ZEALAND

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when many in the Congress and elsewhere in the American society are urging a system of nationalized medicine for the United States it is important to review the experiences which other countries have had with socialized medical systems.

There has been much written about the experience of Great Britain and Sweden in this field. In England today, according to a Reuter's report by Peter Mosley which appeared in the Washington Post of July 6, 1974:

There are longer and longer waiting lists for scarce hospital beds and an alarming militancy by underpaid, overworked National Health Service staffs.

Mr. Mosley reports that—

The health service commissioner—"ombudsman" for the N.H.S.—reported recently that some people needing treatment at the ear, nose and throat department of one hospital were having to join a six-year waiting list.

Reports from Sweden tell a similar story. Most recently, the failure of the socialized medical system of New Zealand has been the subject of much discussion.

The breakdown of New Zealand's cradle-to-grave welfare system, declares the July 12, 1974, issue of *To The Point*:

Has been most obvious in the availability of hospital beds. More than 33,000 people are on public hospital waiting lists and some have been waiting for years. Persons wanting operations for tonsilitis and other relatively minor but annoying complaints must wait at least 2 years. Even delays of four and five years are not uncommon.

The result of the failure of the socialized medical system, *To The Point* reports, is that—

Private medical aid groups are growing at the rate of more than 1,200 new members every week. Two of the main groups have a total of 350,000 members between them out of New Zealand's population of 3,026,000. It has been claimed that 45 per cent of all surgery . . . is performed outside the state system of free medical facilities.

Before we enter into any system of nationalized medicine, it is essential that we understand the manner in which such systems have failed in other countries. Those who carefully review the experience of other countries must inevitably come to the conclusion that our private

medical care system—which has provided us with a surplus of hospital beds—is far superior to socialized systems with their endless waiting lines and lack of facilities.

I wish to share with my colleagues the report on the New Zealand socialized medical system which appeared in *To The Point* of July 12, 1974, and insert it into the RECORD at this time.

[From *To The Point*, July 12, 1974]

SHAKE-UP OVER NZ'S SICK

New Zealand's welfare state health services are to get their biggest shakeup since the system was created by the first Labour Government 40 years ago.

The nation, which pioneered the cradle-to-the-grave welfare system, has been growing restive as it seemed some sections of it were starting to break down. It has been most obvious in the availability of hospital beds. More than 33,000 people are on public hospital waiting lists and some have been waiting for years. Persons wanting operations for tonsilitis and other relatively minor but annoying complaints must wait at least two years. Even delays of four and five years are not uncommon.

As a result private medical aid groups are growing at the rate of more than 1,200 new members every week. Two of the main groups have a total of 350,000 members between them out of New Zealand's population of 3,026,000. It has been claimed that 45 per cent of all surgery in the Dominion is performed outside the state system of free medical facilities.

NEED FOR REFORMS

That so many are deserting the free system in favour of the private medical aids is part of the reason for the Government's decision on the need for major reforms in the medical field. A special White Paper on needed reforms is being prepared by the Department of Health.

It is accepted that more doctors and hospitals are urgently needed. Since 1960 the number of beds per 1,000 population dropped from 6.5 to 6.1. Soon a new clinical school which will turn out 250 doctors a year, will be established and facilities at the medical schools in Dunedin and Auckland will be expanded.

The Government has also announced plans to attract more doctors from overseas. In an effort to streamline the entire public hospital system the nation's 30 hospital boards will be replaced by 14 regional health authorities serving up to 400,000 people each. This will allow patients to be transferred to hospitals presently outside their residential areas, which have either small or no waiting lists.

As these developments take place the private hospital system is expected to suffer. From subsidies of nearly R1 million under the former National administration in 1970-71, the private institutions last year received only R378,000 under Labour. On present rates and on the top automatic salary scale, if a surgeon gave five-tenths of his time to a public hospital, he would be paid R7,764, according to one report. And if this represented only 20 per cent of his income then he would be earning about R38,800 gross annually. This has meant doctors are earning 80 per cent of their income from the private hospital sector—and the public health system has to try to compete. As a result there has been a gross shortage of doctors available for public hospital surgery. These are the sort of figures which have angered the Labour Government and induced it to resolve that the public health system should not be inferior to a private group.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO MR. ELMER HART

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to a man whose energy cannot be quelled by the advance of time. Elmer Hart of Hartford, Ill., has given freely of his time to his city and the other communities in the Alton-Wood River area.

As a former mayor of Hartford, Ill., Mr. Hart has been a guiding force in directing the growth of his city. Since his retirement, he has been a leader in the development of the Lewis and Clark Library district, the Lewis and Clark Park, and the historical societies of Madison County, Hartford, and Lewis and Clark. Truly this man is to be admired and congratulated for his fine record of service. I am proud to count Elmer Hart as a friend and constituent.

Perhaps the following article from the Alton Evening Telegraph best exemplifies Mr. Hart's contribution to his community.

The article follows:

FOR FORMER MAYOR RETIREMENT IS BUSY TIME

(By Dave Miles)

When most men retire, they pick up their fishing rod and sit on the bank of some lake waiting for the fish to bite, but not Elmer Hart, Hartford's senior statesman. Since his retirement he has had to all but give up fishing for lack of time to do it.

Hartford's one-time mayor for 14 years told the Telegraph he has been kept busy after his retirement continuing his service to the community and its people.

At 70, Hart finds few moments for himself or his family and he enjoys every minute he has just serving people. "I find retirement a real challenge. I've never had a dull moment since I retired.

"Of course, I take care of myself, get a good night's rest each night and I've found the days just fly by," the former mayor said.

Besides serving his community, Hart still does most of the work around his home, a converted business building since his retirement. He has even put a new roof on his home.

However, outside his family, his first love is his community and people. His civic responsibilities range from being president of the Hartford Library board, a member of the Illinois Public Library advisory board, a member of the Lewis and Clark Heritage Trail Foundation and on and on and on.

He came to Hartford in 1922 at the age of 18, after growing up in an area now known as Pere Marquette State Park. "I grew up in those hills up there and I bet I knew every one of them," Hart said.

He came to Hartford to take a job in the old International Shoe Factory in 1922, but said there is some speculation by his friends on just how he arrived.

"Most of my friends tell me I must have floated down the river on a log and landed in the horse weeds down here in Hartford," he said.

But however he arrived in Hartford, the community and people have prospered from his efforts.

His first service to Hartford came as a member of the Wood River Hartford Elementary Board of Education. He was elected to that board in 1928, at the age of 24.

The year before his election to the school board, he agreed to serve a long-term position as husband of his wife, Thelma, a native of Otterville. The couple had three children, but lost a son in 1949 in an auto accident.

However, his surviving son and daughter have made the Harts grandparents six times and great grandparents three times.

After a six year term on the school board, Hart decided to run for the board of trustees of the Village of Hartford. He was elected in 1934 and in 1935, he ran for his first term of mayor. However, when he ran in 1935, the office of mayor was being reorganized and it was for a two-year term only. In 1937, he ran for his first four-year term and was elected then and in the two succeeding elections for mayor.

He talked it over with his wife in 1949 and they agreed it was about time for him to get out of public office. He ended his years as mayor of Hartford in 1949.

However, that only brought about other positions offered by other groups. "I've never really actively campaigned for many of the positions I've had the privilege to serve in," he said.

He has served on the Lewis and Clark Library District and was chairman of the building committee when the district built its new headquarters in Edwardsville. He is currently leading the Hartford Library through a 1,200 foot expansion project.

Hart also serves on the Friends of Lovejoy Library at Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville.

Outside his library interests, he is a noted local historian and a big promoter of the Lewis and Clark Park near Hartford. Hart is a member of the Madison County, Hartford and Lewis and Clark historical societies.

Also, as a member of the Hartford Chamber of Commerce, he has been part of a campaign to get traffic signals installed at Rte. 111 and Rte. 11A (the extension of Hawthorne Street of Hartford).

But perhaps his greatest joy has come from working with young people. "Even though I'm 70-years-old, I find I can still relate with today's young people. Working with kids fascinates me, I've seldom found a young person I could not communicate with," he said.

Maybe he has no trouble communicating with young people because he himself is still a young man at heart. One of the few hobbies he still finds time for is bicycle riding—a common interest he has found to have with the young generation.

While the village of Hartford was christened two years before his arrival by log to it, it is little wonder that many people often think the name of Hartford was derived from the name of its most noted citizen, Elmer M. Hart.

REPEAL OF THE SPECIAL POWERS ACT IN NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, recently the Diplock Commission appointed by the British Government recommended that the oppressive Special Powers Act imposed by the British in Northern Ireland be repealed. Rather than adhering to these recommendations, the British Government has chosen instead to merely make new provisions for the continuation of the act, and their claim that it has been repealed becomes very suspect.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Since its inception several years ago, the Special Powers Act has served as a vehicle designed to give the British Government extraordinary powers over the basic human rights of the citizens of Northern Ireland. Stories about the brutal internment of innocent citizens shocked the collective conscience of the world community, and this was reflected in last year's Convention of Human Rights which condemned this practice.

I have long contended that the only true solution to the problems in Northern Ireland will come about with the total withdrawal of all British involvement in the internal affairs of Northern Ireland. In an effort to provide my colleagues with a clear perspective of the Special Powers repeal controversy, I wish to insert into the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Special Powers Act Repealed but Retained," as prepared by Mr. Fred Burns O'Brien, J.D., of the Irish National Caucus.

Mr. O'Brien's article follows:

SPECIAL POWERS ACT REPEALED BUT RETAINED
(By Fred Burns O'Brien)

A major area of contention for the Nationalists in Northern Ireland for the last four years is the ever present fact that men and women are continuously held in concentration camps without benefit of an impartial jury trial of their peers. Internment without trial has offended even the pacifist element of the Nationalist grouping and they persistently demand its curtailment. The Special Powers Act from which authority is derived for internment has been resoundingly condemned by worldwide humanitarian groups concerned with the plight of the Irish victims of this abusive British legislation. Britain has been summoned before the European Court to defend her derogation of human rights and the established Convention of Human Rights to which she is a signatory. With world opinion gathered against her, the British Government created the Diplock Commission to study the Act and make recommendations, which it has done including recommending repeal of the legislation.

THE REPEAL—A PAPER TRANSACTION ONLY

Britain is repealing the Special Powers Act, but has instituted new measures to deal with what she defines as terrorists as a result of recommendations of the Diplock Commission which determined the necessity of a change. The Emergency Provisions Bill that will replace the Special Powers Act appears to be quite vague in that it permits all criticized activity of the Special Powers Act to continue when it is deemed necessary. This is confusing and contradictory.

The British definition of terrorism is any violent action committed by a group connected with the Nationalist position in Northern Ireland. Although there are armed camps in the Six British Occupied Counties of Ireland, only Nationalist "terrorists" are sought out on a daily basis by the British Army and receive the full brunt of harassment. The British Army and Loyalist private armies are not held to the same degree of accountability as the Irish Republican Army. During the four year war in Ireland, Britain's only aim has been the military defeat of the IRA and she has left by the wayside justice in deference to her pride which is all consuming and the Irish people are punished in their own land. (Very recently with Loyalist armies getting totally out of hand, they are now being interned on a token basis for the appearance of impartiality.)

The repeal or the intention to repeal the effects of the Special Powers Act is commendable, but this action is qualified by the British to the extent of making its repeal mute

and ineffectual. The British maintain the necessity for extra judicial process and they cite that their potential witnesses are intimidated, so they in effect will intimidate citizens of Ireland in a vengeful tactic of extra-legal activity. What is not qualified is the British Army's employment of torture of uncharged internees which has been confirmed by concrete evidence. This abuse of humanity contravenes international law and subverts Britain's international stature.

EFFECTS OF REPEAL

The outcome of the removal of the Special Powers Act serves only to create a blank check on activities of the British Security Forces in the sphere of the rights of citizens. Any activity regarded as necessary in combating terrorism may be utilized leaving a broader discretion than that under the internment procedure. The Emergency Provisions Bill is instituted for one year renewal ad infinitum. Britain contends that the Bill should not remain in force unless there is "ample evidence" to combat terrorism. The words "ample evidence" leave a connotation of ambiguity and such a vagueness as to be completely undefined and subject to arbitrary application at the will of Government and Army.

SCHEDULED OFFENCES

Because of past vague practices, Britain has sought to define the offences whose commission would be pursued under the auspices of the new legislation. These offences to be defined can be categorized under the general heading of "terrorist offences", but this leaves a discriminatory practice of selective definition applicable at the time of the given incident in question. In conjunction with the scheduled offences, the administration of justice in Northern Ireland was altered to supplement the Bill in a general state of vagueness. Stringent limitations were placed upon the granting of bail for the scheduled offences which are defined as falling within a number of acts applicable to Northern Ireland. They are: The Malicious Damage Act, The Offences Against The Persons Act, The Explosive Substances Act, The Firearms Act (N.I.), The Theft Act (N.I.), and The Protection of the Person and Property Act (N.I.). These pieces of legislation remove Northern Ireland from the realm of British democracy and place it in a category of military dictatorship and it is not an equal part of the United Kingdom as British propaganda would have us believe.

The so-called trial commensurate to the provisions of the Bill would be restricted to a judge alone in a higher court without benefit of jury trial. Written statements signed by people in the presence of a constable, who cannot be in court, would be allowed into court as evidence as would any statement by the accused. In what appears to be an admission of past and present practices, the British Government states that statements "obtained by torture or by inhuman or degrading treatment" would be inadmissible. The fact of the utilization of torture by the Security Forces was verified by international investigative bodies and was alluded to in the Report of the Commission of Lord Compton. This admission sets the tone of the treatment of those detained under the Special Powers Act and gives rise to the question of future practices under a Bill which seems to allow a wider degree of the opportunity of these indiscretions. The opportunity of implementation of torture has in no way been eliminated. This activity can still be used to elicit information even though it might now be inadmissible before the court of the judge sitting alone as a complete court within himself.

In a reversal of past administrative practices the burden of proof is now completely on the defendant to prove that he or she had no knowledge of the presence of a firearm in a case where a weapon is found in a

vehicle or on the premises of the defendant. What this creates is a situation where the defendant might not be able to prove that there was no knowledge of the presence of the firearms because it was planted in all probability which has been proven factually in many past instances. Weapons can be conveniently placed in a vehicle or on the premises of any contrived defendant in order to have an excuse for incarceration of one held in suspicion. To avoid these possible inaccuracies, the burden of proof should be on the Government to prove defendant's knowledge of the presence of the firearm especially when Britain constantly reiterates a need for an improvement in the protection of individual human rights. This purported practice is a digression from the stated intent.

DETENTION OF TERRORISTS

For the most part detention means the detaining of alleged members of the IRA and other Nationalist groups in the North as previously stated. According to the Emergency Provisions Bill, an individual could be detained up to a year when the case would be reviewed and then again at six month intervals during the term of internment. This policy would secure the process of detaining people rather than allowing them the rights of a courtroom. For all the rhetoric, the results of the Special Powers Act are in effect whether it is called such or not. What is needed is legislation guaranteeing rights not a system that substitutes one repressive procedure for another. It just serves to perpetuate injustice disguised in a new form with the intent of harassment intact.

A STRONG U.S. ACTION RECOMMENDED INVOLVING TURKEY EXPORTS

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Wall Street Journal reports that, effective today, the European Common Market is drastically increasing its levies on turkey imports. This unjustified step can only create additional hardship for the turkey producers of our Nation at a time they are already being severely damaged by depressed domestic prices and sharply escalating costs.

The Minnesota commissioner of agriculture reported on June 21 that turkey producers in our State—the Nation's leading turkey grower—were losing up to \$2.60 per bird. He reported their situation as "desperate" because of the severe price slump and mounting costs.

Obviously, therefore, the nine-member European Economic Community's latest move to curtail U.S. turkey exports will be felt even more severely. Accordingly, I have today written to President Nixon urging that he move swiftly to initiate U.S. retaliation against the European Common Market to force its suspension of these newly imposed protectionist barriers. I insert the text of that letter at this point in my remarks:

AUGUST 1, 1974.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to urge that you move swiftly to initiate U.S. retaliation against the European Common Market

to force its suspension of newly imposed protectionist barriers against our turkey exports. We ought to withdraw recent U.S. concessions on brandy and strengthen our duties on wine, small trucks, starches and other items to which the Europeans may be sensitive. We must convince the Europeans that they cannot get away with their ever-increasing effort to squeeze the U.S. out of their market.

I would also like to suggest that you establish a special top-level government group to provide us with a definitive analysis of which trade interests would be hurt most, the U.S. or the Common Market, if retaliation should escalate. I often think that we are overly fearful of the impact that retaliation might have upon our own producers. It is my view that our trade partners need us more than we need them, and the development of supporting data could be a powerful force to persuade the Common Market to mend its ways before a full-scale trade war develops.

The fact is that the EEC action effective on August 1st, which raises levies by a reported 25 percent on whole turkeys and by 35 percent on drumsticks, will hurt U.S. turkey producers and hurt them badly. My own state of Minnesota is the nation's top turkey producing state, and last year raised 23 million turkeys with an estimated worth of \$187 million to farm producers. Minnesota is also a leading farm exporter of soybeans and other farm commodities being discriminated against by the EEC's protectionist trade policies.

To give you an understanding of the new EEC action's effect upon our producers, it should be noted that the U.S. has been selling around two-thirds of all its turkey exports in the Common Market.

Our turkey exports to the nine-member European community in calendar year 1973 totaled 32,779,000 pounds. During the first six months of this year, U.S. turkey exports to these countries totaled 13,178,000 pounds, an increase of about 10 percent over the first six months of last year.

With turkey prices in this country at the bottom of the cellar and producers suffering losses of up to \$2.60 per bird in my state, strong U.S. action is clearly warranted in this matter.

With warmest thanks for your consideration,

Sincerely yours,

ANCHER NELSEN,
Member of Congress.

I should add that officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, together with other Government officials, have already filed a protest over the new turkey levies with representatives of the EEC. They are to be commended for doing so. But unless our Government follows with additional measures to emphasize that we mean business, it is entirely possible that the EEC will not yield on this matter.

Because of this possibility, I am also submitting my recommendations to the Secretaries of Agriculture and State as well as to the President's Special Trade Representative.

Finally, I want to insert the Wall Street Journal article in the RECORD at this point for the information of my colleagues:

TURKEY WAR LOOMS AS COMMON MARKET LIFTS IMPORT FEES

Now that the chicken war is over, let's talk turkey.

The chicken war, you will recall, was an affair between the U.S. and the Common Market during the early 1960s, when the European Community raised its import levy on chickens and Washington retaliated by increasing its tariffs on French cognac, Volkswagen buses and Dutch starch.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Now, as scars from the battle heal, comes the turkey war. Effective today, the Common Market is raising an average 16% the base price on which it calculates its levies on imported turkeys. There are 39 different levies, covering everything from whole birds to drumsticks.

U.S. sources dispute the average figure and say whole-turkey prices will rise 25% and drumsticks 35%. They say possible negotiations on lowering those U.S. bus and starch tariffs might be scrapped. And they moan that a recent cut in the U.S. tariff on top-grade cognac doesn't seem to have made any impact on the men who set the Common Market's fowl-import rates.

There is a way out, peacemakers note. Another Common Market committee must consider an aspect of the turkey levies, and it could wipe out the effect of what the base price committee has done.

AN ANALYSIS OF GLASS CONTAINERS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the use of beverage bottles—both returnable and nonreturnable—has become an increasingly controversial subject. Legislation aimed at regulating these glass containers is being proposed at all levels of government.

Owens-Illinois, Inc., which does a substantial part of its business in beverage bottles, has prepared a position paper discussing the glass container issue in relation to various environmental and social considerations. The paper is a calm and thoughtful analysis of a complex subject. I believe it deserves the serious consideration of my colleagues.

Following is the text of the Owens-Illinois paper:

[From the Public Affairs/Environmental Affairs Departments, Owens-Illinois, Inc., Toledo, Ohio]

A STATEMENT ON GLASS CONTAINERS: THE ENVIRONMENT AND OTHER LIFE QUALITY CONSIDERATIONS—A POSITION PAPER, 1974

INTRODUCTION

Although Owens-Illinois has been dealing with the environmental impacts of its manufacturing plants and products for a long time, our corporate policy on pollution was first formally published in 1966. This policy gave pollution control the same importance in our business operations as manufacturing efficiencies, safety, materials and labor costs, and other factors affecting the profitable growth of our Company.

This policy, and past and present applications of it, has won for our Company a number of national awards—from both the private and public sectors.

Unfortunately, despite our sincere efforts to cope with our internal and external environmental problems, we have seen unique external considerations come to the forefront in recent years. Basically, these have been attempts to legislate bans, restrictive regulations, or other controls on the products which we manufacture—specifically in the packaging areas of our business.

As we have attempted to analyze and react to the external pressures impacting on our packaging business, we have concluded that they are not considerations that can be dealt with independently. Each has "quality of life" social and economic con-

siderations which represent highly complex, interrelated, often mutually exclusive, sets of objectives with constantly changing priorities. Conversely, we have discovered that no one packaging product seems to satisfy all "quality of life" criteria. One logical hypothesis is that legislation which effectively removes or otherwise regulates products in the marketplace in response to one objective (e.g. air pollution) may actually be a detriment to another "quality of life" concern (e.g. energy). Automotive emission controls and their penalizing effect on gasoline mileage would be but one example of this relationship.

In response to "quality of life" considerations, we will attempt, in this paper, to position one of our packaging products, the glass container for soft drinks and beer, in terms of the environmental or social concerns about—

- A. energy.
- B. resource conservation.
- C. solid waste.
- D. litter.
- E. product safety and health.
- F. air and water pollution.
- G. economics and labor.
- H. changing life styles.

Although not its primary purpose, this paper will also briefly treat the role of packaging in our society, only because the glass container is, and has been, a major factor in that industry for generations.

SPECIFICS Energy

Currently, high priority is being placed on energy considerations, and rightly so. However, the energy/packaging relationship is only one of thousands of counter-balances which must be addressed in the energy area. One current approach to the energy situation focuses on the product resulting from the manufacturing process. The question of proper energy management must be examined with extreme caution.

The end-product approach implies that energy should be withheld from certain producers or services because of the items being manufactured, or services being offered. This involves value judgments on the part of governmental agencies or groups, without evaluation of consumer preferences and other important considerations. An end-product energy concept would regiment our economy by logically and legally requiring governmental valuation of the energy requirements of the vast number of products and services produced by American industry. It is questionable that our country could endure this procedure, even if it were administratively possible. Who has the wisdom necessary to weigh the ultimate value to our society of the many goods and services demanded by the consuming public?

There is no question that our world has a finite supply of fossil fuels. Many studies have been performed to measure what share of this reservoir is being consumed by packaging. Although results of these studies vary, the general conclusion is that if a complete transition to a "returnable" packaging system for beer, soft drinks and milk were possible, and assuming extremely high return rates, the resulting savings in energy consumption have been estimated at less than 20/100 of one per cent. Later in this paper, we will deal with the negative impacts on the quality of life that would accompany such a change.

With these caveats in mind, how does the glass container compare to other packages on the consumption of BTU's? A well-known consulting firm, employed by Owens-Illinois, has conducted an exhaustive study which examined energy consumption beginning with the mining of raw materials and extending through the manufacturing, filling, distribution, consumption, and final disposal of the various beer and soft drink packaging

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

August 1, 1974

systems. As an example, the soft drink comparison in the study shows the following:

12-OUNCE CAPACITY SOFT DRINK SYSTEMS

One million gallons of beverages produced and consumed (including bodies, tops, and associated packaging)

System	Energy Use (MM BTU's)
Returnable glass (15 trips)	17,000
Steel—3-piece	45,100
Plasti-Shield	45,600
Plastic-coated glass	47,800
Steel—2-piece	49,700
All plastic	54,500
Nonreturnable glass	54,700
Aluminum	60,500

The preceding comparison shows how glass stacks up in a 12-ounce soft drink comparison. As larger bottles are used (16 oz., 32 oz., 48 oz. or 64 oz.), glass uses less energy per million gallons of soft drink. This results primarily from the reduced number of closures required and less glass weight per ounce of capacity for a given volume of beverage packed.

A similar comparison for 12 oz. beer containers indicates an even more favorable energy consumption profile for the various glass container systems due largely to lower glass weight.

Another currently popular approach in attempting to analyze the energy situation has been to make various comparisons of products and their energy impacts. Since most of these products serve different human needs, such comparisons are extremely misleading from the "quality of life" or life style viewpoint. For example, the average American family purchases about 3,000,000 BTU's in the form of glass bottles each year. At average current gas rates, the cost of this energy is \$3.10. This cost compares with other family expenditures for energy consuming items as follows:

Glass containers	\$3.10
Air conditioner (2,000 KWH/yr.)	47.20
Electric blanket (150 KWH/yr.)	3.54
Coffee maker (100 KWH/yr.)	2.36
Frying pan (240 KWH/yr.)	5.66
Hot plate (100 KWH/yr.)	2.36

Such comparisons as this serve very little purpose, since a full evaluation of a product's value must consider much more than energy alone.

Resource conservation

Our Nation is being plagued with shortages of critical materials. Fossil fuels and feed stocks, chemicals, ferrous and non-ferrous metals are currently in short supply. These shortages compound our Nation's balance of payments problems. They also put us, in some cases, at the mercy of foreign interests and power groups.

Currently, the glass industry is suffering from a temporary shortage of soda ash used in the glassmaking process. Most of this difficulty has been created by soda ash production problems, rather than capacity problems. This shortage situation will correct itself in the months to come.

Substantial soda ash expansions are being constructed, or have been announced for Wyoming and Searles Lake, California. It has been estimated that Trona ore deposits in the State of Wyoming alone are sufficient to meet the current level of total soda ash demands for approximately 3,000 years.

The dominant raw material for glass, however, is sand. Sand is one of the world's most abundant resources. The glassmaking process converts sand to glass. The simple grinding of waste glass converts it back to a sand-like resource and, in turn, to glass again. The glass does not deteriorate or degrade at all in the process. We will never have to fear that the raw materials for this industry will be controlled from a supply or price standpoint by some foreign-based pressure group.

Solid waste

As in the energy question, glass containers represent a small part of the solid waste problem. Treatment of municipal solid waste—garbage—is dwarfed by the much larger problem of mining and agricultural solid wastes.

Addressing the municipal solid waste problem alone, numerous studies indicate that all glass represents approximately 9 per cent of our garbage. About two-thirds, or 6 per cent, of this small percentage consists of glass containers, and only about 2 per cent of total municipal refuse consists of nonreturnable beer and soft drink bottles. In perspective then, legislation dealing with nonreturnable bottles addresses only a minute percentage of the municipal solid waste problem—which in itself is only a portion of the Nation's total solid waste considerations.

Owens-Illinois feels that the only logical solution to the total municipal solid waste problem is resource recovery. This should entail the recovery of energy from waste, as well as the recovery of ferrous and non-ferrous metals, paper fibers, and glass. In locations where present economics and market conditions favor sanitary landfills, glass presents no problems because it is inert, nonbiodegradable, compacts, and cannot create air or water pollution through decomposition and leaching.

The extensive voluntary recycling efforts of the glass industry, pioneered by O-I, have given us several positive environmental benefits. One very important aspect of recycling is its impact on the use of soda ash. In recent months, soda ash has been in short supply. By increasing the use of waste glass culled in the manufacturing process, glassmakers have reduced their need for soda ash, extending available supplies.

Voluntary recycling programs have also provided the opportunity to discover ways and means of using the larger quantities of waste glass from the myriad of municipal and regional resource recovery facilities which are coming on stream and will soon proliferate across our Nation.

The glass industry has been working in concert with private industries and local government on the development of municipal and regional resource recovery facilities in such locations as Franklin, Ohio; New Orleans; Westchester, New York; Lowell, Massachusetts; Detroit; Baltimore; San Diego; San Francisco; Toledo—and with the states of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Delaware, and New York.

Litter

The problem of litter is an inexcusable disgrace to our Nation's highways and public recreation areas—both urban and rural. Studies indicate that glass containers represent about 6 per cent of highway litter. Of the total, about one-half consists of glass nonreturnable beer and soft drink containers, or approximately 3 per cent.

The person who throws away a beer or soft drink container, in our opinion, does not make his decision based on whether or not that container carries a refund value. Rather, his choice is often based on the actions of other members of the group of people with whom he may be at the time. If their normal behavioral pattern includes the act of littering, he is apt to decide in favor of littering. This choice is made, rather than storing the empty package in his car, returning home with it, and then subsequently taking it to a retail outlet for redemption.

Studies have shown that market areas heavy in returnables are also similarly heavy in returnable package share of the highway litter count.

Much research has been done lately in regards to the sources of litter and the psychology of the litterer. Research shows that litter comes from seven sources, not just the

two—pedestrians and motorists—on which most litter-control programs have concentrated.

Surveys in 1971 and 1972 in 105 cities in 17 states comprising about half the Nation's population (including nine cities in New York State) showed that, combined, these five other sources account for a larger share of total litter than pedestrians and motorists. These five sources are:

1. *Improper refuse putouts at commercial establishments and institutions.* These conditions were prevalent at 35 per cent of the installations observed—creating litter that spread as far as six blocks from the points of origin.

2. *Improper household refuse putouts.* Found at 52 per cent of the locations surveyed and responsible for litter throughout entire neighborhoods.

3. *Lack of containment at loading and unloading platforms.* Half of these platforms at shopping centers, factories, warehouses and other locations had litter scattering and blowing onto adjacent properties and beyond.

4. *Uncovered trucks.* Dropoffs, spills and flyoffs from trucks were responsible for between 15 and 20 per cent of the litter observed along roads they normally travel.

5. *Lack of containment at construction projects.* This situation, creating litter in all directions from the sites, was found at as many as seven out of ten projects in some cities.

There are tested techniques that can be applied to stem the flow from the seven sources in communities. They include modern Sanitation Codes, use of technology that makes it easier for people to dispose of litter properly, new educational devices, and streamlined enforcement methods.

Product safety and health

Increased attention is being focused on consumer health and safety as a high priority life quality consideration. The attributes of glass make it extremely useful in dealing with these issues.

With respect to consumer health objectives, the glass container for centuries has been the perfect package. The purity and inertness of glass have long been recognized as superior packaging characteristics. These attributes insure that the packer can deliver his product to consumers without contamination, adulteration or losses in flavor or nutrition due to the package.

Once in the hands of the consumer, the glass package with its reliable closure systems and resealability features, serves as a convenient and safe long-term receptacle for the product until it is finally consumed.

The transparency and clarity of glass enables the consumer to visually inspect the product prior to selection at the point of sale and prior to its ultimate use of consumption.

From the safety viewpoint, the glass container, as well as many other consumer products, is being examined by the Federal Consumer Product Safety Commission. Although glass packaging has not been singled out by the Product Safety Commission for regulation, the fact remains that glass can break—a fact that has long been well understood by consumers. The injury rating of glass containers in the Product Safety Commission's surveillance system (NEISS) is relatively low and about equal to that of cans. Nevertheless, Owens-Illinois and the glass container industry have in the past devoted and are continuing to devote, significant effort and resources to determine ways to build glass containers with improved performance characteristics. These product safety improvements will continue to receive the highest priority attention.

Probably the greatest "plus" for glass containers in the areas of consumer health and safety rests with its longevity as a packaging medium.

Transmission, extraction, and migration problems are non-existent, and for all practical purposes glass is truly inert. Virtually all of the uncertainties and unknowns have been eliminated. Therefore, while additional improvements are being investigated in the area of glass performance, they are being developed under conditions of extensive experience rather than the uncharted, unpredictable environment of more exotic materials.

Air and water pollution

Owens-Illinois has cooperated with state and federal environmental protection agencies in helping these bodies establish realistic and meaningful goals for glass manufacturing operations, in order to achieve optimum air and water pollution abatement levels. Much has already been accomplished in the development and implementation of new technology to achieve these goals. A great deal of human effort, as well as capital and operating expenditures, has been spent toward these environmental objectives. Much remains to be done—in terms of technology, manpower, and capital—to meet agreed-upon goals and compliance programs. A healthy industry made these achievements possible. Needless to say, it will take a healthy industry to meet the challenges in the future.

Economics and labor

In recent years, the Nation has enjoyed a standard of living which by world standards constitutes affluence. Such has not always been the case. Per capita output in goods and services in 1900 was 25 per cent of what it is today; in 1929 it was only 50 per cent of today's per capita GNP. The concept of mandated source reduction—that is, artificial limiting of production and jobs by fiat rather than free market checks and balances—is not consistent with the free enterprise foundation on which our Nation was conceived and through which it has grown and prospered.

The Executive Council of the AFL-CIO has gone on record with a major policy statement condemning this type of source reduction as being diametrically opposed to interests of the labor movement. Source reduction would induce high unemployment and severe economic and human dislocation.

Labor cannot conceive of a legislative course of action that would trade off well-paying, highly-skilled jobs for menial non-union, minimum wage, litter pick-up jobs to accommodate well-meaning environmentalists with conflicting sets of priorities and objectives.

Changing life styles

Today, 45.8 per cent of American women are in the work force. Many of these working women fulfill the additional roles of wives, mothers, and homemakers. Convenience packaging has contributed in large measure to making freedom from household drudgery possible, and economically attainable. Packaging has increased the amount of discretionary leisure time available for recreational, social, cultural, educational and similar pursuits. The value of human labor and the need to continue to upgrade the quality of human labor are real social concerns which impact significantly on our national standard of living.

The best of all worlds, we believe, is the co-existence of returnable and nonreturnable packaging systems. Those persons who choose to return their containers will purchase returnables. Those who prefer not to return the containers will choose the nonreturnable package.

As a case in point, for years our Company had two large factories that manufactured principally glass returnable milk bottles. The glass milk bottle was an excellent package. It was designed to withstand the rigors of many trips to the consumer's doorstep. It was never littered and seldom found itself in the solid waste stream. The dairies and

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

glass plants provided a perfect closed-loop recycling system. Glass broken at the dairy was returned to the glass plant to be remelted and transformed into new milk bottles.

But, the returnable glass milk bottle did not survive in the marketplace, largely because it no longer fit the life style of the American consumer and the growth of the modern supermarket retail system. It disappeared from the marketplace in relatively few years and apparently has not been missed by the American consumer.

THE ROLE OF PACKAGING IN SOCIETY

In January of 1974, Arthur D. Little, Inc., published a comprehensive study entitled "Packaging in Perspective." This study was sponsored by an ad hoc committee of the packaging industry.

Glass containers are an integral part of this larger packaging/industrial complex.

The following excerpts from the Little report summarize the critical and highly complex functions performed by packaging in our society:

"But packaging is more than just the container. It is a system in which the product is the focal point. Packaging starts with the assembling of raw materials to manufacture a package and a product, and includes manufacture, packaging, unitization (the combining of a number of individual packages), distribution, breakup, and marketing. In this packaging chain, what influences one link can influence every other. And in this context, the total value of packaging when the costs of design, filling, plant operation, and other services are included, is estimated to be \$35-\$40 billion annually, or about 10 per cent of the value of all finished goods bought by the U.S. consumer each year.

"This dollar value, however, still does not reflect the entire economic value of packaging, for packaging is part of almost every element of U.S. industry today. Few products are distributed to the consumer without it. On a dollar basis, about 75 per cent of all finished goods purchased by the consumer is packaged. The package-making industry, with about one million workers, is considered the largest industrial employer in the United States and the third largest in sales value."

The packaging system today is inextricably interwoven in the matrix of our economy. It is present at all levels of operational activity—in industry, distribution, and the marketplace. Consumption of packaging correlates directly with a nation's standard of living, as measured by per capita income or the degree of industrialization. Packaging and mechanization have contributed to the phenomenal efficiency of agriculture in our country, where only 4.5 per cent of our population produces enough foods not only for our population of 220 million, but also for another 55 million to whom we export.

Every indication from the marketplace is that packaging will become more significant in the future. Packaging will change as new products develop to satisfy the demands of an ever-growing society. And in the future, products will change more rapidly. Packaging will be a critical factor in their marketing and distribution as attractive, functional, and convenient packages will be demanded.

Packaging will continue to have many roles and many functions. It will remain an essential system within the total system that brings more products to the American consumer at a cost he can afford. It will continue to be a complex, delicately balanced, self-correcting system that has operated and should operate on the basis of a free competitive market.

CONCLUSION

In the preceding discussion, we have briefly commented on the attributes of glass containers in respect to various environmental and social considerations. Because of its ex-

treme adaptability, glass as a packaging material is able to satisfy successfully these varying sets of "quality of life" objectives.

For generations, glass has successfully proven itself as a packaging medium. It is continually being improved to fulfill an even more demanding role in this regard.

In looking at the various "quality of life" considerations discussed in this paper, it would appear impossible to put together a set of legislative or regulatory controls to give proper balance to all of these important factors. The interrelationship of all of these factors in our economy is so complex and in such a constant state of change that attempts to control them artificially by regulation can only result in severe dislocation to the economy.

Our free enterprise economy, if allowed to function as designed, will make the proper adjustments to keep the system in balance. Attempting to control these diverse factors through edict, legislation, or executive fiat cannot help but further aggravate existing and potential imbalances, resulting in increasingly severe dislocations. It is impossible to conceive of creating a set of governmental controls that are capable of giving proper balance to all of the pertinent "quality of life" factors.

We have just witnessed the ineffectiveness of governmentally mandated controls during the two-year experience with wage and price controls. The complexity, interplay, and fluidity of the various "quality of life" considerations nullified any opportunity for the wage and price controls to succeed.

In fact, there is only one workable approach to these types of problems in our society—and that is to let our free economy, governed by the laws of supply and demand, determine the proper solutions. For example, in the area of energy, an increase in the price of fossil fuel will cause some energy-intensive products to cost the consumer more. He, in turn, casts his dollar votes between such trade-offs as convenience and cost. It is through this free market supply-and-demand mechanism that balances will be restored without the serious dislocations associated with artificially created, man-made controls.

In like manner, scarce materials will begin to demand higher prices as dictated by the laws of supply and demand. Once again, the consumer will be faced with a selection of products competing for his dollar. His free choice will then determine both the most satisfactory set of purchases for each individual citizen and the allocation of scarce resources among alternative applications—with the dollar acting as the "common denominator" arbiter of the allocation program.

This free market interplay will in the end yield a far better solution, without the trauma that has historically accompanied mandated answers. This should not be interpreted to mean that in a free economy we do not need government participation in these areas.

The proper role of government is to anticipate problems before they occur and adopt policies that promote orderly solutions; and in emergencies, take action to prevent irreparable damage and hardship to protect the public's general welfare. However, the orderly solution can best be effected through private initiative directed by the free play of market forces.

Well-intentioned, but simplistic and ill-defined, restrictive legislation aimed at the regulation of beverage containers, or packaging in general, would seriously endanger the health of the glass container industry. It would be impossible to confine the adverse effects on the industry solely in the beer and soft drink areas. The trauma that would accompany such legislation would also seriously hamper the industry's ability to furnish glass containers for such other critical end-uses, as medicines, foods and other consumer products.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Since packaging performs a necessary function in our society, another packaging material would quickly emerge to replace any lost glass-packaging application. This could result in an increased demand for other materials already in short supply, or result in the use of materials without the proven track record of glass from a health standpoint.

We feel the wise course of action is to promote a healthy glass container industry which can improve its products, both nonreturnable and returnable, which will continue to meet the changing needs of society—rather than replacing the glass package with an unknown and potentially far more risky substitute package. Such a substitution could represent a gamble that would be ill-advised for our Nation.

ONE PRACTICAL ANSWER TO THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, we are all increasingly aware of the ever-worsening global problems of food supply and rapid population growth. Despite efforts by governments and business communities to deal with these problems, man's ability to produce food is not keeping pace with his need. Escalating food prices and demand aggravate an already serious scarcity of protein-rich foods, particularly in countries where hunger and the diseases that thrive on undernourished bodies are prevalent. Unless there is a continued increase in world food production, there will be even more hunger and malnutrition and rising food prices.

Mr. Speaker, the need to find a solution to the world food crisis is pressing indeed. Surely, effective and realistic measures which would have a tangible impact on eradicating this critical manifestation of world poverty must be found. I am pleased to inform my colleagues that one distinguished citizen in the Fourth Congressional District in Wisconsin, which I represent, has developed a unique concept of preventing a further depletion of food reserves by the development of an inexpensive, versatile, and palatable nutritional food called CSM.

Mr. Charles Krause of the Krause Milling Co. in Milwaukee, developer of the cereal-based CSM, is optimistic about the ability of the world to grow cereal grains in quantities sufficient to feed the populations that are anticipated in the next 50 years. Although Mr. Krause claims that CSM is not a "magical" food, he has taken a creative approach to the food problem by providing a cheap, highly nutritional food that can taste good in all cuisines. His efforts should remind all of us that, acting together with purpose, confidence, and determination, we can effectively mitigate the world food problem and create more hope for mankind in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in order to share with my colleagues the unique idea of the Krause Milling Co. of Milwaukee, I am inserting into today's CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD an article by Fran Smith, printed in the summer 1974 issue of Creative Living, which tells of one practical solution to the world food crisis. I commend the article to my colleagues for their serious consideration:

THE GRAINING OF EVERYMAN'S PLATTER

(By Fran Smith)

There is much talk these days of crisis: the energy crisis, international political crisis, the credibility crisis. But one crisis is the root of all the others—the food crisis. Think about it. If you are hungry—and undoubtedly everybody reading this article has never known starvation—you are not concerned with the energy crisis or crises of confidence or political scandals. You have one concern—food.

If world food reserves become further depleted, as seventy-five million new mouths enter the population each year, and a seeming shifting trend in world climate continues to destroy crops in many areas, all the other crises will become inconsequential in a world gone mad for food. This grim forecast may or may not transpire. If it doesn't, Charles Krause will have had a hand in preventing it.

The problem at hand was to develop a "total nourishment" which was inexpensive, versatile in its use and palatable to the many food-taste habits of people the world over. It was a problem that could have continued to defy solution. But, Charles Krause, president of Krause Milling Company in Milwaukee, helped develop a proposed answer: CSM.

Sounding more like a fabric blend than a highly nutritional food, CSM is a mixture of three ingredients—sixty-four percent precooked cornmeal, twenty-four percent soy flour and five percent nonfat dried milk (with two percent minerals and vitamins, plus five percent soy oil added to increase fat content)—grown stateside, then shipped daily to over 120 impoverished countries throughout the world. Since its original introduction, instantized and sweetened variations of the basic product have been introduced, as well as a new corn-soy blend. The CSM concept has also been applied to wheat products, oat products, and, in fact, the idea of upgrading the nutritional content of many grains by combining various forms is becoming quite popular.

"Several things conspire to make the CSM concept unique," observes Krause. "First, there's the positive effect on the millions it's reaching (fourteen million in India alone), and especially its effect on school children and infants, for whom it halts nutrition-based illnesses, such as the fatal kwashiorkor—symptomized by bloated bellies and reddish hair. Wherever it's served daily, the stories of restored health are countless."

"In addition, all people know how to cook with it. But that's no mystery, for cereal-based CSM is a universal culinary tongue—wherever grain and flour-based recipes are understood. CSM is understandable. With it, traditional barriers of language and illiteracy just don't exist."

It was in 1963 that the government began its search for a low-cost, high-nutritional food. Until then, a common denominator had been missing. Either flavor appeal was lacking, the texture didn't adapt or some intangible went against prevalent eating habits. Whatever the reason, one thing was apparent: No food product fights hunger if it goes unprepared and remains uneaten.

Industry was asked by the government to join in a testing effort, and donated 10,000 pounds of precooked cornmeal to sixteen countries. Krause Milling was among the leading manufacturers who did. And when the donated product was enthusiastically received—in corn-, wheat- and rice-eating countries—the government moved to supply the willing manufacturers with Agriculture

August 1, 1974

Department guidelines for a new and full-nutrition product.

Among those 1965 guidelines were these prerequisites, out of which CSM developed:

It must have a cereal base of either wheat or corn.

It must be partially cooked, ready to serve within one- or two minutes.

Its protein content must be in the range of eighteen- to twenty-two percent.

It must be fortified with minerals and vitamins.

According to Krause, his company spent over a quarter of a million dollars on research, handling, blending and packaging facilities, in anticipation that CSM would be accepted. The investment paid off in September, 1966, when part of the first order went to Krause Milling. It was a modest request—nine million pounds of CSM—for a company that produces more than one million pounds a day. (Since then, more than two and one-half billion pounds have been shipped.)

Whatever the destination of CSM shipments—be it Lima or Biafra or Bangladesh or Madras—getting the fifty-pound bags to that final unloading dock is a complex matter. "It's a constant, but stimulating challenge to overcome the logistical nightmare involved in transporting the bags from our plant to a location that's possibly 15,000 miles away," remarked Krause. "Before it's opened, the bag, which has been sealed against moisture, rodents and insects, may be handled as many as thirty different times.

"In India, for example, CSM is moved from ship, to rail car to truck, to warehouse and to bullock cart. And from there, it is toted on head to the schools—some of which even report employing a special CSM cook for one hour a day—to be mixed with local spices in a native and nutritious variation on India's *peccorah* dish—tiny balls fried in soybean oil.

Nuances of political strife are often woven into the considerable distribution of CSM, which serves as the mainstay of relief projects and child-nutrition programs. A classic case proved to be that of the Indian and Pakistani distribution. Krause recalls, "Our government had to satisfy both the Pakistani and the Indian governments that our involvement there was humanitarian in nature, and that our goals were geared only to saving lives, not to strengthening Pakistan's position against the rebels or the rebel position against Pakistan.

"It's rare in business," Krause reflected, "to be part of something that's successful and also creative. The thrust within the program is for countries to develop food products comparable to CSM."

As to the actual creation of CSM, Krause avows that, "When management and employees have an integral part in the production of such a sophisticated, life-giving product, work *always* has meaning. You know where the effort goes and the results.

"But that same meaningful activity exists for everyone," he added, "if an individual knows what makes him or her feel worthwhile. From tutoring, to political workshops, to fund raising, once you have a sense of what's important, *what you're looking for*, you'll find it everywhere. In human relations, there's no lack of opportunity."

"Sadly enough, few people develop as far as they can. They leave vast possibilities untouched, either through not searching for them or, worse than that, through doubting their own capabilities."

"Some are quick to say that self-fulfillment is selfish, but I believe that it's good, even necessary, to chart the direction your life takes. As a businessman, I feel that every worthwhile demand makes you more concise, more specific. You learn to reach, to implement and to remain flexible."

Visiting many recipient countries has given Krause firsthand experience with the

CSM distribution system. "To see the eager response of the children now receiving CSM . . . the feeling isn't merely a humanitarian one: it's more like father and child. But to realize that, for all that's being accomplished, CSM reaches only ten percent of India's hungry children, for instance, creates a sense of personal failure."

As one of the country's largest corn millers, employing more than 400 people (with plants in Milwaukee, St. Joseph, Mo., and Dodge City, Kansas, where only sorghum grain is processed), the Krause Milling Company has excellent credentials for supplying a major food program of international proportions. Started in 1907, it has diversified its operations. Besides supplying the market with products such as corn flour, brewer's grits and grits for breakfast foods, it also manufactures an industrial cornbinder—to hold together forms when pouring molten metal—sells crude corn oil and is active in the hominy-feed business.

Why, then, doesn't a company so closely involved with the heart of American agriculture and production make CSM available for the hungry in the United States? Krause Milling simply isn't geared to sell in the retail market. But the future may change that. Although Americans are the best-fed people on earth, we are not *all* well fed and our food delivery systems, as witness recent shortages, are not fail-safe.

The average American consumes roughly four times as much grain as the average world citizen. This is not to say that Americans eat four times as much grain. Rather, with our tendency to derive much of our protein from meats, we consume much of our grain indirectly and inefficiently. One pound of beef is produced by a steer eating seven pounds of grain. That seven pounds of grain would be much more efficiently consumed directly by humans. Although steak and potatoes may continue to be the all-American meal, there is no question in the minds of Krause and other experts that American diets will have to be geared towards direct grain consumption.

With an eye toward this future, Krause did conduct a four-month study in four southern counties to determine CSM's acceptability. About 20,000 people were given one pound a month, and the results were overwhelmingly favorable. Again CSM translated, serving, this time, as a base for meat loaf filler, bread and biscuit flour and gravy thickening.

Appearing before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Krause detailed how CSM results could—and should—be implemented immediately to provide nutrition to the twenty million Americans who receive partial food assistance.

But some basic problems today threaten the increased distribution of CSM abroad. According to Krause, "The government is now placing budget restrictions on the program, at a time when the need in Africa and in Asia is the greatest it has been in the last decade.

"In addition," he noted, "with current increases in the cost of all commodities, including wheat, soy beans and corn, the dollar restriction imposed on PL 480 by the Office of Management and Budget means fewer pounds can be purchased with the approved funds. Also, concern over commodity availability has resulted in additional program setbacks. So it is important, particularly at this time, to rekindle the once-enthusiastic commitment of our people to such a program." Less than enthusiastic U.S. Government support is one of the problems affecting those who desperately need foods like CSM. Some prominent climatologists have attributed recent droughts in Africa and India not to the whims of the Monsoons, but to a global cooling trend. If these experts are correct, millions more will be added to the millions who are starving to death today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Despite the horror of such predictions, Krause does not view the future as necessarily horrible. "I am not pessimistic about the ability of the world to grow cereal grain in quantities sufficient to feed the populations that are anticipated in the next fifty years," says Krause. "I think the earth can support the nutritional needs of the life on it, but only if that nutrition is allocated properly. The problem is one of logistics—not so much one of growing grain, but of getting it, in proper nutritional form, to those who need it. The earth will support us if we support ourselves . . . and the earth."

Regardless of the political and logistical complexities surrounding this highly versatile product, the one thing that humanizes CSM is its uncanny ability—when local seasonings and spices are added—to become a familiar food, anywhere in the world.

Capable of being prepared in numerous ways—boiled, steamed, oven-baked or skillet-fried—its simplest form is porridge, made by combining one part CSM with two- to three-parts water. This is brought to a boil, and then cooked gently for ten minutes. In Colombia, however, there is the variation of cooking with milk and flavoring with the juice and grated rind of fresh oranges; another translation, in the Dominican Republic, calls for the addition of coconut milk and raisins.

CSM becomes an acceptable soup anywhere, with seasoned vegetables such as spinach, cabbage, squash, yucca, plantains or sweet potatoes dropped in the pot. In fact, there is no flavor, texture or taste that doesn't blend with CSM, from the molasses-like jogari of India, to the mashed banana of West Africa.

Krause believes that, "CSM is both a weapon against hunger and a hope for the future. For without nutrition, the less-developed countries have scant opportunity to create their own future. Only when their minds and bodies are nourished, can they enter into a full partnership with the world of nations."

But the Milwaukeean is quick to point out that CSM is not a magical food. "It is merely a logical use of commonly known facts about nutrition," he notes. "For example, knowing what we do about the amino acid balance in soy and corn, we combine the two and the synergistic effect is fantastic."

Cracking all the logistical, political, chemical and managerial puzzles of CSM marketing requires much corporate and individual vitality and creativity. Yet, in spite of the broad (even planetary) nature of his business interests—covering territory from India to Dodge City, Kansas—Krause is quick to qualify that every individual can and should maximize his professional and personal creativity beginning with the simplest of givens, the "nows."

"The world is full of worthwhile and creative things to do . . . but first, you must let yourself see what's in that world immediately around you. No one has to leave his own environment. Wherever you are, it is . . . and you can do it right there," Krause encourages.

Those who know him remark on Krause's ceaseless occupation with projects. And when he's put the holistic life question of how to mediate the polar pulls of leisure and business. Krause explains that, for him, "Leisure time spent in another type of 'work' isn't the sign of a driven man. Instead, it's indicative of a man who's been lured by the conviction of his own usefulness . . ."

In Krause's case, that "usefulness" has affected what is probably the major problem facing the world tomorrow—famine. Using a creative approach to an "impossible" problem—providing a cheap, highly nutritional food that can taste good to all tongues and in all cuisines—Krause energized his company and sweated out a solution. That solu-

tion instantly manufactured a host of other problems, some of mystifying complexity.

"You must be an optimist in the business of world feeding," concludes Krause. "Certainly we as a nation have always managed to overcome the past threats to our survival. We've come close to the brink and we see blackness looming, but then we always seem to pull logic and expediency creatively together . . . and we get the job done."

DR. EDWARD TELLER

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, at the June 11, 1974 luncheon of the National Capitol Section of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable THOMAS DOWNING, introduced Dr. Edward Teller, pioneer in nuclear development, who gave an incisive review of the importance of our national space program in these days of energy and other crises. I am including Dr. Teller's impressive discussion and the Honorable THOMAS DOWNING's introductory remarks in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and the general public:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN THOMAS DOWNING FOR DR. EDWARD TELLER

I have the honor of introducing our speaker this afternoon because the man who was supposed to introduce him, the Hon. John Davis of Georgia, chairman of the subcommittee on Science, Research and Development, was unable to be here. He asked me to extend his regrets and to introduce Dr. Teller and of course I'm delighted to do so.

You all know him. He's a physicist, a former Director and currently Director-at-Large of the Livermore Laboratory of the University of California. He's had a long and distinguished career. He was born in Budapest, Hungary and got his Ph. D. in Leipzig, Germany in 1930. He studied in Copenhagen with Nils Bohr, and in London, and came to the United States in 1934. During World War II you know of his work on the Manhattan Project at the University of Chicago and at the Los Alamos Laboratory in New Mexico.

Since 1945 he has done scientific work on a wide range of subjects from atomic and nuclear energy to astrophysics and space. He's been accorded many, many scientific honors, too many to mention here. Naturally a member of the National Academy of Sciences, he won the Einstein Award in 1955, the Fermi Award in 1962 and has merited many other honors. He is a frequent witness before the committees of Congress, a respected witness.

It is my pleasure to present to you probably the most distinguished physicist in the world, in my opinion, Dr. Edward Teller.

SPEECH BY DR. EDWARD TELLER

The question that comes up again and again is, what is the advantage, more than that, what is the practical advantage of space exploration. I can respond to that question quite conclusively by telling you that in the late 15th century, when Christopher Columbus was on his fund raising trip to Queen Isabella of Spain, his argument was that the voyage would make possible better trade with China, a purpose which has indeed been accomplished but only recently by Mr. Kissinger.

However, on the way Columbus seemed to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

have discovered something else. That story is to remind you that what we promise is one thing, what we perform is another. But contrary to expectations what we perform is, and I think will be, more than what we promised, I do not have the wisdom to foresee the actual result.

Having therefore described my crystal ball as appropriately cloudy, I shall now take you into these clouds. But first let me stay with solid and obvious problems where no crystal ball is needed. We have an energy crisis. The crisis is real. The crisis is bad for the United States; it may be catastrophic for other parts of the world. And in this crisis NASA is helping in ways that are small and in ways that are large. Harrison Schmitt, scientist-astronaut, who has gone to the moon and who now has his feet back on the common ground is in charge of the small part of the effort. I had the great pleasure of talking with him about everything between the moon and the earth and I would like to mention a couple of ideas which are modestly funded and which I'm sure fully deserve this funding.

The most popular energy source in astrodynamics is, of course, solar energy. And why not get the abundant solar energy to solve our crisis? There is just one little difficulty. The capital expenditures are too big by approximately a factor of 1000. We have to find ways to mass produce, and produce cheaply, the appropriate apparatus to transform solar light into electricity. It is very doubtful whether this can be done; a factor thousand is not easily obtained, but in new technologies they might be obtained. And it would be of tremendous significance if there would be success. The modest investment that exists in this field is certainly justified.

Let me mention an entirely different project which is connected with the energy crisis a little indirectly but which will certainly work, and which will certainly pay off. We are talking more and more, and we should be talking more and more, about the recovery of materials. For instance all cars should not be junked when they deserve to be junked, but the materials in the cars should be recovered. That is being practiced now, but when it is practiced the car as a whole is junked and what you get back is scrap iron. However the car is more than scrap iron even as far as materials are concerned.

There is chromium, there is copper, there are other materials, and the value that you can recover if you separate out these components and make them available each one in its place is much greater. There is at the same time a saving in energy, because in producing these materials, if you wouldn't recover them, energy would be spent. And this we now can save.

There are plenty of other projects; I happened to think of these two. The ingenuity, the technical know how of NASA is being put to good use.

But let me go back to the big aspect, the field most proper to NASA. One of the possible catastrophic consequences of the energy crisis is in the feeding of the people of the world. Many of the developing nations, for instance India and many others, are hit hard. These nations survive today, their people can be fed today, only on account of the green revolution which has introduced crops growing more food per acre. But the new grains, while they perform better when fertilized, don't perform when not fertilized. And the cost of the fertilizer has skyrocketed. The most important fertilizers, the nitrogen based fertilizers, which are based on gas and oil, are three times as expensive as they used to be a year ago. The result may be starvation for millions of people.

Now what does NASA have to do with this? A great deal. Catastrophes can be avoided;

at least they can be rendered less acute, if we foresee them, if we learn where it is that crop failure threatens. In the United States we have good enough reporting and we don't need NASA, but abroad it is a different story. In many of the developing countries it is from space that we can first see that drought is beginning to make an inroad, where blight endangers the crop, where the grasshoppers get going. These troubles might be remedied if seen soon enough, and if they can't be remedied at least we shall be forewarned in which areas of the world there is real trouble and where real help will be badly needed.

From a global point of view the situation is even worse. There are people in the world who are powerful and who are less open than we are. Our crop prospects are available. The Russian prospect for the harvest is not. Yet a success or failure of crops in Russia affects the world. By now, the Russians consume per capita almost as much grain as we do and they want it, and they are quite willing to let their allies the Hindus starve. And worse than that, in order to make good wheat deals, they don't give warnings of what their needs on the market will be.

I object to capitalism. I object to the dirty tricks of capitalism. Particularly when practiced by Communists.

Now we can contribute to needed openness in the world because we have satellites that can observe. I would like to see better and I would like to communicate promptly and openly in the interest of feeding all the peoples of the world.

Satellites, in looking back on Earth, are useful in this way and they are useful in many other ways. Dr. Fletcher, I know that you remember a bad and violent girl by the name of Camille. She was a hurricane and she tore Corpus Christi apart. But NASA caught her, reported on her and told the people of Corpus Christi to get out of the way. She killed a few hundred people, but if NASA had not been there with a warning (we have no stations in the Caribbean which could have warned) 50,000 people may have been killed or at least injured on that one occasion.

Ladies and gentlemen, I do not believe that the money spent on NASA is wasted. In fact I sometimes have the sneaking suspicion that the money that is not spent on NASA may be wasted. I believe that with weather satellites around, the time will come where we shall have good enough global weather reporting from the angels point of view and we can use these data not only to predict weather but to study how weather develops with the help of electronic computers. We will not be able to predict the weather for a year in advance because weather is full of trigger effects. But we can study the trigger effects and when we have understood them we might be able to influence weather and when that happens we shall have lost our last safe topic of conversation. And if that is not an accomplishment I don't know what is.

I have talked about practical applications and left out some that you can fill in. I want to turn to my fields of interest in science, to those fields where we gain nothing but knowledge, where we satisfy nothing but our curiosity. Yet curiosity is the most valuable heritage that we got from our ancestors the monkeys. It has carried us to the Moon, it has made modern technology possible and, as I said in the beginning, the unpredictable results are the best.

What can you do in a place like Skylab apart from looking at the sun? Well, I have said on previous occasions and I want to repeat it now, that the theme song of NASA should be the very old and beautiful song, which I will just recite: "I Have Plenty of Nothing, Nothing Is Plenty For Me." And by nothing I don't mean an absence of dollars, although that may begin to be true.

August 1, 1974

By nothing I mean a vacuum, a real vacuum where you may have not more than a few thousand molecules per cubic centimeter.

We pay a high price for a vacuum on earth in scientific experiments. Think of this pen which I hold in my hand as broken. Think of my fitting the pieces together. Will it be whole again? Well you know I wouldn't succeed and you know why: because the broken pieces are a jagged array of microscopic and submicroscopic hills and valleys, and I can't make them fit. But let me take a piece of graphite and break it. When graphite breaks, it breaks along a crystal surface which is completely plane, because graphite is put together from sheets of tightly bound carbon atoms. As we try to fit that together it won't work either, it won't stick. Why not? Because in a time much shorter than a second, the surface that was originally clean has become dirty.

Molecules from the air will sit down on it, stick to it and the two surfaces no longer stick. If I do the experiments in a vacuum I think we will be able to break graphite and put it together again, which is just a nice demonstration. It might not be a useless demonstration because we can prove that the surface remains clean. It might be a sensitive test of how good your vacuum has been.

Now these surface problems are more than toys, more than mere demonstrations. Many of our instruments in electronics are important in hearing aids, important in television—God forgive us for television (I shouldn't have said that, television after all performed a useful purpose at the time of the Moon landings)—and they are important in making computing machines and even in defending the United States. It's the one and only field in which we are still ahead of the Russians, as far as defense is concerned. Surfaces, the study of them, the making and the modifying of clean surfaces, can be decisive in the further development of electronics. This is a highly practical field.

In the recent experiments in Skylab a very remarkable experiment was carried out. People tried to grow crystals in a gravitationless surrounding, and they built the most perfect crystals ever produced by human hand. Some perfect crystals may be good starting points again for electronics. Clean silica crystals in which you can insert the appropriate perturbations and impurities could be manufactured in space. Here we have something more valuable than gold or diamonds so that you might indeed want to go to space to obtain it.

Ladies and gentlemen, where should the money come from? Of course from Congress. It is very possible that there could be another source and that should not diminish our efforts to persuade our own Congress to go ahead. The United States is not alone in the world. I have already pointed out that our activities in space may be more useful for starving people elsewhere than they are in the United States. In space an international effort is fully justified. Weather predictions are needed around the world and if international cooperation is useful in space, international cooperation in space may serve as a symbol, more practical and more valuable than the United Nations.

This may be a long distance off. But I hear that the Germans are beginning to put money into space for the simple purpose to get more deeply involved in developing technologies. Where the Germans go, the Japanese cannot be far behind. So I wouldn't give up. There seems to be another bidder who might be unexpected, but at least he has some money. I mean the Shah of Iran, who is interested in a satellite so as to be better informed about what's going on in neighboring countries. (That this is an important topic many of you know.) We might have bilateral arrangements and surely we might

look for multilateral arrangements which are the really important ones.

All of this of course will be immensely helped by the shuttle program which will allow us to put, at a lower price, many space vehicles into orbit for all the purposes I described and for very many which I did not.

But now I would like to look farther ahead. We have been to the Moon and we got back. We got back rather rapidly and as far as I'm concerned, quite unfortunately. We should have stayed. We should have established a base on the Moon: a laboratory to let some of our students do scientific studies on the Moon and get Nobel Prizes, in astronomy, about many other subjects.

Let me mention to you one point that Jack Schmitt mentioned to me. It is extremely interesting and in a technical sense quite relevant. The top few feet of the Moon contain hydrogen. Hydrogen atoms, protons, coming from the sun have embedded themselves throughout the ages so that from one cubic foot of "green cheese" you can get one cubic foot of hydrogen gas at normal temperature and pressure. Now this to my mind is extremely important. Oxygen we have plenty of on the Moon, water unfortunately we don't—at least none has been found. But hydrogen has been found and oxygen from iron oxides can be obtained relatively easily. From the oxygen and hydrogen we then can get concentrated power. One place where there will not be an energy crisis is the Moon. We need not worry about power on the Moon, there will be plenty. You even can put a refueling station onto the Moon. You send up a rocket and you don't carry the fuel for the return trip and then your rocket can be small and cheap. You refuel and come back to Earth and save your rocket. This might make the trips so cheap that the tourist business even might start. I would apply myself for such a trip except that I have promised my mother on her 70th birthday that I won't go to the Moon.

Refueling on the Moon; there is still another application. To go to the Moon to refuel puts you into a position where you can take off for months, with rockets smaller than have been built so far, or at least no bigger. The manned exploration of the solar system can be made into a reality with existing technology. Not today, because we don't have the money, not tomorrow because we don't have the lunar bases, but the day after tomorrow, not in the distant future.

I'm afraid I've talked too long. I have started with China, I will end with China. I have been very much interested in the history of science and technology. Why did this remarkable mutation, the industrial revolution, occur of all places in Europe in the 15th century? It would have been hard to predict such an event and if somebody predicted it he would have located the revolution in China. The Chinese discovered silk. They built, around the time of Christ, the first big canal. The engineering in the Chinese wall was outstanding. They invented gunpowder, rockets, printing, paper. They invented the proper use of horses. The harnessing of horses came to Europe from China.

Why did they fall behind? Why did we forge ahead? There was a critical time in the 15th century when Africa was explored. The west coast by the people sent out by Henry the Navigator and the east coast by the Chinese who came with the monsoons in one direction and sailed back with the monsoons during the other season. And then the internationally minded Tartar dynasty was overthrown and the Ming dynasty took over, and with it Neo-Confucianism was born. On imperial edict the Chinese started to look inward. They produced in the Ming period the best porcelain ever, the best ancient scholars ever, but technology and interest in the rest of the world withered. The Ming emperors forbade the travel outside China,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

specifically these expensive, senseless trips to some outlandish portion of the world which contained nothing but savages.

Our Ming emperors in the U.S. made a similar edict recently. I hope they shall not prevail.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FOR DR. TELLER'S SPEECH

Q. You've talked about applied research and the very practical aspects of the space program. I wonder what you'd say about the more esoteric research—the long range basic research, cosmology, neutron stars, black holes—what value do you place on that?

A. The black holes shouldn't be called black holes. The right name for a black hole is "boojum." You don't know what a boojum is? Haven't you read Lewis Carroll and the hunting of the snark? Haven't you heard of the warning to the nephew that if you ever encounter a boojum you will never be met with again? That's a black hole.

I think they exist. They should exist. We haven't seen any one yet. But we have seen the collapse of a star in a supernova. Then dense material is created and we believe occasionally we can obtain such masses and such densities that the gravitational attraction becomes so strong that once you are in you never get out again, not even if you are light. Therefore it is black. Therefore it is boojum.

I think these boojums exist and I hope they do. Some of my young friends have been telling me that when the universe was made, all kinds of strange things happened and a lot of small black holes occurred which are even more dense and are quite small. No one has ever seen such a small black hole, but they may be hard to find. Someone has claimed that the Russian meteorite of 1908 was such a black hole and I know that isn't so because if it had been it would have caused by far the biggest earthquake in history while passing through the earth. Yet very small black holes might exist and some people are trying to look for them. I certainly cannot tell you what good these black holes are, except to satisfy my curiosity. And on that and on the connected intellectual values I would like to put a high price.

Q. NASA presently has a \$3.2 billion budget. How much more would you add to it to maximize the potential of NASA?

A. I don't know what you mean by "maximize." I would think that to get back to at least \$5 billion would be highly reasonable and you realize how insanely modest I am. Because after all \$5 billion today doesn't buy what \$5 billion used to buy. With \$5 billion we can begin to start making preparations for the lunar research centers and then I would like to bring in the Shah of Persia and others. It should be an international effort, but he should ante up.

Now let me tell you another story. You asked the wrong person about the budget. Before the Manhattan Project started, a fellow Hungarian, Leo Szilard, wrote a letter, actually signed by Einstein that reached the President. A meeting was held and at that meeting I was asked what is the needed budget. And I said that I don't know but that one of my friends, Enrico Fermi, who couldn't be present suggested that for the first year we should spend on nuclear energy \$6,000. And that is what we got. My friends never forgave me. So I have a record for understatement.

Q. Dr. Teller, I really appreciate your mention of China because I came from there and recently I made a trip and stayed five months in Peking. I will tell you something which I saw there. They have been able to push the frontier of the farming land into the desert by a process, which I don't have time to tell you much about. They have been able to double their food production in the last

ten years. By the old method, carts and hands, no automobiles, no trucks. Very small help from you. So you can see now what others have been doing. We should do more to help people and create more food.

You talked about satellites; I must mention this fact. They have made use of the satellites of ours, not theirs, for predicting the weather, everywhere. They have more than 30 stations to use satellite pictures and to make weather forecasts. We should do better on that.

A. I am very much in agreement, I would like to see all the pictures published. And furthermore I would like to tell you one more thing about food in China by first telling you something that happened in this country. In 1963 an American company, the Kellogg company, developed a new method of making nitrogen based fertilizer. They are the biggest and the best today. As far as I know at the present time more than half of their orders have been placed by the mainland Chinese government. I agree with you that the Chinese are not in urgent need of automobiles but that does not mean they are not in urgent need of technology.

Q. Dr. Teller, in the last few months there's been new talk of a crisis in fundamental physics, particle physics. It seems to me we have these just about every ten years and then we have a new accelerator.

A. Look, the crisis in energy and the crisis in physics are two entirely different things. The crisis in energy most of us don't want, but the crisis comes. The crisis in physics most of us physicists want, but it doesn't come.

Q. What do you think of gradually opening up our military intelligence satellites so that all of the nations of the world will begin to have a warning system of war in any place in the world? This topic you have written about previously.

A. I have written about things of that kind previously. I have testified before Senator Muskie's committee on secrecy and science and technology, and while I don't think I should answer here your questions I want to repeat my public testimony of yesterday, and you may draw your conclusions. I have four proposals:

1. Science should not be classified.

2. Technology may be classified at any level for the purpose of national security, but after two years this kind of classification must expire because the Russians don't even take that long to find out our secrets.

I suggest that the AEC, the DOD, should imitate NASA. NASA has introduced a new kind of classification which I want to call the U.S. Proprietary Classification, similar to the company confidential or company proprietary classification. This procedure does not try to classify big, important things but it does classify tricks of the trade. The kind of things people abroad, particularly the Russians, have difficulty in obtaining. We should not rush to support our own competitors in trade, and even less in military preparedness.

This is a low-key and an effective procedure. And if government and industry are to cooperate, which they must in solving the energy crisis, then I think a similar mechanism in the two organizations is needed. Secrecy in government didn't work, proprietary information in industry works. Therefore let the government assume the modest low profile of industry and try to spread the information where it belongs and limit the information from spreading where it should not go.

4. There are a small number of topics, an extremely small number of topics, not many millions of documents but a few thousand documents, which have some very special importance and where technical and scientific secrets have to be kept. In those fields I would keep secrecy and make one

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

man responsible for all of it and he should be responsible for a small number of people. In this way I hope to get away from the unwieldy classification of information which does not allow our own people to find out what the Russians already know, which will not allow that warning be given to a country about to be invaded and which sometimes even limits us from giving information abroad about an impending hurricane or an impending shortage of food.

I want to conclude by quoting a remark of a really great physicist Nils Bohr who in 1945 said: "In the cold war one should expect that each side should use the weapons which it can use best. The best weapon for a dictatorship is secrecy, but the best weapon for a democracy is the weapon of openness." It is indeed a weapon which will lead to faster development of industry and defense, which will lead to international cooperation, and which will work for peace.

UNBELIEVABLE FAITH

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House are aware of my interest in reaching the time when America's vast resources will find a way to eradicate or prevent cancer. All too frequently, we are confronted with compelling evidence that this goal must be attained through a concerted national effort.

Such a case is that of the Brasington family, about whom an excellent article recently appeared in the Columbus, Ga., Ledger. Donna Brasington, a brave sixth grader, died a few days ago of leukemia, while her mother, who has suffered from leukemia for 4 years, remains seriously ill. The article follows:

GOD GAVE DONNA UNBELIEVABLE FAITH

(By Lisa Battle)

"She wanted a horse. She'd had a pony when she was little. She read about horses. When she was able to talk, we talked about horses. We had planned to get her a horse. Of course, we never did."

Loving horses was a natural interest for Donna Brasington, her sister, Mrs. Rita Riley, says. The sixth grader at Nanikpooh School was a Girl Scout, a 4-H member and sang in the youth choir at Victory Heights Baptist Church.

"She didn't like to sit still."

But since April, Donna spent most of her time in bed at Atlanta's Emory University Hospital. She died Saturday of leukemia.

Donna's sixth floor room was not far from her mother's. Ruth Marie Brasington has suffered with leukemia for nearly four years and is seriously ill, according to Mrs. Riley.

On the night of May 9, Donna and Rita's father, Columbus contractor James Kirby Brasington, 48, got up from his cot near his daughter's bed to give her cough medicine and had a fatal heart attack. Donna had been suffering intensely for weeks. "He couldn't bear it. His heart was just breaking."

Donna was shocked and hurt over her father's death but her "tremendous faith" kept her from being completely overwhelmed, her sister says.

"She just seemed to accept God 100 percent. She would witness to people visiting her in the hospital and say, 'God's with me. I'm all right.' She had the same faith that he

(her father) would be all right, that he was going to be with God.

"There were times she was very scared. We never told her she had leukemia. I think maybe I didn't want to face it. You feel so confused at such times and don't know what to say."

The dark-haired young woman, mother of two small daughters, took care of Donna during Mrs. Brasington's periodic hospitalizations over the past several years. She was with Donna "almost constantly," during her three months at Emory.

Despite Donna's suffering—she had recurrent chills and fever and hemorrhages—she never cried. But at one point, she asked "Why, God, why does this have to be?" Then she said to me, "Sister, I know I did the wrong thing. You shouldn't ask God why. There's a reason for me being in this hospital. She died saying 'The Lord's Prayer.'"

Donna was the only child on the floor and a favorite with the patients, all of whom had cancer or leukemia, her sister recalls. When her long brown hair was cut in a shag, some of the patients wheeled their chairs to her door, eager to see the new look.

"I told everybody about the love Donna gave people on that floor. They drew faith and strength from her."

Mrs. Riley was to take her mother to Emory today following Donna's funeral here Tuesday. The death of her father and sister and her mother's long illness have been experiences "I never thought I could bear." Yet they "have brought me closer to God."

"God has given me unbelievable strength. You don't really know how much He'll help you until you have to depend on Him." She speaks of the help of family, doctors, nurses, a young chaplain and various friends (a Marie Brasington Fund was started Tuesday at First National Bank) as being from God. "I believe God sends these people."

"The young chaplain . . . cried with me . . . prayed with me . . . held my hand . . . held Donna's hand . . . then he'd go to mother's room. He was there when we needed him." The chaplain is from New York, at Emory only for the summer—"just like God sent him to be with us."

Mrs. Riley says she prayed a long time that Donna would live, then asked God "to take her if He wasn't going to heal her."

"But God did answer my prayer. In a real sense she has been healed. She's alive in a way I can't understand."

The young Fortson woman wants to help other people diagnosed hopelessly ill now that she knows what their lives are like. "They're hurting. Their lives are not normal. They live such a sad life, so heartbreaking. If people would give of their time, of themselves. They need people to talk to them, to be with them, not just money."

"People should try to help anyway they can. I hope I can do more now that I know their need."

THE REVOLUTION IN WARFARE:
THE COMPUTER IMPACT

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, we are going through difficult and trying times in this country and at least partial blame for the problem lies in Congress' inability to assert itself in terms of its constitutional mandate as a separate, equal branch of our Government charged with the responsibilities of regulating foreign

trade. For too long now we have operated as a rubberstamp in this city for all of the trade policies that the boys at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue dream up. And recently the golden boy of all those boys, Dr. Kissinger, has taken to moving right into the realm of foreign trade as a supplement to his foreign policy programs. All that we are getting out of the mix is confusion and a horribly convoluted, disorganized, and unbalanced trade policy.

For that reason a bipartisan group has sponsored H.R. 15657, the National Protection Act amendments to the Export Administration Act of 1969.

The amendments will go a long way in reasserting the responsibilities of this Congress to put an end to this abuse of the fundamental powers of the Secretary of State.

I have several other concerns apart from the obvious one of our congressional responsibilities, however. A very basic question can be asked here: Are we exporting technological and strategic materials or are we simply selling prototypes to the Soviets, to be suddenly made aware of the folly involved in such short-sighted practices. First of all, it is a dangerous thing indeed to give the Russians the various capabilities in technology that they presently lack. This is of prime strategic consideration. But there is also the consideration to be made secondarily in conjunction with the subsequent losses to be suffered by business and labor if the Soviet desire for prototypes proves to be of economic, and not strategic motivation.

These amendments will protect U.S. labor and industry from purposefully unfair Communist competition. While it is true that our labor force is among the best paid in the world, and our industrial might the strongest, there are indications that recent trade policy has tended to undermine these statuses in favor of détente agreements. And with the advantage of our technological advances and the presence of a near-slave labor system in Russia the Soviets may very well be successful in their attempts.

Already my good friend and colleague in the Senate, HENRY JACKSON, has warned us of the inherent dangers in such naive dealings with a country of the recent reputation of the Soviet Union.

I applaud any chance whereby we might get to know the Russians better in order that we might get along with them better.

But I do not think that any rush to détente in the various forms that the present administration practices is any indication of the stability of such a course of action. And I definitely am sure that these various technological exports, whether detrimental to our strategic outlook or to our economic outlook are poor judgments and should be controlled in whatever way we can control them.

It is time that some basic judgments were made by this Congress and I feel that this amendment will begin to exert our responsibility to that better judgment.

I commend to your attention a very

August 1, 1974

timely argument in support of the National Protection Act, as published in the July 20, 1974, issue of *Human Events*. The author, Miles Costick, makes some very cogent points in opposition to any continuance of technological trading with the Soviets.

The article follows:

THE REVOLUTION IN WARFARE: THE COMPUTER IMPACT

(By Miles M. Costick)

At the outset, let me say that we are concerned lest the present detente euphoria mislead us into lowering our guard toward the Communist world. Consequently, we must recognize that a crucial element in our international relations is the maintenance of a margin of military advantage through possession of a number of sophisticated technologies.

The field of computers provides a prime example. A great many modern weapons systems depend on computers, and in the technology of their production and their application in combination with systems integration we are, by conservative estimate, about 15 years ahead of the Soviets. It is not that they cannot make computers. The fact is that they have a computer industry with substantial logic design capability and one to some extent able to supply the most critical military requirements.

What the Soviets lack is the ability to build large numbers of highly reliable sophisticated machines, to provide related equipment and follow-on support, and "naked" technology: i.e., technology as such and not that embodied in a machine.

In October 1973, Control Data Corp. announced its signing with the USSR Council of Ministers for Sciences and Technology of a 10-year agreement for technical "co-operation" in developing and manufacturing advanced computing equipment.

The Soviets said a key purpose of this agreement would be "econometric modeling and management of the Soviet economy." American sources in Moscow put the ultimate worth of the agreement at about \$500 million.

Admittedly, the United States must redress its foreign trade imbalances of recent years. It is my contention, however, that such dubiously profitable ventures as this help the Soviets plan what could become our eventual destruction.

The unusual enthusiasm with which Moscow announced the signing of this computer contract was, in itself, quite revealing. It was in marked contrast to the bland, general announcement disseminated by Control Data.

Working through TASS, the official Soviet news agency, the Kremlin leaders volunteered the information that Control Data and Soviet tracking organizations had maintained "commercial ties . . . for over six years." The TASS announcement in English on Oct. 23, 1973, states that "the Control Data Corp. is the first American firm to have signed with the Soviet State Committee an agreement for scientific-technical cooperation for a period of 10 years.

"The agreement envisages joint work in designing most up-to-date computers, computer peripheral equipment (magnetic tapes), systems of information processes, and communication and also software (language and instructions to tell the computer what to do) for such systems."

Furthermore, the TASS announcement went on to reveal that . . . "talks are on the way on the sale of high-speed 'Cyber' electronic computers."

This raised eyebrows in some of Washington's more sensitive sanctums. U.S. officials, as well as some Control Data officials, were surprised that TASS announced any dialogue on the Cyber System. Cyber is an

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

extremely sensitive topic. It is a very high-speed, large-volume, third- or fourth-generation scientific computer which processes 94 million bits of information per second, or even more.

Only eight to 10 such installations exist. Typical installations belong to the Atomic Energy Commission, U.S. Air Force, NASA, and National Security Agency.

Considerable confusion exists regarding the strategic importance of computers. Many analysts point out that numerous other technologies are revolutionizing warfare. For example: gyro, lasers, nucleonics, metallurgy and propulsion.

Yet, in one way or another, all technologies including the computer technologies themselves, are dependent on computers. For example, our Illiac IV, which is the key facility of the large computer network run by the Advance Research Projects Agency (belongs to NASA), the world's most advanced computer, was built with the help of several other large computers.

In short, today's emerging technologies are as dependent on computers as the technologies of the first industrial and military revolution were related to energy. Furthermore, computers, lasers and nucleonics are inter-related.

Without computers, modern weapons systems could not be built, integrated, tested, deployed, kept combat-ready and operated. In fact, weapons such as missiles, aircraft, tanks and submarines incorporate computers, as part of their armament. Avionics are intrinsically computer-linked. So is missile accuracy. MIRVing missile heads is impossible without computers. Helicopters used against tanks are provided with computers and computer links to obtain the real-time information needed for effective battlefield inaction.

In brief, there are no modern weapons systems that are not vitally dependent upon high-speed computers. A number of strategic missions are centered on high-performance computers: e.g., early warning systems, command-control-communications (C-3), all command control problems, anti-ballistic missiles defense, anti-submarine warfare, space operations and several branches of intelligence.

Simply stated, computers are not just swift calculating machines. They are entire systems. They include memory stores and testing and correcting mechanisms that include, also, peripheral equipment such as display units, input and output links, communications and "software" (instructions for computer what to do); i.e., old and new installations.

The big operational structures such as missile force or the meteorological or hydrological service must have several large general-purpose computers and special computers feeding the general-purpose machines. They also require field computers aboard mobile units such as ships, airplanes, missiles and space vehicles.

For example, in the Apollo Program a fairly large computer is carried in the Saturn booster. One is housed in the command spacecraft; two are attached to the lunar module. The launch site has a large computer installation. The vast tracking system contains many smaller and several large computers. Mission control has still another large installation. The Earth Resource Technology (ERT) program would be useless without computers to handle and "enhance" the inputs from the diverse sensors aboard the satellite.

The actual dismantling of export controls began during 1972. The Office of Export Control staff was reduced from 206 to 138. Also reduced was the list of commodities embargoed for strategic reasons for export to the Soviet Union and other Communist-ruled countries.

Since October 1972, the Commerce Department has removed export restrictions on all

but 70 of the 550 items once on that embargo list. At the same time, the Commerce Department has created a new bureau under its jurisdiction—the Bureau for East-West Trade with a staff of 150 people.

The Bureau for East-West Trade has three offices abroad: in Vienna, with 50 employees, Warsaw and Moscow. The purpose of the Bureau for East-West Trade is to actively promote commercial relations with the Soviet Union, its satellites and Red China. In addition, the United States has surprised its allies by actively seeking exemptions to restrictions jointly set by the countries in its own defense network.

In August 1972, the Congress' response prodded by the White House ordered the embargo list to be reviewed. This was in connection with the passage of the "Equal Export Opportunity Act." Commerce officials alleged that the review brought the unilateral American controls into line with the less extensive controls of "COCOM," the Coordinating Committee, the latter consisted of Japan and all the NATO countries except Ireland.

A Paris-dated New York Times report of July 14, 1973, said: "The U.S., which used to be the main force pressing Western Europeans to outlaw a number of items for export to Communist countries on strategic grounds, is now pushing for more exceptions to the ban list."

"The about-face in the American position came about last January 1, it was learned from U.S. officials dealing with East-West Trade in Vienna. Now, when the Coordinating Committee for the Western Allies Trade Embargo Committee meets, the American sources say, the U.S. is the major seeker for clearance of new types of products it can sell to the East.

"COCOM was intended to make sure that strategic goods did not leak through to the East as a result of competition among concerns in different Western countries. Two reviews of the forbidden list have been made recently. They reduced the number of banned items from many hundreds down to what was described as 'less than 50.' 'We no longer use the shot-gun approach,' S. Douglas Martin of the American East-West Trade Center in Vienna said recently. 'We don't ban whole categories of items. Our job here is not to enforce control.'"

Examples of commodities which have been removed from the embargo list include: vehicles for carrying liquified gases; parts and accessories for certain kinds of helicopters; video tape recording equipment; some computers and semi-conductors, satellite communications equipment; industrial pumps; cathode ray tubes; some kinds of transistors; various kinds of quality control machinery; raw materials such as tungsten and titanium; navigation aids; and some explosives.

According to the *Washington Post* of Nov. 14, 1973, a highly placed U.S. official said: "If the U.S. goes too strong in delisting, the whole COCOM fabric could come apart."

The present U.S. list is still lengthy. It contains a wide variety of chemicals (rocket boosters in which we hold a significant lead over the Soviet Union), metals, adhesives and electronics, equipment used mainly in chemical warfare agents, rocketry and military aircraft.

On paper, most computer technology is still restricted. But the U.S. has sold a variety of computers and computer hardware to a number of Communist nations. Decisions on which computers to let the Soviets buy seem to be marked by a latitude which detente buffs call judgment and which experts call "ad-hocerry."

Wade B. Holland, editor of Rand Corporation's *Soviet Cybernetics Review* put it this way in *Science*, Vol. 183, Feb. 8, 1974:

"There are no rigid standards. Getting a license to export depends on how much weight you can throw or whether your tim-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ing is right, like if Nixon has just made a visit to Moscow."

In 1972 the Commerce and State Departments approved the export of 164 Centalign-B precision grinding machines. Just before the presidential election, Nicholas Leyds, general manager of the Bryant Chucking Grinder Co. of Springfield, Vt., announced a contract with the Soviets for 164 Centalign-B machines capable of finishing precision miniature ball bearings to tolerances of 25th-millionth of a inch. The U.S. reportedly never owned more than 77 of these machines.

Ball bearings are an integral part of many weapons systems, there is no substitute. The entire Soviet ball bearing production capability is of Western origin. All Soviet tanks and military vehicles run on bearings manufactured on Western equipment or on copies of Western equipment.

All Soviet missiles and related systems, including guidance systems have bearings manufactured on Western equipment or on Soviet duplicates of this equipment. Bryant Chucking Grinder Co. has been a major supplier of ball bearings processing equipment to the Soviet Union.

"Upon purchase, in 1972, of 164 Bryant precision grinding machines, Anatolly I. Kosztousov, minister of the Machine Tool Industry in the Soviet Union, said they had waited 12 years for these machines, which included mostly the banned models: "We are using more and more instruments of all kinds and our needs for bearings for these instruments is very great. In all, we need to manufacture five times more bearings than 12 years ago."

That makes sense—the Soviets have five times more missiles than they did 12 years ago. (*National Suicide*, Antony C. Sutton, Arlington House, 1973, pp. 100.)

My inquiry with a Defense Department source regarding the Bryant equipment and precision miniature ball bearings resulted in the following reply: "They are the key to our highly accurate, miniaturized ICBM guidance systems and the MIRVing of our warheads."

Recent reports about agreements signed by General Dynamics Corp. with the Soviet State Committee for Science and Technology are also disturbing. The five-year agreement for scientific and technological cooperation covers such defense-related fields as ships and ship building, telecommunications equipment, asbestos mining and processing, commercial and special purpose aircraft, computer-operated microfilm equipment and navigation and water buoys.

Similarly upsetting: the Fairchild Corp. deal with Communist Poland for sale of U.S. integrated circuit technology used extensively in modern weapons systems and in third-generation computers.

The February 1974 issue of *Armed Forces Journal International* reports that the Soviets are asking major U.S. aerospace firms (Boeing, Lockheed and McDonald-Douglas) to sell them, on a major scale, the manufacturing technology and managerial expertise to build wide-bodied commercial jet liners. This is but one of a series of recent deals that bring to a head the issue: How far should the United States go in cultivating new "trade" relations with the Soviet Union?

Where do we draw the line between commercial technology and military or strategic technology in our exports to the Soviet Union?

Firms now being asked to supply Moscow with a full range of technical know-how to build jumbo jets are the same firms building most of our military aircraft. It would be challenging, to say the least, for these firms to develop a major aviation complex for the USSR without some compromise of our own security.

Jumbo jets are the primary aviation in which U.S. industry holds unchallenged domination in world markets. It makes no sense to ship our technology to our self-

declared adversary, thereby giving him the ability to disrupt markets, wage economic warfare and inflict damage upon the United States' economic welfare. The word for this is "suicide."

PUBLIC CITIZENS VISITORS CENTER

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to submit the following addenda for the Members' roster of items for visiting constituents. I am particularly delighted to offer this article because Ralph Nader is a constituent of mine; Patricia Brooks, the writer, is based in my State of Connecticut, and the subject—the Public Citizens Visitors Center—is an especially timely one and will, no doubt, prove helpful to visitors to the Washington scene.

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1974]

INSIDE WASHINGTON WITH RALPH NADER

(By Patricia Brooks)

"So many visitors to Washington walk past all the famous monuments in lockstep, eyes glazed over. They get no sense of the dynamic things going on around them, things that are going to shape their lives. We're trying to clue them in on the action."

Fay Mauro speaking. She's the director of the Public Citizens Visitors Center, a new enterprise of Ralph Nader, the consumer advocate, devoted to helping tourists see the real sights behind the sites in the nation's capital. It opened late this spring in a modest storefront at 1200 15th Street N.W., just down the road a piece from the White House, and thus far it has corralled only a few hundred visitors a week—a negligible fraction of the 19 million expected to stream into Washington this year. But if the House Judiciary Committee recommends a bill of impeachment, and if the full House of Representatives debates the issue, the volunteers at the Visitors Center expect to have their hands full dispensing free information, advice and assistance. That's exactly the kind of action the center hopes to clue visitors in on.

The earnest intent of the center is evident in its weekly calendar, a four-page compendium of Washington happenings of consumer, civil, political, ecological and cultural interest. Copies are distributed to hotels and motels in the District of Columbia, to the Convention and Visitors Bureau ("They tell you how to spend your money, but not how to spend your time," says Fay Mauro), to the Smithsonian Institution and other places where tourists gather. Some examples of listings in the calendar.

Events of Special Interest. Programs at the Visitors Center starring the deputy director of the Federal Office of Consumer Affairs . . . or with a member of the Capitol Hill News Service on how the press covers Congress . . . or with lobbyists . . . or with someone from the Federal Energy Administration on the energy crisis.

A STOP AT THE PENTAGON

Tours and Visits Recommended. A stop at the Pentagon with "special briefings for small groups" . . . a tour of the Agricultural Research Science Center, "a 'must' for green thumb gardeners" . . . a visit to the Goddard Space Flight Center ("Note: 45 min. driving time involved—but worth it!"). Some of the off-beaten-track tours require appointments, which the Visitors Center offers to arrange.

August 1, 1974

Congressional Hearings of "Special Interest." "An agricultural committee hearing may sound like dullsville," says Fay Mauro. "But when you get Cabinet officers testifying about the economy before the Senators who are going to write the laws for change, it can be damn exciting!" The subjects apt to be considered of "special interest" include regulatory agencies such as the Federal Trade Commission, governmental secrecy protection of individual rights, or even hearings chaired by a prominent Senator or Representative known for his interest in consumer or public-interest affairs.

The Visitors Center itself is a pocket-size rectangle of a room staffed by young and enthusiastic volunteers who encourage you to take without charge any or all of the diverse pamphlets stacked neatly on tables. The pamphlets cover such topics as energy, consumer news in Spanish as well as English, the schedule of Smithsonian events, historical data on impeachment and information on salmonella and food poisoning, nursing home care, acupuncture and—not surprising considering the center's guiding light—all you'll ever want to know about automobile safety belts.

FREE MOVIES

There is a tiny adjunct to the Visitors Center on the third floor of the same building, where free movies of public interest are shown three times a day. The films are shorts, many from the National Film Board of Canada, on a variety of subjects: grass roots activism, abuse of the environment, economic exploitation.

Also available upstairs are the Nader reports on all Congressional voting records, handy if you plan to call on your Congressman. The center will also help you contact your Senator or Representative. "If a group comes in," one volunteer explained, "and wants to see their Senator on a specific issue or problem, Fay Mauro tries to help set up an appointment, if not with the Senator, at least with his legislative aide." And the center will point you in the right direction if you want to see your Congressman in action. Volunteers will look up the committees he's on, check the schedule and send you off to the hearing where you can see him function, or not function, as the case may be.

A look at the center's guest book indicates that the 350 or so weekly visitors come from all over the United States, with a handful from Europe. In general, they seem to be people whose political consciousness is raised, though the 16-year-old high school boy manning the desk says, "We do get a few who just come in for the free bus maps."

I accompanied a small group from the Visitors Center one morning to the Dirksen Office Building of the Senate. A young woman from Florida, waiting in line to be admitted to the large hearing room where the Senate Judiciary Committee was hearing witnesses on the appointment of Earl Silbert as United States Attorney, said: "I used to wonder when I took the guided tour of Congress why so few of the Congressmen were on the floor. The tour guide implied they were all goofing off. I've been learning at the Visitors Center about all the hearings our Representatives have to go to."

A college student at George Washington University said, "When I first came to Washington, I thought you had to have 'pull' to get into hearings. Now I know it's just stamina. The popular hearings have thick lines from 9:30 on. But if you persevere, you usually get in for some of the action before the hearing ends at noon. Afternoon hearings generally are even easier to get into."

This was an "action" hearing. Henry Peterson, Assistant Attorney General, was the first scheduled witness. The hearing was to begin at 10:30. It was only 10 A.M. and the line already stretched halfway down the long hall. As members of the Judiciary Committee

strode down the hall, the television crews primed themselves to interview the superstars—Sam Ervin, Ted Kennedy, Peterson—while Senators Tunney, Hart, Hruska, even Chairman Eastland, drifted by unheralded. At the hearing itself, Henry Peterson exploded at Sam Ervin, slammed the table repeatedly, and the audience gobbled the scene greedily.

Ralph Nader, at the press conference that officially opened the Visitors Center May 14, was asked, "Why will tourists bother coming here to get information about Congress, the Supreme Court and regulatory agencies' hearings? That doesn't sound like much fun."

Nader replied: "It depends on one's definition of fun. One definition is not being bored. We hope to offer visitors a chance to make their stay in Washington more meaningful than a Gray Line Tour."

The Public Citizens Visitors Center (tel: 202-659-9058) is open from 9 A.M. to 5 P.M. Mondays through Fridays, 9 A.M. to 1 P.M. Saturdays and closed Sundays. The center's calendar states that it is "a free non-profit facility open to everyone and funded entirely by contributions." A discreet money box accepts visitors' donations, but much of the rent is paid by Nader's Public Citizens Organization, which in turn, of course, is funded by contributions.

Much of the material available at the Visitors Center could be obtained elsewhere by diligent bird-dogging. The daily Congressional hearings, for instance, are listed in *The Washington Post*. But the Nader Center is an unusual one-stop facility that wraps up all kinds of information of general public interest.

NATIONAL SECURITIES MARKET BOARD

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance may shortly be taking up consideration of H.R. 5050 which provides, among other things, for the establishment of a national securities market system—an electronic link-up of the stock exchanges with the over-the-counter market. This will be accomplished primarily by a composite quotation and transactional tape which will allow investors to buy and sell at the best possible prices no matter where they occur throughout the system.

Although Congress and the Securities and Exchange Commission appear committed to seeing the implementation of the central market concept, there is as yet no consensus within either the industry or Congress as to how the national securities market system should develop, who should or should not participate, and how it should be regulated. All these are extremely important questions, and the way in which Congress answers them will have a significant impact on the viability of the securities industry, the corporations raising capital through the equity markets, and the public investors who directly or indirectly commit their funds to the growth of America's publicly owned companies.

One of the answers, which I submitted to the subcommittee several months ago in the form of a discussion proposal, is to create a self-regulatory body, a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

National Securities Market Board. By delegating to the Board regulatory authority over key elements of the national market system—composite quotation and transactional tape—both industry and the public would be assured of maximum involvement in developing, operating, and regulating the system.

The Board would also introduce a greater degree of flexibility into the system's regulatory framework. Subject to SEC and congressional oversight, the Board would be in a position to react quickly and in the public interest to day-to-day management and regulatory problems while also being in a position to evaluate the system and anticipate problems without waiting on Congress for enabling legislation. There is much talk about the "evolution" of the national market system, but no one really knows what this evolution will entail. It would seem that a self-regulatory body for the system would be in a unique position to guide the system's evolution.

A third advantage is the clear delineation of regulatory responsibility for the national market system. The Board would not add another regulatory layer; rather it would prevent the occurrence of either overlapping self-regulatory responsibilities or a void of self-regulatory authority. My bill would accomplish this by providing that the exchanges and the National Association of Securities Dealers would continue to perform those self-regulatory functions not performed by the Board. The Board would only have jurisdiction over: First, the criteria for determining the eligibility of securities to be traded within the system and second, the criteria governing and regulating a consolidated transactional reporting system and a composite quotation system.

Before briefly summarizing the bill's provisions, it should be pointed out that I am introducing the proposal in bill form only to facilitate the solicitation of comments. I plan to offer the bill as an amendment to title VI of committee print No. 1 of H.R. 5050, if that is the vehicle chosen by the subcommittee for markup.

In reviewing and commenting on this proposal, I would encourage interested parties to focus on: First, the need for a self-regulatory body for the national securities market system, an industry board with public representation, and second, the areas of the system over which the self-regulatory body should be granted jurisdiction in order to insure that the system operates smoothly, in the public interest, and with an eye toward future needs. After these major substantive points are addressed, then I think it would be helpful to comment on other provisions such as how many Board members there should be, how they should be elected, who they should represent, et cetera.

We are fast approaching the implementation of key elements of the national securities market system. I would hope that if there is no consensus over other matters, there would at least be consensus on the need to stop haggling over who would have veto power and who should receive special privileges in

the system. I would also hope that this proposal coupled with agreements already hammered out on important provisions of H.R. 5050 would be recognized as positive steps in the direction of designing the new system before it designs itself in an ad hoc fashion to the possible detriment of the industry, listed corporations, public investors, and the Nation's capital markets.

EXPLANATION

The bill adds a new section, section 15B, to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Subsections (a) and (b) of the new section attempts to indicate the nature of a national securities market system and to specify what may be some of its components. Subsection (a) contains certain findings concerning the country's capital markets and the need to develop a national securities market system, including a national self-regulatory body to govern and operate the system subject to SEC oversight and regulation.

Subsection (b) directs the SEC to take all steps as may be authorized by the new section to establish such a system, and the subsection states that such a system shall include, at a minimum, a transactional reporting system, a composite quotation system, and, until such time as the self-regulatory body is effectively established, rules to establish criteria for securities to be qualified for trading in the system.

Subsection (c) provides that the SEC must appoint a National Market Board at least 3 years after the enactment of the Securities Act Amendments of 1974—H.R. 5050. The SEC may defer appointment of the Board for periods up to 2 years, but such periods must not exceed a total of 4 additional years from the 3-year time period. In deferring the appointment of the Board, the SEC must give Congress prior notice and state its reasons therefor.

Subsection (d) states that the SEC must appoint 15 members to the Board who will be reasonably representative of registered exchanges and national securities associations; likely classes of participants in the system—securities information processors, marketmakers, specialists, and brokers and dealers—investors; the public; and other persons as the Commission may deem appropriate.

Subsection (e) gives the appointed Board 1 year within which time to file with the SEC a proposed constitution and rules which must provide for, among other things, fair and equitable procedures for the election of successors to members of the Board reasonably representative of the persons identified in subsection (d).

Subsection (f) provides that the SEC must approve or require modifications of the proposed constitution and rules 120 days after the filing, or within such longer period of time as the SEC determines necessary, after providing interested parties with an opportunity for oral or written comments.

Subsection (g) delineates the Board's area of jurisdiction. The Board's rules shall: First, establish criteria for determining the eligibility of securities to be traded within the system; and second,

establish criteria governing and regulating a consolidated transactional reporting system and a composite quotation system.

Subsection (h) gives the SEC responsibility for promulgating rules to assure the fair and equitable treatment of all participants in the system and to coordinate functions among the various markets comprising the system.

Subsection (i) prohibits any securities exchange or securities association from maintaining or enforcing any rule or any action that would be inconsistent with the rules promulgated pursuant to subsections (g) and (h).

Subsection (j) provides that the SEC will have the same authority with respect to the Board, its constitution, and its rules and amendments thereto as the SEC has with respect to registered securities exchanges and securities associations on the day after enactment of the Securities Acts Amendments of 1974.

Finally, subsection (k) gives the Board authority to assess participants in the system reasonable fees to finance the cost of the Board's operations and to contract with suppliers and operators of equipment needed to perform the appropriate functions of the system.

LOANS FOR VETERANS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in our 200-year history, American soldiers have returned home not to cheers, and trumpets, but rather only to the closed eyes and ears of a nation that grew tired of the Vietnam war. Our colleague, Mr. MURPHY of New York, has opened his eyes and has seen one of the

major needs of the Vietnam era veterans—money; money to start or improve his business.

Mr. MURPHY's bill, of which I am a cosponsor, will not only raise the loan ceiling from \$2,500 to \$30,000 but further it will make all veterans eligible for these loans. To date, young veterans, or those who have served in our Armed Forces since January 31, 1955, have been excluded from eligibility for small business loans. This bill would correct this injustice.

Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam war may not have been our most popular war. However, we should not turn our backs, nor our budget, to the millions of America's former service men and women. They were there when called on, and it is our national and humanitarian duty to come now to their aid.

I introduce the following editorial from *El Diario, La Prensa*, the fine bilingual newspaper in my city on Mr. MURPHY's bill for the further information of my colleagues:

LOANS FOR VETERANS

It does seem often that veterans are a separate oppressed minority. Many feel that the only time they are in the newspapers is when someone with military experience hijacks a plane, robs a bank or goes out on a killing spree. In the nation's haste to forget its wars, the veteran has been left alone, alone to grapple with his particular problem: trying to get back the chance to enter the mainstream he lost when he answered the call of his country.

Especially poignant is the case of the Vietnam Vet. After other American wars, veterans came home as victors, full of tales of glory. But not the Viet veteran: Wrong war. Wrong generation. Wrong ending. There were no heroes this time. In 1970, a study found that the Vietnam veteran is in much worse shape than his World Wars I and II counterparts.

Coming to the aid of the forgotten veteran, Congressman John Murphy (D-N.Y.) has now introduced a bill that would really aid the ex-soldiers in their struggle to carve out a future for themselves. The bill would pro-

vide for a new program for veterans to obtain business loans.

"Our veterans—the Congressman stated—are a valuable asset to any community. Their desire to own their own business must be encouraged. The legislation I have introduced will add the needed momentum to get veterans back into their community."

Congressman Murphy went on to say that "Veterans who want to obtain loans to start their own business, or improve an existing business, have been fighting a lot of red tape. With the introduction of my new bill, I hope to raise the limits on the amount the veteran can borrow."

Right now the Business Loan Program of the Veterans Administration is foundering. Loans are hard to obtain, and when granted, the maximum amount that a veteran can receive is approximately \$2,500. Now, this is chickenfeed in these times of brutal, runaway inflation.

Congressman Murphy's new bill would raise the loan limit to \$30,000. Of this amount, not more than \$20,000 shall be used for purchases of construction, repairs, or improvements of lands and buildings. Not more than \$10,000 is to be used for repair or improvement to equipment or stock.

"The most important part of my bill—Mr. Murphy added—is the fact that for the first time all veterans will be eligible to obtain these loans. Up until this time there was a discrimination against the young veteran." (Veterans who have served after January 31, 1955 have not, up until now, been eligible to obtain a small business loan.)

The Congressman stated that this inequity must be resolved: "These men answered the same call to serve their country as did the men of World Wars I and II, and it is unfair that they are being denied the same benefits that our older veterans now possess," Mr. Murphy said.

With the increase in benefit allowances and the eligibility of veterans who have served since the Korean conflict, this new legislation should provide greater assistance to all veterans.

We hope with Mr. Murphy that Congress will not let this bill languish and die in committee and that the measure will not only increase the amount that the Vet can borrow but that it will encourage more veterans to actively seek these loans as a way of starting a business and getting back into the community.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, August 2, 1974

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the Earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.—Psalms 90: 1, 2.

Our fathers looked to Thee and trusting in Thy mercy, Thou didst uphold them all their days. Give to us in our day such an awareness of Thy presence that we may know that Thou art with us to uphold us and to guide us. Strengthen us in the hour of temptation, keep our feet from falling and our spirits from fainting. Lead in the paths of Thy peace and along the road of Thy righteousness that we may not fail man nor Thee in these critical times.

Make us true children of Thine, promoting peace and justice with good will among our people: for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3620. An act to establish the Great Dismal Swamp National Wildlife Refuge; and

H.R. 4861. An act to amend the act of October 4, 1961, providing for the preservation and protection of certain lands known as Piscataway Park in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 15544. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15544) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. BAYH, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. CHILES, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr.